

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 14 August 1985

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

## PETITION: CRAIGBURN FARM LAND

A petition signed by 16 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to purchase Craighburn Farm land, north of the Sturt River, and retain it as open space was presented by the Hon. D.C. Brown.

Petition received.

## QUESTION TIME

## TAXATION

**Mr OLSEN:** Will the Premier tell the Prime Minister that the South Australian Government is completely opposed to tax on fringe benefits in view of its impact on the South Australian motor vehicle and wine industries? Arising out of the Federal Government's failure to achieve the tax reform it promised, it is to proceed with a tax on all fringe benefits such as company cars and entertainment allowances.

Already, it has been estimated that such a tax could cost up to 5 000 jobs in the manufacturing, distribution and retailing segments of the motor vehicle industry. Sales have already been affected in the wine industry by the 10 per cent sales tax introduced by the Hawke Government in its last budget, and will be further hit by a tax on entertainment expenses. In view of the importance of these industries to the South Australian economy, and in view of the Federal Government's failure to introduce its preferred tax option, which will not lead to any increases in personal disposable income tax to offset a tax on fringe benefits, will the Premier completely oppose the fringe benefit taxation proposals of the Federal Government?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** First, I would like to comment on the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition in explanation and his reported remarks today about the failure of option C as proposed at the tax summit. I find it extraordinarily hypocritical that the Liberal Party, which sat on the sidelines in the sense of actually proposing anything positive and joined with and supported any disaffected groups that raised their heads during the tax debate—in other words, helped create a climate which meant that at the tax summit we were not able to reach the sort of consensus decision—can now, having seen the end result of that, stand up and criticise. I do not think I need say any more on that point. As to the question of deductions—

**The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:** You had no package yourself.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the Premier to resume his seat. I call the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to order.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. A constant barrage of interjections will not overcome the fact that what we are seeing is gross hypocrisy. The attitude is that one sits on the sidelines, licks one's finger, and holds it in the wind to see which way it is blowing. I understand that the Leader of the Opposition made remarks recently about people's decisions being governed by polls. If ever we have seen such fence sitting and irresponsibility in the course of this historic tax debate, we saw it from the Liberal Party.

I understand now that, after the event, the Leader of the Opposition supported the broadly based consumption tax. That was very interesting: he was singularly silent about what he supported before the summit—very quiet indeed about what the implications would be, how he would protect lower income earners and a whole range of other matters. Our position was set out on many occasions; it was stated firmly at the tax summit. On the question of deductions, I quote from the remarks I made then, in relation to entertainment expenses in particular:

Deductions for entertainment, too, have come under close scrutiny. Let us not forget that a major industry or at least aspects of it have been built around those deductions. People are employed in consequence of them. What replacement can we provide? How can we ensure that the adjustment is not too disruptive? These are questions of policy that have to be addressed.

I have made quite clear to the Prime Minister over the course of a long and constructive dialogue on this matter where we stand on this; that if those policy decisions are to be made in the broader community interest we must also look at the consequences of them and provide protective mechanisms. That remains our position.

**Mr Olsen:** Would you oppose it or not? The Premier still hasn't made up his mind.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

## MURRAY RIVER WATER QUALITY

**Mr MAX BROWN:** Does the Minister of Water Resources agree with remarks made by Senator Jessop, as reported in the *News* of 29 July, wherein he was reported as saying that Murray River water quality is currently a matter of concern and, further, that in 15 years the quantity will also be of concern? In relation to this matter Senator Jessop cited the City of Los Angeles buying water rights for farmers, and apparently he believes that in 15 years South Australia will be buying water rights. As this matter is important to South Australia, and the Iron Triangle in particular, I would appreciate the Minister's comments.

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** Yes, I have seen the press report of the remarks made by Senator Jessop, who I understand visited the United States of America, specifically Los Angeles, where he found that one State was purchasing water rights from another State, involving a considerable distance. I think this is probably an issue that does not have a great deal of substance. A rather pessimistic viewpoint has been taken, and I do not agree. Obviously, Senator Jessop is not aware of the River Murray Commission and the work it does in allocation of various volumes of water to the respective States involved. The Commission plays a very important part in ensuring that South Australia gets its entitlement and allocation of water.

We have experienced some difficult seasons over a period of time. Of course the volume of water fluctuates with seasonal conditions but, in relation to this year, until a few weeks ago there was some concern about the volume of water contained in the Upper Murray catchment region—the Dartmouth/Hume regions. Fortunately, over the past few weeks the situation has changed significantly. Indeed, in the Adelaide area the position has changed significantly because of the substantial rains that have fallen in the past couple of weeks.

I do not agree with the pessimistic viewpoint that has been taken. I do not foresee the time when South Australia will have to purchase water from the other States. The River Murray Commission has the responsibility to ensure that the allocation is fair and reasonable. It has always adopted that practice, and I am sure that it will continue to do so.

### GAS SUPPLIES

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Will the Premier say whether the statement made in His Excellency the Governor's speech at the opening of this session of Parliament, namely, that 'The Government is determined to take all necessary steps to secure long-term gas supplies for South Australia,' means that one option that the Government is considering is legislation to break the indenture which was negotiated by the Dunstan Government and which ratifies current supply arrangements?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** It means exactly what it says: we will take all necessary steps to secure supplies.

### JAPANESE CONTAINER SHIP TRADE

**Mr WHITTEN:** Is the Minister of Marine able to provide any details of how the new Japanese/Port Adelaide container ship trade will benefit South Australia? The Minister will recall that recently at Port Adelaide he said that the trade link was 'one of the most significant developments that the Port of Adelaide has witnessed in many years'. He also said that the new trade link was worth millions of dollars to South Australia and would provide a significant boost to local industry, importers and exporters.

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** There are many advantages for South Australia in winning that direct shipping service from Japan. First, there will be substantial advantages for exporters and importers simply because they will have more direct control over their goods. The service will reduce delays, both at dockside and for road transport. The Japanese are sensitive about the good industrial relations record in South Australia, and that is a tremendous advantage.

Increased tonnages through the Port of Adelaide will create new employment in all cargo handling and warehousing areas. Increased shipping will result in a boost to marine service industries and other port related facilities. Most importantly, it will ensure the viability of Port Adelaide, a most important aspect of this whole matter. I am sure that everybody would agree with that.

Initially this will be a monthly service, but I am hopeful that by the end of this year it will be fortnightly. Several officers from the Department of Marine and Harbors will soon travel to Japan to follow up the winning of that direct service from Japan. They will be visiting the port of Mizushima to follow up the sister port relationship. We do not want that agreement merely to be a piece of paper. I think that there is a lot in that sister port relationship agreement for South Australia and that a good deal of trade is available in that area. The sister port proclamation provides that it is the purpose of both ports to contribute to the promotion of trade as well as the economic, cultural and social exchange between Australia and Japan, and make utmost efforts to deepen mutual understanding and confidence and bring prosperity for both countries.

All of this should complement the work being done by the department in South Australia. We currently have in the field officers who are attempting to attract more trade and cargo through the Port of Adelaide. I am sure that the visits by our officers will assist in gaining additional cargo for our port.

I place on record my recognition of the cooperation of my predecessors, the members for Torrens and Victoria, who were previous Ministers holding this portfolio, and of successive governments that have fought hard to achieve this direct shipping service. I also compliment the shipping user group, which cooperated in this achievement. I believe that there are many advantages for South Australia in this service and that it will bring additional revenue to the State.

I am hopeful that by Christmas we will have a fortnightly service rather than the present monthly one.

### ELECTRICITY TARIFFS

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** Will the Premier say what the impact will be on electricity tariffs if the Electricity Trust converts about one-third of the capacity of the Torrens Island power station to burn black coal instead of natural gas? A report in today's *Advertiser* indicates that the Government is still pursuing the option of converting part of the Torrens Island power station to burn black coal imported from New South Wales. As well as the cost of boiler conversion, the output of the station would be downgraded significantly, and a great deal of money would have to be spent to minimise the environmental impact of burning coal in a densely populated area. The impact on tariffs of such a move would be massive. Will the Premier quantify this, as this is still an option that the Government is pursuing?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** At the moment we are some 80 per cent dependent on natural gas for our power generation. It is clear that we must have options and diverse sources of fuel if we are to create a situation where we do not have a total dependence on one source and therefore a monopoly situation, which may command a particular level of price. Therefore, all those options are being pursued by the trust. The Future Energy Action Committee, which is being established under the chairmanship of Mr Stewart, has also examined in some considerable detail these various options. It is pursuing those studies further, and questions such as the honourable member asks will obviously be part of that study. The impact on tariffs is crucial as to whether or not it is a feasible option. That is still to be determined.

### ADVISORY TEACHING POSITIONS

**Mrs APPLEBY:** Can the Minister of Education advise the House what is the correct situation in respect of advisory teaching positions in 1986? I ask this question in light of the assertions made by the member for Torrens in this House last night.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I am happy to answer the honourable member's question and to edify members of this place. I find it interesting that it has fallen to the member for Brighton to choose to follow up this very interesting topic, which is a matter of great concern to a number of teachers in our schools in South Australia: it was not picked up by the member for Torrens at any stage during the sittings of this House. In fact, he raised a number of issues last night in his Address in Reply speech on education which seemed to me to be fertile ground for many potential questions that could be asked of a Minister of Education. However, what did we have in terms of questions on those issues that the honourable member chose to raise last night at 11.30 when nobody was around to hear the unfounded assertions that he made?

He chose not to challenge that issue in this House and ask the question directly: instead he decided to make that speech late at night and presume that, therefore, that meant it was fact, because he had said it to be fact. A number of misrepresentations, untruths and mistakes were, to put it kindly, made by the honourable member. I suggest that, if other members are looking for question fodder, they look to his speech last night and pick up many of the things that may seem to be valid questions. I caution them about using his line of reasoning in relation to many of those issues, because if they do they will be cut down. Nevertheless, the

areas raised are certainly worthwhile canvassing in this House.

One of the subjects mentioned related to advisory teachers. The member for Bragg cast some doubts on whether I might give some facts to this House on advisory teachers. I do not want to leave him with that view; I certainly intend to give some facts to this House. I intend him to be as edified as anyone else with respect to what is happening to advisory teachers in 1986 in the light of some quite outrageous statements that have been made by certain people in the community indicating, among other things, that there will be a cut of 37.2 per cent. One statement even suggested that the number of advisory teachers would be cut by half. Both statements are simply arrant nonsense.

Before I canvass what is going to happen in 1986, I will examine the 1979-82 situation with respect to seconded teachers within our education system. I notice that that was not mentioned last night, but during that four year period 92 seconded teachers were removed from the system; the level of seconded teachers within the Education Department fell by 92. I notice that there is now some conversation taking place between the member for Mount Gambier and the member for Torrens. It is a little late to discover that massive cutback of seconded teachers within this State.

I have said previously in public fora (and I repeat today) that in 1986 there will be no fewer advisory teachers serving the teachers of this State than there are in 1985. There may be one or two more positions, depending on the outcome of present budgetary discussions. I cannot confirm that, but I can give the unequivocal assurance that in 1986 the number will equal that in 1985. The member for Torrens last night suggested that he could not understand figures and that he was a bit confused by figures floated around in the various categories.

*Mr Ferguson interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Yes, that is right—he is easily confused. I do not want to bring down a statement of broad global figures that might easily confuse the member for Torrens. I have indicated publicly that I will come down with two lists—one for 1985 and one for 1986. The list for 1985 will be a list of names of advisers and their positions, and the list for 1986 will be a list of positions that will exist. Obviously, I cannot put names next to them because many are vacancies that have been advertised and will not be filled for a couple of months. When people see that list, which will be a public document, they will find that the number of advisory teachers in 1986 will equal, if not exceed, the number we had in 1985. That possibility is still being canvassed.

I assure the House that in both respects the 1986 list and the 1985 list will exceed the number that applied in 1982—again, another point that might be overlooked by the member for Torrens. He said that he is receiving many telegrams and letters and thought that I might also be receiving such. That is true—I am receiving a number of letters from advisory teacher associations, as has been the case every year in education for goodness knows how long. At the end of every year there is a reallocation of advisory support between subject areas, between the central office and the former regions (now the area offices), and that has been an ongoing process year after year. Consequently, some subjects lose a position from time to time whilst other subjects gain a position.

Even in the context of the 1986 figures equalling or exceeding the 1985 figures, some subject areas will not be serviced as well as they were in 1985. I would fully expect those advisory associations to examine whether they view that as a warranted decrease and to approach me or any other member of this House accordingly. That kind of debate will continue.

It behoves the honourable member to have sought out more substantial information on what is taking place and to take the opportunity of Question Time in this House to verify statements he makes before making broad assertions and attempting by innuendo to damage the advisory system in this State. He is attempting to create by innuendo the belief that massive cuts are to take place within the advisory teacher service. He spoke about a 37.2 cut to take place. Not only am I advising this House that there will not be cuts of 37.2 people, but also I will give this House a public document showing the position for 1985-86.

I ask members to cast their minds back to see the devastation wrought on the advisory services from 1979 to 1982. That behoves the member for Torrens to say what he believes should happen for the next three years with advisory services. Will he reflect the savage cutbacks of his shadow ministerial colleague, the former Minister of Education, or will he reflect the positive work of this Government should the electorate ever cast the misfortune upon this State of seeing him as the Minister of Education at any time in the future?

### GAS PRICES

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Has the Premier obtained any guarantees from the Cooper Basin producers about gas price arrangements in 1986 and subsequent years? In his announcement last week about electricity tariffs, the Premier said that ETSA had agreed to keep tariffs in 1986 below inflation. That statement suggested that an agreement had been reached on the price of gas so that the trust could predict its operating costs next year.

However, an article in this morning's *Advertiser* states that price negotiations are still going on. In view of this, I ask the Premier what assumptions he has made about gas prices in saying that the Electricity Trust will be able to keep its tariffs below inflation in 1986.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Negotiations with producers are proceeding. They are obviously highly sensitive, and I do not propose to comment publicly on them.

### CARAVAN PARK ELECTRICITY METERS

**Ms LENEHAN:** Can the Deputy Premier, as acting Minister of Mines and Energy, say whether any further progress has been made to enable more long-term residents of caravan parks to gain access to electricity at domestic rates? Soon after I was elected to Parliament, I was approached by constituents from the Vines Caravan Park, who raised with me their concern at the situation that existed, namely, that long-term residents of caravan parks were forced to pay commercial tariff rates for their electricity. I subsequently took up this matter with the Minister of Mines and Energy and I am aware that for some time the trust has been prepared to provide power at domestic rates to long-term residents of caravan parks under certain conditions.

Basically, these conditions involve the installation of the trust's meters at each long-term site, the provision of accommodation for the meter by the park proprietor, and the payment of a nominal rental charge to cover those periods when the proprietor uses the meter as a sub-meter during periods of short-term occupation. However, this scheme has been of no assistance to operators of parks with self-installed meters, such as the Vines Caravan Park. Because these meters have not been acceptable to the trust, there has been no incentive for the proprietors to become involved in the existing scheme, with the result that long-term residents of

these parks have been unable to obtain power at cheaper domestic rates.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I compliment the honourable member on her tenacity in this matter. In fact, if I could revert to the language of the Authorised Version of the Bible, 'importunity' might be the proper word to use, because the honourable member has banged on the door at midnight in relation to this and other matters to the advantage of her constituents. I am aware that the honourable member has made a series of representations to my colleague on behalf of long-term residents of caravan parks, and he has taken up the matter with the Electricity Trust.

The initial result of this was the introduction of the scheme referred to by the honourable member, but there was a problem with that because the scheme did not help those parks that already had their own sub-metering systems installed. The operators of those parks had made a capital investment in the metering equipment and saw no commercial benefit in changing to the ETSA scheme. Obviously, the trust takes seriously its responsibility to ensure the suitability, accuracy and maintenance of equipment on which consumption is measured and accounts levied, and it felt that it could not accept responsibility for equipment that was owned by a third party. However, the honourable member kept trying and it gives me considerable pleasure on behalf of my absent colleague to inform her and the House that a sensible compromise has been offered by the trust following further representations.

After a detailed examination by ETSA, it has concluded that most of these existing sub-meters would, after examination and testing, be suitable for use as trust meters. Accordingly, the trust is prepared to buy the sub-meters at sites allocated for long-term occupancy from the park proprietors, test them, and then use them for billing in line with normal procedures. The proprietors will continue to be responsible for providing adequate housing for the meters and to pay the 70 cents a month nominal rental. It should be stressed that these new arrangements will apply only to existing sub-meter installations. All new caravan parks and all existing parks which are extended or significantly modified, the proprietors of which wish to provide for long-term residents to receive the benefits of domestic tariffs, will have to provide for the installation of standard trust metering equipment. I am informed that the trust will implement these new arrangements progressively, following specific requests from the proprietors of individual eligible caravan parks.

#### CHILD ABUSE

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** Will the Minister of Community Welfare table in the House the report he received from the Ombudsman relating to his department's handling of a sexual assault on a four-year-old girl by a formerly licensed family day care giver? The Minister must do everything possible to reassure the public that the Government has handled this matter properly and responsibly, and the Ombudsman's report will provide an independent assessment of that. If the Minister is concerned that individuals may be identified by its tabling, the Opposition would agree to the deletion of names to resolve that problem.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFT:** I thank the honourable member for his question. As I explained to the Leader of the Opposition in the House last Thursday, I said that I had received a report from the Ombudsman some few weeks prior to this question being raised, and that the matter was being considered by the Director-General of the department. In light of the additional evidence that the honourable member raised, both on Thursday and again yesterday, I

have asked that department and the Police Department to investigate further all of these allegations. It is then my intention to refer them back to the Ombudsman for further consideration of all those matters. Then, I will receive a further report from the Ombudsman. When I have it, consideration will be given to whether or not it should be tabled.

#### PORT ADELAIDE SEWAGE TREATMENT

**Mr HAMILTON:** Can the Minister of Water Resources advise whether the Engineering and Water Supply Department has considered the use of a product known as Deodourgas for odour control at the Port Adelaide sewage treatment works? I have been advised by residents in the West Lakes area that during 1979 and thereafter some land agents supplied prospective buyers, and indeed purchasers, of real estate with a document which came from the E&WS Department. I have sighted that document, and have a copy of it. The document gave a false impression that the Port Adelaide sewage works would be upgraded and would be equal to the Glenelg treatment works, despite the fact that industrial and commercial wastes are treated at this plant.

The supply of this document built up false expectations amongst the residents. My constituents have expressed appreciation of the \$2.5 million spent on upgrading the plant since 1979, and particularly since 1983 under this Government. However, I still receive complaints. A constituent who lives in the West Lakes area has supplied me with an article in relation to this Deodourgas, which reads, in part:

Many wastewater treatment plants sited near residential areas or where housing estates have developed in close proximity to their boundaries—

this is the situation in West Lakes—

experience problems with odours becoming noticeable to nearby residents.

The article further outlines how this CIG Deodourgas has been used in locations in and around Sydney. Therefore, can the Minister advise as to the practicality of the use of this product known as Deodourgas?

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** I have to give the member for Albert Park 100 per cent marks for his persistence.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** Wait on; do not make this a smelly question! It is important, because I give the member for Albert Park full marks for his persistence on behalf of his constituents in relation to this problem. I have always said, and I repeat, that the problem we have at the Port Adelaide treatment works arises basically because of its age. We have made significant improvements over the past 2½ years to try to overcome some of the problems that exist in relation to odour. Of course, this occurs under certain conditions. We are aware that in New South Wales and other places a product called Deodourgas is reportedly used effectively at a particular plant in Shell Harbor. However, there are significant differences between the Port Adelaide treatment works and Shell Harbor.

For instance, the contributing population in the Port Adelaide area is some 140 000, whereas in relation to the plant referred to in New South Wales the contributing population is substantially smaller, at about 40 000. Weather conditions and residential development adjacent to the plants vary in relation to the two plants. The nature of the buffer zone which existed for many years around the Port Adelaide treatment plant has changed. For many years there was no residential development in the area. Of course, people take the risk of building in such locations as problems may become evident after they have resided there for some time,

but the nature of the problems depends on the weather conditions prevailing at a certain time.

The potential source of odours at Port Adelaide are widespread as compared to Shell Harbor which is localised in one lagoon where conditions can be more easily controlled. Deodourgas is expensive. I have been advised by the E&WS Department that the cost for Port Adelaide would be in the vicinity of \$240 000 a year. Even then, it may not prove to be fully effective. The E&WS Department is now taking the approach of controlling the generation of odour rather than attempting to mask it after it has been released. That is considered to be the most suitable method and that will continue to be used in the future.

The member for Albert Park and his constituents will agree that we have made some progress with this matter. Since the commissioning of permanent prechlorination facilities at the plant in December 1984, as far as I am aware no complaints have been received by the department. I believe that the level of odour has been considerably reduced. No significant complaints have been made in relation to this matter since December 1984, and I hope that position continues to apply in the future. It is considered that the present approach adopted in overcoming the problem is more appropriate and beneficial than would be the use of Deodourgas.

#### CHILD ABUSE

**Mr OLSEN:** Will the Minister of Community Welfare say why the Director-General of the Department for Community Welfare was not informed until last Wednesday of the serious allegations against a family day care giver of sexual assault of a four-year-old girl, particularly as the Director-General of the department revealed that the original allegations made two years previously had not been drawn to her attention until Wednesday of last week, let alone the Ombudsman's report?

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTY:** I thought that I had explained this yesterday. As I understand the procedure in these matters, not every file of the 4 000 children in family day care in this State, the 1 200 or so children in child care centre care, or the 1 100 children in privately owned child care facilities comes to the Director-General's office. These matters are dealt with by other senior officers in the department.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTY:** I can assure the House that both the previous Director-General of the department, Mr Cox, and the Deputy Director, Mr Harris, personally reviewed this case and the matter was then referred to the Ombudsman. The report—

*The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTY:** The honourable member does the community no service at all with her outrageous comments.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable Minister to resume his seat, and call all honourable members to order. The next breach by an honourable member will result in a warning, and members know the consequences from that point. The honourable Minister.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTY:** The report was being processed by the department and would then, in due course, have been considered (as it was) by the Director-General. I inform the House that, during part of the period in question, I was on leave and for another part I was at the Constitutional Convention in Brisbane. There may have been a speedier response within that two week period had I been at my office because of my personal knowledge of this matter.

It concerns me that the Opposition has chosen to pursue this matter in a political way. Its agenda became clear today when a letter appeared in this morning's *Advertiser* from the South Australian Association of Child Care Centres. It is obvious from the generalisations made by Opposition members that they are part of a campaign to discredit the family day care scheme in South Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTY:** The day prior to the last State election the then Community Welfare Minister purported to enter into an arrangement with the then Federal Minister for Social Security (a most improper arrangement) to provide funds to privately owned child care centres.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTY:** The scarce resources then available for family day care and other child care services were to be diverted, under that agreement, to the profit making child care centres. That was not the policy of the Federal Government when elected in 1983, and the increased funds it made available were not to be used in that way but were to go to community based child care centres and to improve subsidies for family day care schemes under the 20 000 child care places to be provided. The Government is under attack from the Opposition on a matter of ideological debate or principle. It is clearly the intention of the Opposition—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the Minister to resume his seat. I warn the member for Coles. The honourable Minister.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTY:** It is clearly—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the Minister to resume his seat. Those honourable members who called 'Hear, hear!' were also gravely out of order. Had I noticed who they were I would have warned them, too, and I will. The honourable Minister.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTY:** It is clearly the intention of the Opposition to continue to pursue the policies with respect to child care that it enunciated and tried to introduce prior to the last State election—that is, the privatisation of child care in this State.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the Minister to resume his seat. I warn the Leader of the Opposition.

#### ELIZABETH MOTOR VEHICLE OFFICE

**Mr M.J. EVANS:** Can the Minister of Transport say when the Motor Registration Division office at Elizabeth will be housed in more suitable accommodation? This office is presently housed in most inadequate premises some distance from the Elizabeth City Centre. Many constituents have complained to me that the standard of accommodation in that office is far below that which might reasonably be expected by both staff and the public. In addition, the building is a significant distance from the main regional shopping centre with car parking facilities far from sufficient to meet the needs of the public. Given the large number of people served by this office, can the Minister say when it will be relocated to more appropriate premises?

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I am aware that there have been a number of complaints about the inadequacy of the motor vehicle registration office at Elizabeth. Obviously it is not sited in the most appropriate place to service the very large number of clients it has in what is a significant part of the metropolitan area. This matter has been referred to

me by not only the member for Elizabeth but also my colleague the Minister of Education, whose constituents also use this office. I have been advised that it is intended to site the office in a more appropriate place, which I understand will be next to the Sidney Chambers, by 1 November next. I will advise the honourable member of the actual siting within a day or two.

#### PROCLAMATION DAY HOLIDAY

**Mr BECKER:** Because the Government has made a decision to transfer this year's Proclamation Day holiday to Boxing Day, and because it will also grant public holidays in various areas of the State for specific Jubilee 150 events will the Premier advise whether it is still the Government's intention to declare 31 December a public holiday to coincide with the concert to open the Jubilee 150 celebrations?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I will obtain that information for the honourable member. The matter was discussed at some length by the Jubilee 150 Board and then referred to the Industrial Relations Advisory Council, the tripartite body comprising employer, trade union and Government representatives which looks at the ordering of public holidays. It made a decision which I cannot conjure up in my mind at this stage, but I will obtain a considered reply.

#### NOTICE PAPER

**Mr KLUNDER:** Can you, Mr Speaker, give the House an indication of the cost saving that would ensue from a change in format of the Notice Paper? The Notice Paper in this place consists of four major sections: the first lists the business before the House on the day of sitting; the second lists notices of motion and questions on notice; the third gives an indication of the subordinate legislation before the House; and the fourth consists of a list of Bills and details of Joint and Select Committees of the Parliament.

The five Notice Papers for this session so far have contained 28 pages each, of which only two or four pages have been necessary to list the business before the House on the day in question. If the Notice Paper were printed in full on, say, Tuesday, and only the business of the House and notices of motion were printed on Wednesday and Thursday, the printing for last week would have been reduced from 84 to 36 pages. Mr Speaker, can you give an indication of the cost saving that this would entail in one year?

**The SPEAKER:** I thank the honourable member for his question. This matter has been under active consideration by the Clerk and his officers for some time. It is clear that there would be a significant saving if the proposal put forward by the honourable member were adopted. It is very difficult to quantify what that saving would be. However, I undertake to obtain the necessary detailed analysis and bring down a considered answer as soon as possible.

#### THEVENARD

**Mr GUNN:** Can the Minister of Lands, in his capacity as Minister of Marine, advise the House whether the Government intends to proceed with upgrading and further developing the port of Thevenard? A number of comments were reported in the *West Coast Sentinel* of 31 July, under the heading 'Thevenard port upgrading axed'. One comment referred to a new ship which had been purchased by a gypsum company to cart gypsum from the port of Thevenard but which could not leave the port fully loaded. It also referred to a previous article which appeared in the

*West Coast Sentinel* on 14 September 1983, headed 'Port upgrading—study under way'. That article referred to the deepening of the channel and turning basin and some of the work that was going to be carried out. I therefore seek from the Minister a clear statement on the Government's policy in relation to the port and point out to him that his statement on Wednesday 31 July has caused considerable concern in the Ceduna area.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is commenting.

**Mr GUNN:** I am clearly explaining my question so that the Minister can be under no misapprehension about the feeling of my constituents and the district council in my area in view of the two conflicting statements that have appeared in the local paper. The Minister is aware that I was going to ask the question, and I look forward to his answer.

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** I thank the honourable member for his question. I know that he is vitally interested in this issue. I have always attempted to keep him fully informed on it, and I read his speech in a grievance debate last week. However, it is incorrect to say that the Government has reneged on a promise to do something about the Thevenard harbour, and a long story attaches to this issue. I have a report on the matter, and I will give the honourable member details of the changed circumstances.

We did not break or renege on any promise. It was the full intention of the Department of Marine and Harbors to carry out that work. In fact, it had been provided for in a capital works program, and it disappointed me considerably that we were not able to proceed with that work, as at the time work was fairly scarce and we were looking for more work for the dredging crew within our department.

I will take a few moments of the House to explain what will happen and the honourable member will then better understand the situation. Over the years a number of proposals have been put forward to increase the size of ships which can be handled at Thevenard. In early 1983 a decision in principle was made for deepening work to be done which would allow vessels up to 25 000 tonnes to load in the port. This decision was based upon the need for this size of ship for both domestic and export markets. The cost of the improvements was estimated at between \$5 million and \$8 million, depending upon the exact nature of the material to be dredged and the extent of improvements required in the loading plant. The loading plant was originally built to handle much smaller ships at a rate of up to 500 tonnes per hour. Its output has been expanded a number of times since and now operates at a rate of up to 900 tonnes per hour. It has now really been stretched to the limit, and any further improvement is likely to require rather expensive and fundamental changes.

In 1984, the gypsum producers using Thevenard merged. A CSR vessel was introduced to service domestic gypsum needs. A letter was received from the producing company on 8 November 1983 stating that this vessel was specifically designed for current channel and berth dimensions. This meant that improvements to the channel could only be based upon the needs of export markets. A series of detailed discussions have taken place with representatives of the producers since that time. Competitors in the export market are in a position to handle ships of up to 80 000 dead weight, although few buyers are interested in parcels of more than 30 000 tonnes. Improvements to Thevenard to allow ships loading 30 000 tonnes would be extremely expensive—perhaps more than \$25 million. As well as improvements to existing facilities, a number of other more radical solutions were considered to see if there was any way to provide the gypsum producers with access to larger ships more cheaply. None of these proved to be feasible.

To consider such large expenditures, the Government must justify spending taxpayers' funds to that extent and must have some reasonable level of assurance that the facilities would be used. Therefore, the producers were asked to provide an indication of the minimum tonnages that would be involved. It was indicated that there would have to be a level of guaranteed minimum to ensure some level of return to the Government. It was stated that the Government would be prepared to lag this minimum in a formula which retrospectively applied an average annual minimum tonnage after, say, five years. The idea was to provide time for the producers to develop their markets. In the event, a letter was received from the producers in March this year which stated:

In considering your proposals for upgrading port facilities at Thevenard we reached the same conclusion as your department, that effective upgrading can only be achieved by major works. Such upgrading, in addition to increasing the competitive position of gypsum exports, also benefits coastal trade. Restrictions at other ports and the requirements of GRA's customers however would not allow the full benefit of the upgrading to be realised on the coastal trade.

After careful consideration, and in-depth study by our shipping managers we have concluded that, while it is GRA's intent to increase exports from Thevenard, the current state of the gypsum market precludes us from entering into performance guarantees. Rather than make a negative decision on upgrading at the present time we would ask that the project be deferred for 12 months after which we will undertake a further review.

In the light of this response and the inability of the producers to accept any responsibility for the investments required I had no choice but not to proceed. The gypsum deposits in the West of the State represent important export potential. Improvements at Thevenard to facilitate this trade have not been 'axed'. Rather they have been delayed until the market for the product improves sufficiently to make the project viable.

#### FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT

**Mr PETERSON:** Is the Minister of Marine aware of a recent Department of Marine and Harbors report which states that firefighting equipment at the Port Adelaide and Outer Harbor petroleum products berths is inadequate? Has action been taken to have these facilities upgraded immediately? The berths defined in the report are 'J, L, M, N, and Outer Harbor 4'. Referring to fire prevention facilities, the report states:

Port authorities and others responsible for tanker terminals around Australia are generally regarding the second level (referred to variously as Table III or Level/Phase/Section 2) as the minimum standard. Many ports in Australia are in the process of upgrading to this standard. Facilities at limited tanker disaster level are seen, for the lower throughput terminals especially, as not realistically achievable. None of the berths under discussion has facilities equivalent to Level 2 and only a few approach compliance with Level 1. . . Firefighting standards are inadequate at all berths, with virtually nothing at M,N, and OH4. J Berth is the best in the port, but only complies with Level 1 of the A.A.P.M.A. recommendations on tanker terminal safety. Level 2 is the minimum desirable level.

The risk of fire during ship discharge and loading operations at petrol terminals is ever present, and the locations of the installations along the Port River are such that a serious fire and/or explosion could place many residents on the LeFevre Peninsula in great peril and close the Port of Adelaide. As the report is signed by officers of the Department of Marine and Harbors, I ask the Minister what is being done to remove what is alleged to be an unacceptable risk to South Australia's major seaport and the thousands of people who live and work in the vicinity of these terminals.

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** I am very much aware of the report referred to by the honourable member, simply because

I commissioned that internal report from the Department of Marine and Harbors. In fact, we made one of our senior engineers available full time to work on it. In reply to the specific question the answer is, 'Yes. Action is under way on the whole question of petroleum facilities in South Australia, especially in relation to the very important safety issue of firefighting equipment.' That report is being circulated for comment and more work is required on it. However, one cannot just wave a magic wand and expect everything to be done tomorrow. Time is required to get certain matters under way. In the long term it will probably be necessary to move those petroleum wharves in Port Adelaide further down the Port River, purely for reasons of safety. Nevertheless, when one is considering work of that magnitude, one is looking at the millions of dollars required to do the work. Currently, at Port Pirie there is a certain danger especially in the event of accident, which could be disastrous. I should be falling down in my duty and responsibility if we did not look at these issues and do something about them. Therefore, I commissioned the report referred to and I assure the honourable member, in response to his specific question, that firefighting and other safety issues are being treated as a matter of priority.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION: TAXATION

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

Leave granted.

**Mr OLSEN:** I claim to have been misrepresented by the Premier in his reply to my question on taxation issues earlier this afternoon. The Premier indicated that the Liberal Party had not put down its position on taxation, specifically on a broadly based consumption tax. I quote *Hansard* of 7 May 1985 (page 3909), where I put down the position of the Opposition on taxation, saying:

The Opposition supports the introduction of a broadly based consumption tax as a major reform to allow cuts in personal income tax. . . In seeking the details of the submission by the Government to the tax summit, the Opposition also seeks the opportunity to have that submission debated in Parliament before the summit.

In reply to my question on that occasion, the Premier gave the following commitment:

The summit is not until July. At the appropriate time I will certainly produce the South Australian position so that there will be a chance to have it debated. . . I would certainly welcome a debate on the issue when we resume.

I also asked a question concerning taxation reform on 14 May (*Hansard*, page 4244), and in reply the Premier reaffirmed his previously stated position. The Premier is prepared to abuse the truth as it relates to the Opposition's position on taxation reform, and he has not yet honoured his commitment to the House to table the appropriate document and allow a debate to take place.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.  
(Continued from 13 August. Page 242.)

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** When I concluded last evening, I had been dealing with various aspects of the housing industry. I had previously referred to my experiences in relation to those ex-members whose deaths are recorded in the Governor's opening speech. I failed on that occasion not to progress further on that matter, but to express a personal best wish to those members of the House who are not with us at present because of ill health. It does

not matter on which side of the House members sit, it is not a favourable situation to know that one's colleagues are unable to go about their normal business because of ill health. To all the Ministers and former Ministers who are unable to attend to their business, I extend my best wishes for a speedy recovery.

I had proceeded to discuss various matters relative to housing and, more specifically, relating to the manner in which the Minister of Housing and Construction had misled this House. He was here and heard those statements, but he has failed today in Question Time to come in here and apologise to the House for the misleading advice he gave by way of an answer to a question. There is no doubt whatsoever that the information given by the Minister of Housing and Construction, in relation to a question from the member for Albert Park, means that he specifically misled the House as to the effects of current interest rates.

So that there can be no misunderstanding about this matter, I shall read from a statement that was freely available in March this year. I have had the information updated to the June quarter of this year, but I point out that in that statement it was clearly indicated that real interest rates—interest rates adjusted for the effects of inflation in Australia at present—are the highest they have been since the great depression of the 1930s and that there is little prospect of any relief from this situation in the immediate future.

Real interest rates for housing loans have increased more than sixfold since the Federal Labor Government was elected in March 1983. Real housing loan interest rates were 1 per cent in March 1983 and now they are about 6.5 per cent. The Premier fully recognises that position because in his answer the day after the Minister of Housing misled this House, and because the Minister has not had the intestinal fortitude to come in here and apologise to the House for the error that has been drawn to his attention (I can only believe that he did it intentionally), the Minister had the ground cut from under his feet by the honesty of the Premier, who clearly indicated the true position.

I referred to that matter previously, but if we take that 6.5 per cent that applied in March 1983 we find that new buyers and people with mortgages are now paying more in real terms on their loans than they have in 50 years. In other countries—such as the USA and Japan—there have been falls in both nominal and real rates over the same period. Whilst one recognises that the present high level of interest rates is due to a number of factors, including the high Federal budget deficit and excessive public sector borrowing requirements, also inflation in Australia has been higher than in those other countries and is therefore a factor in the end result.

I have two statistical tables which put this position into clear perspective. First, I seek leave to have a table which is nominated as attachment A inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it. It relates to the period 1950-1975, on a yearly basis. The second of the two tables is denoted as attachment B and it relates to the changes in the interest situation on a half-yearly basis from 1975, updated to June 1985. As I said, I seek leave for those documents to be inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Can the honourable member assure us that these documents are purely statistical?

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I can, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Leave granted.

ATTACHMENT A  
Housing Interest Rates 1950-1975

Year	Savings Bank Housing Loans Actual % p.a.	CPI Change (financial year) %	Real Interest Rates %
1950	3.88	13.0 (1950-51)	-8.1
1951	3.88	22.5 (1951-52)	-15.2
1952	3.88	9.4	-5.0
1953	4.5	1.9	2.6
1954	4.5	0.7	3.8
1955	4.5	4.1	0.4
1956	5.0	5.8	-0.8
1957	5.0	1.0	4.0
1958	5.0	1.6	3.3
1959	5.0	2.5	2.4
1960	5.0	4.1	0.9
1961	5.75	0.4	+5.3
1962	5.75	0.2	+5.5
1963	5.25	0.9	4.3
1964	5.5	3.8	1.6
1965	5.75	3.6	2.1
1966	5.75	2.7	3.0
1967	5.75	3.3	2.4
1968	5.75	2.6	3.1
1969	6.25	3.2	3.0
1970	8.25	4.8	3.3
1971	8.25	6.8	1.4
1972	7.75	6.0	1.7
1973	7.75	12.9	-4.6
1974	9.5	16.7	-6.2
1975	11.5	13.0	-1.3

Source: Reserve Bank Occasional Paper No. 8A Australian Statistics 1949-50 to 1978-79.

ATTACHMENT B  
Interest Rate on Housing Loans to Individuals for Owner Occupation, Nominal and Real—1975-1985

	Nominal	CPI Movement	Real
1975 March	11.5	17.6	-5.2
September	11.5	12.0	-0.4
1976 March	10.5	13.4	-2.6
September	10.5	14.0	-3.1
1977 March	10.5	13.7	-2.8
September	10.5	13.1	-2.3
1978 March	10.0	8.3	1.6
September	10.0	7.9	1.9
1979 March	9.5	8.2	1.2
September	9.5	9.2	0.3
1980 March	10.5	10.5	0
September	10.5	10.3	0.2
1981 March	11.5	9.4	1.9
September	12.0	9.0	2.8
1982 March	13.5	10.6	1.1
September	13.5	12.3	1.1
1983 March	12.5	11.4	1.0
September	12.5	9.3	2.9
1984 March	12.0	7.6 (a)	4.1
September	12.0	6.1 (a)	5.6
1985 March	12.0-12.5	5.1 (a)	6.6-7.0
June	13.0-13.5	6.7	6.3-6.8

(a) Excludes Hospital/Medical component.

Source: Parliamentary Library Statistics Group

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Without any doubt whatsoever the true position is clearly outlined by that information. I now challenge the Minister of Housing and Construction to have the intestinal fortitude to come into this House and advise honourable members of misrepresentations that he made in an endeavour to try to gain some cheap political point.

I also indicated, towards the conclusion of my address last evening, that the position in relation to the movement of the relative price of public sector housing to private housing had altered quite dramatically in the period under review. Movement in private sector housing has been of the order of 16 per cent and it is 36 per cent for public housing. This is clearly outlined in statistical material taken from the Australian Bureau of Statistics figures on the



average value of approvals. I seek leave to have that information inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

A.B.S. STATISTICS—AVERAGE VALUE OF APPROVALS

	Private \$	Public \$	Difference \$
1981-82 .....	38 557	28 098	10 459
1982-83 .....	39 019	29 346	9 673
1983-84 .....	40 887	32 470	8 417
Month of Dec. 1985 ..	45 651	45 478	173
8 months to Feb. 1985 (i.e. July 84-Feb. 85)	44 862	38 115	6 747

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** It is interesting to go one step further and point out that housing sources indicate that the average house price in Adelaide was \$80 176 in the March 1985 quarter, which was 36 per cent more than in the March 1984 quarter, and that the median sales price was \$72 748 in March 1985. This does not have a direct impact upon public sector housing, but it is certainly playing a part, and the activities of the Minister of Housing and Construction and his colleagues in forcing price increases upon the housing industry are reflected in the previous document to which I referred and which is inserted as the last of the tables for which I sought leave.

I challenge the Government and its members who have been quite vocal in relation to the importance of housing—no more vocal, I suggest, than members on this side of the House who are genuinely and quite seriously committed to the provision of as great an amount of public housing as it is possible to acquire. The quantity of public housing as was expressed last evening is reduced now by 'the pea and thimble' trick of the Minister of Housing and Construction in relation to his refusal to accept that by taking money from the Commonwealth and putting it into one's pocket denies the opportunity of its being extracted from the other pocket for housing improvements or purchases.

I draw attention to an anomalous situation which has been perpetrated upon aged people, not only of this State but of the Commonwealth generally. I hope to be able to obtain assistance from members on both sides of the House to make necessary representations to the Commonwealth to overcome the difficulty. Without going into statistics, we can accept that the number of aged people in our community is increasing quite dramatically and that demands for housing for those ageing people are also markedly increasing.

This is reflected in figures for the Housing Trust in recent years where greater proportion of its total production has been in the area of cottage homes, cottage flats or other developments for the benefit of the aged. On the information available to us from the demographers quite obviously that demand will increase for the foreseeable future.

Part of the housing for many of these people has been taken up by organisations in the community which are non profit making: some are associated with churches, lodges, local government and community bodies, all of which have provided housing for the aged. In the early days of those developments it was possible to get assistance by way of subsidy, not only from the Commonwealth but also from the State.

Progressively, the State withdrew from providing subsidisation in the manner that it had done previously. Although the Commonwealth is still providing some subsidisation, in more recent times the amount of subsidy has been nowhere near sufficient to meet the demand. Many community bodies have gone out into the building world and have had houses built on the basis of sponsor donorship. I shall briefly explain that. A person might want to take up residence in one of these homes, which would enable them to

vacate their own home and the problems associated with maintenance, the payment of rates and taxes and the need for security.

Such people might have problems associated with living in relative isolation from other people, as they may live in a separate house on a big block, with no immediate contact with anyone. These people may be pleased to sell their home and to put their money (or part thereof) into the sponsored building of aged homes, on the clear understanding that, when they die or leave that home to go into hospital or to some other place of residence, they or their estate will recover a percentage of the sum that they have put into the sponsorship of the original home.

In October 1984 the Commonwealth sought to provide answers about the assets test and the effect that it might have on people in the community. It produced a question and answer brochure which was made available to members through their electorate offices. The brochure was promoted by the Department of Social Security to the electorate secretaries of members of this place. Question 39 stated:

How will a person be affected if he or she enters aged persons' accommodation?

The answer provided was as follows:

Where a person paid a lump sum, gave a donation or made a loan to secure accommodation in aged persons' accommodation, the person would be considered as a house owner and the amount paid will not be taken into account as an assessable asset. If a person enters aged persons' accommodation without any initial cost to himself or herself, the person will be considered as a non-home owner.

This answer was provided in October 1984. The Federal assets test legislation has been put in place, and most recently information provided by the Department of Social Security to the electorate offices of members, this time in the form of a two page brochure, dated May 1985, indicated, under the heading of 'Administrative changes to the assets test', the following:

Aged persons' accommodation.

1. Pensioners living in aged persons' homes will be considered as home owners only if they have purchased an interest or right to accommodation which is saleable or otherwise redeemable.

2. Pensioners who make a donation on entry to an aged persons' home will now be regarded as non-home owners, giving them the benefit of the extra \$50 000 limit. If the donation was made on or after 1 June 1984 it will be treated as an asset under the deprivation provisions in the same way as other gifts or donations.

3. Pensioners who make a loan on entry to an aged persons' home will also be regarded as non-home owners, and the amount owing will be treated as an asset in the same way as loans to individuals or other organisations. Pensioners who were adversely affected by the previous policy will not be able to seek a review of their pension and any increase due will be paid retrospectively from 21 March 1985. Regional offices will be contacting aged persons' homes directly to identify pensioners who may benefit from the change.

No reference is made to identify those who will be adversely affected by the change. This is affecting those who are making their money available for the building of homes, thinking that they will have access to a home for an indeterminate period of time, and that subsequently they or their beneficiaries will benefit from regaining a proportion of the initial outlay, whether it be 75 per cent, 80 per cent or whatever, as previously arranged. However, the money that was made available for their own security is to be considered as an asset in hand without the benefit of the deprivation benefits, which have been spelt out, for the assets test.

I suggest that it is quite within one's expectation that people may be deemed to have received an interest benefit on that fund and may find themselves in receipt of a demand for income tax on that unearned (but deemed to have been earned) income. Because these people are deemed to have that sum of money in their possession, with an

earning capacity even of 10 per cent making it a considerable sum, the distinct possibility exists that they could lose their fringe pension benefits. There would be the impossible situation of people not in receipt of actual income being required to pay income tax and also losing the pension benefits that would normally apply.

Members opposite in conjunction with their Federal colleagues, must believe that it is a sin for these people to seek to make their latter days more comfortable and secure and, because they want to live in close association with others, to put money into these non-profit making homes, providing the opportunity later for other people to enter a home for the aged without having to pay for it, and helping to secure the future of aged people in the community.

Members on both sides of the House must give this matter urgent consideration. It is a matter on which we must all make representations to the Federal Government.

*Mr Ferguson interjecting:*

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I am glad that the member for Henley Beach acknowledges that point that I have made. On previous occasions the honourable member has always accepted points which have merit and which are beneficial to the community at large. This is an urgent and serious situation which the Minister of Housing and Construction ought to address, rather than trying to make cheap political points and falling flat on his face, as has been demonstrated. In addressing this matter he would be doing the Government and the people of this State a service.

I want to refer briefly to local government matters, although I will not do so at great length. There is virtually nothing in the Governor's speech relating to local government. The recognition of local government in the Federal Constitution was a matter of some moment in debate at the Constitutional Convention held in Brisbane two weeks ago. It was clearly spelt out that South Australia and two other States had been responsible for writing local government into their Constitutions some years ago, thus showing the way to other States. It is to be hoped that other States in turn will pick up these legislative matters and write them into their Constitutions. There is no doubt at all (as the contributions to the convention demonstrated) that the three spheres—and I refer specifically to spheres rather than levels of government—are interrelated in very positive ways.

It is important that we recognise the individuality, yet the cooperative aspects that are necessary one to the other. One matter that was expressed clearly on a number of occasions related to a point of view put to me emphatically in America and Canada in recent days when, with the help of the Director of Local Government, I was able to make contact with inter-governmental relations officers in Washington, Toronto and Vancouver. The Americans and Canadians have learnt from experiments commenced about the time that L.B. Johnson was President of the United States.

He sought to bypass the States or Provinces with funds going direct from the Federal jurisdiction to local government. They have now desisted from that practice. It became apparent that funding in that manner was causing tremendous difficulties in communities. There was a situation of a remote Federal Government making decisions about priorities which were not the priorities of the State or the local government body receiving the money. The end result was the building of white elephants or of facilities that could not be properly matched with existing ones. There was no opportunity for additional infrastructure or funds to be made available.

It is a fact that in America and Canada any funds that now flow from the federal body to local government are made available through the State governments in America or Provincial governments in Canada. It has been clearly recognised that that is the best way to distribute those funds.

We know that under Mr Uren, as Minister in the Whitlam Government, there was a major move towards a regionalisation program that was spelt out as early as 1967 by Mr Whitlam in a series of lectures that have been spoken of in this House previously.

About two weeks ago, when Mr Uren advised the Brisbane Constitutional Convention that he had never been a centralist, there were laughs of derision. I took that opportunity of having inserted into the record of the convention one or two statements that came from reports that the Hon. Mr Uren had laid on the table in the Federal Parliament. The centralism theme was quite obvious in those papers. I think that even Mr Uren subsequently suggested that there might have been a slight slip of the tongue or a misinterpretation of what he meant by 'centralism'.

There is no place (and will be no place in their State's Olsen Liberal Government, which will come into office after the next election) for the Federal Government to bypass the States and to deal directly with local government. There will be acceptance by the State Government of Commonwealth funds to be made available to local government after consultation at the three levels of government. Those funds will then be directed to where they will be of best use to the State. It is our belief, and it was the belief of many local government representatives (who have made this very clear) at the convention, that there is a real need for local government to liaise closely with its State counterparts so that funds can be put to the most effective use gaining the maximum benefit for their sphere of the governmental system.

I will briefly mention one of the difficulties I faced frequently in America, but mainly in Texas. It was quite apparent to anyone travelling in America because of the frequency with which the subject was raised on television programs (and not only news services but educational services) and in newspapers, that the American agricultural community is facing actions that are militating against its members continuing to follow their vocation. Much of this problem arises from a major imbalance of payments as between the United States and Japan. Many of the cars being driven on American roads are Japanese.

There is a trading imbalance of about \$3 billion between Japan and America at present. This is reflected in a number of areas of the American economy, not the least of them being the agricultural sector, which is very much involved with the export of beef and beef products. One of the traditional markets for American beef is Japan. We know the difficulty that we have had in Australia maintaining our percentage of the market because of the considerable pressures placed on Japan by this major imbalance of payments. It may well be that the Australian position will be even less favourable in future than it has been in the past. The Americans believe that they are very much at a disadvantage. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it a statistical table headed 'No growth in '84: 40 000 farms close'.

Leave granted.

The number of farms across the USA has declined from 2.37 million in 1983 to 2.33 million in 1984. Agriculture in Transition conference, meeting last week in Des Moines, Iowa, discussed how to lure new farmers to the land. Farms and acreage in 1984:

	Farms	Acreage
Alabama	54 000	11 500 000
Alaska	650	1 560 000
Arizona	8 300	37 500 000
Arkansas	55 000	1 610 000
California	78 000	33 000 000
Colorado	27 000	34 600 000
Connecticut	4 300	500 000
Delaware	3 600	660 000
Florida	40 000	13 000 000
Georgia	51 000	13 500 000

Hawaii	4 500	1 950 000
Idaho	24 600	14 700 000
Illinois	96 000	28 700 000
Indiana	82 000	16 400 000
Iowa	113 000	33 600 000
Kansas	74 000	48 000 000
Kentucky	101 000	14 500 000
Louisiana	36 000	10 100 000
Maine	8 000	1 560 000
Maryland	17 800	2 700 000
Massachusetts	6 100	680 000
Michigan	63 000	11 400 000
Minnesota	101 000	30 400 000
Mississippi	50 000	14 200 000
Missouri	117 000	31 000 000
Montana	24 000	61 000 000
Nebraska	60 000	47 200 000
Nevada	2 700	8 900 000
New Hampshire	3 500	550 000
New Jersey	9 400	970 000
New Mexico	14 000	45 800 000
New York	48 000	9 400 000
North Carolina	79 000	11 000 000
North Dakota	36 000	41 000 000
Ohio	90 000	15 800 000
Oklahoma	74 000	33 000 000
Oregon	37 000	18 000 000
Pennsylvania	58 000	8 700 000
Rhode Island	750	73 000
South Carolina	28 000	5 600 000
South Dakota	37 000	44 500 000
Tennessee	95 000	13 400 000
Texas	187 000	136 800 000
Utah	14 000	11 000 000
Vermont	7 300	1 700 000
Virginia	57 000	9 700 000
Washington	38 000	16 100 000
West Virginia	22 000	3 800 000
Wisconsin	86 000	18 000 000
Wyoming	9 100	34 800 000
Total	2 332 600	1 019 503 000

Source: Department of Agriculture

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** This table gives useful information relating to sums of money involved and the difficulties that will flow in this area. It is not directly applicable to Australia or South Australia, but does advance our knowledge of the difficulties which are besetting agricultural production overseas, and which are impacting in a major way on production in Australia.

Returning now to the Governor's speech, at paragraph 24 he said:

My Government will provide greater protection to home buyers by amending the Commercial Tribunal Act to give the tribunal power to award damages against builders for unsatisfactory building work. Procedures will also be implemented to register the security interests in motor vehicles.

It is the first part of that quotation relating to buildings that I will comment on. The present Government took action that was applauded by the Opposition (although we pointed out the regulation did not go far enough) to bring some semblance of sanity to the continuing argument about house footings and the additional costs involved for engineering demands relating to those footings. This matter has not been finalised by a long long way. It came to the fore as a result of difficulties emerging at Campbelltown resulting in court litigation known as the Carosella case. Flowing from that case was a belief that local government could be joined with the builder and the engineers who made available the footing plans. This matter is still in dispute.

In the *Advertiser* of 5 July 1985 there is a statement, 'The High Court alters law on negligence.' There was also a very useful argument set out in the *Australian* of 2 August, only 12 days ago, pointing out that the negligence found against certain councils in the past does not apply. I suggest that, although there are some similarities, the case which has been under consideration and referred to in the *Advertiser* and the *Australian* does not really address the Carosella and Campbelltown council proposition.

I have a large amount of material in my possession from the CSIRO and various engineering groups explaining that they are applying themselves to this problem of footings. I appreciate that the building advisory group in South Australia, as part of the Minister of Housing and Construction's department, is looking at a blanket form of determining a safe, satisfactory and adequate footing which can be applied to the various South Australian soil forms. However, because of the blanket nature of the consideration, the question is being asked by a number of participants in the discussions whether the end result will be to the satisfaction of the owner of the subsequent building or of the person who has commissioned the building. I believe that is a debate which will continue for some length of time. Suffice to say that in the interim many young people are going to be forced into more difficult financial straits as a result of the increase in the price of their homes.

A great number of these people have accepted the proposition of building a home on the basis of a fixed sum contract for the footings and, although the contract clearly indicates that this is subject to an engineer's report and the types of footing actually necessary, a number of those involved believe that it cannot happen to them. They go ahead and sign the contract and, almost before the building starts, they are suddenly faced with an additional sum of \$1 500 or \$2 000. When their budgets are already stretched to the limit, that only adds insult to injury. It is a problem that forces those people into bridging finance at higher interest rates at a time, as has been demonstrated previously, when real interest rates are higher than they have been for 50 years. That situation spells potential disaster for people entering into contracts today.

**Mr S.G. Evans:** And it does tend to be an over-specification now, to the point where that's costing more money.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Yes, I acknowledge the point made by my colleague; it is an over-specification, but the engineer who makes the recommendation to the client has to safeguard his or her position. Additional costs have been forced on those engineers by their insurance companies in order to give them protection against indemnity. It is a real difficulty, and the problem has flowed over into the area of local government. We now find that most local governing bodies have been quoted an increase in insurance rates for 1985-86 of up to 56 per cent. Almost the whole of that increase is associated with their public indemnity clause which relates back to the original Carosella case and the yet to be determined application of the High Court decision to the problems of that case.

It is a matter which will need monitoring for quite some time, and I am sure it will involve a bipartisan approach, because we are obviously dealing with a major number of items in the hope that we can soon start meeting the requirements of many people in the community.

The Governor, in his speech, referred in paragraph 26 to the fact that the Government had drawn attention to planning for 1986. I am very pleased to have had the opportunity of spending 12 days in Texas during May and June of this year. The specific purpose of my visit was to meet with a number of the sesquicentennial committees in various places in Texas linked with the Jubilee 150 Committee of South Australia. At the present time some 170 communities are directly matched, some of them on a town-by-town basis and some on a district to county basis. Texas has a population exceeding 18.5 million people compared with approximately 1.3 or 1.4 million in South Australia. We have no real knowledge of what their local government system entails and nor do they of ours.

Without disrespect to anyone, I would point out that the major thing to emerge from my visit was evidence of the ignorance existing among Americans of our situation and

the ignorance of Australians of their position concerning local government. In Texas local government is disposed differently where the town seeks direction through a mayor and commissioners or through a mayor and aldermen, as the case may be. They are responsible for running quite a number of services, including the police. That situation does not apply in Australia. Superimposed over that is the county judge, who is really the person responsible for local government and the police in the county sense; the police in turn being run by the sheriff and deputy sheriff. Those officers superimpose, to some degree, over the Chief of Police, who is managed by the town.

In many communities that arrangement works satisfactorily, but when there is a duplication of that nature obviously some problems may occur. There is also the difficulty of where the road ceases to be the responsibility of the town and becomes the responsibility of the county. They are matters which are interesting to follow through, but they make our appreciation of each other a little more difficult.

I visited communities with a population of over two million down to country community groups of less than 2 000, and I found that they were interested to know one another better. Since my return I have made some suggestions to people in South Australia, and believe that a four or five page document is about to be published which will give South Australians and Texans some better appreciation of the relativities between Australia and the United States. I have no doubt that the friendships which will evolve and the visits that will take place in 1986 between the two States will only be the tip of the iceberg. I predict that the visits and contacts will continue over very many years.

Preparation is going ahead for the world three-day equestrian event which is to be held at Gawler, with the horses being housed at Roseworthy Agricultural College, and great interest is being generated throughout the world. More than 10 teams have indicated they will be coming to Australia, and possibly 80 horses will be competing. The horses will be quarantined at Torrens Island and also in Sydney. No stone has been left unturned in ensuring that exotic diseases are not introduced into Australia and that the horses are safe.

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

**Mr MAX BROWN (Whyalla):** I could start my remarks in this debate by saying that if I were to deal with the merits of the debate my contribution could well go down as one of the shortest in history, and that if I were to deal with the demerits of the debate I would probably need an extension of time. Having said that, however, I will endeavour in my short address (I will not need 60 minutes—I will try to get through in 59!) to deal with some of the important issues in which I have been involved in my electorate.

Before so doing I join with other speakers in this debate in conveying my condolences to the families of the late Messrs Hunkin and Clark. I did not know Mr Hunkin but I certainly knew Mr Clark. He was an elder statesman of the Government when I first came into this place and I found him a very approachable and knowledgeable gentleman. What I admired about him was that he did not speak very often in this House but that when he did speak he usually had something to say worth listening to. I would hope that that would sum up my time in this place.

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** When he did speak you heard him.

**Mr MAX BROWN:** Yes, I agree. I will briefly reflect on my opportunity to go, as a stopgap, to Brisbane recently for the Constitutional Convention. Some members questioned whether I should have gone. However, my legal expertise is well known, and I was the obvious choice! I had no sooner

arrived than I noticed the member for Light doing something rather stupid and I had to pull him up on it.

I will deal briefly with that conference, because I found there a practice that appealed to me greatly, namely, that when there was a division the ayes sat down and the noes stood up. That is a very important point because in the casino debate we could have saved at least three hours if we had voted that way. The idea has merit, and I hope that something along those lines will come out of that convention, as I doubt whether any other positive aspect will come out of it.

I am glad that the member for Flinders is here. Everyone understands that I am retiring from politics. Some are saying 'Hear, hear!' and some are saying—

**Mr Trainer:** There, there!

**Mr MAX BROWN:** I will ignore my colleague's interjection. However, I wish to put the rumours to rest. There is an extremely high possibility that I will be back here, as I am very seriously thinking of accepting a nomination from the Country Party to stand in the area in which I may be retiring. Indeed, I may be opposing the invaluable member for Alexandra not at this election but at the next election. I look forward to the time when he is doorknocking and visits me. I hope he brings a lot of goodies with him as it will take him a long time to get away from me. I inform members that I have that option available to me and it is one that I may be taking seriously over the next few years.

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** Next to the report on your overseas trip is this speech you're making in the Address in Reply.

**Mr MAX BROWN:** That is right. I come now to an unpleasant but serious problem in my electorate, and it is a problem that has given me much concern for many years. The problem does not seem to be able to be solved and does not go away, despite the efforts that one might put into it. I refer to unemployment, and recent figures released by the Australian Bureau of Statistics concern me greatly. No ready solution exists to the problem but, unfortunately, certain people in our society appear to glory in peddling some sort of solution. In fact, they are only cruelly lifting the hopes of the poor unfortunate people who are unemployed. I suspect very strongly that they are seeking some personal glory in perpetrating such a hoax, and they are merely grasping at straws as far as the problem is concerned. I refer to a statement that appeared in the local press on 15 May this year. Headed 'Jobless increase', it states, in part:

Almost a quarter of Whyalla's working population is estimated to be unemployed following a rise of 631 in jobless figures until the end of March.

The article goes on to state:

In the 1984 March quarter there were 1 911 men and 962 women unemployed compared with 2 290 men and 1 214 women this year. Whyalla CES office representative Mr Doug Pucknell said this contradicted the popular conception that women were worse off for employment than men.

That is an interesting and important statement by the CES representative, as it has been said for many years that women are the greater losers in unemployment. The article continues:

In the 15-19 year age group there were 942 unemployed. By the end of the March quarter this had been reduced to 865. Mr Pucknell said this showed some school leavers were placed. 'By far the largest unemployed age group is the 25 to 44 years,' he said.

The latest figure for this age group showed 1 202 unemployed. Mr Pucknell estimated Whyalla unemployment was 20 to 24 per cent of the population able to work. This compared to 8-10 per cent in most metropolitan areas. However,—

and this is another important statement by Mr Pucknell—Mr Pucknell said Whyalla's unemployment problem and the age group breakdown was similar to other one-industry cities such as Newcastle and Wollongong.

The figures I have just read to the House, appalling though they may be, contain some interesting facts: first, the unemployment figure for women and, secondly, the unemployment figure for youth. It is obvious to all that the major concern in unemployment involves those areas.

With the availability of low rental homes in Whyalla, brought about in the main by the closure of the Whyalla shipyards and the downturn in the steel making processes, people with all types of welfare problems have been attracted to Whyalla. I do not wish to excuse the figures I have quoted, but it is important for us to understand that within that unacceptably high unemployment figure is a component covering welfare payment receivers who in turn show up statistically in the unemployment figure.

I refer to these figures specifically because I have grave doubts about the employable status, first, of workers who have been retrenched from the shipyards aged between 55 and 65 years; secondly, of single-parent workers and other pensioners who are included in the statistics; and thirdly, of workers who, because of industrial or personal injury, would have restricted employment opportunities in the future, these being an important component in the unemployment statistics.

Be that as it may, when considering unemployment in Whyalla, one must remember that the figure comprises two components: first, the genuinely unemployed, the person who could be employed if he could get a job and who is genuinely looking for work; and secondly, the unemployable, the person who is unemployed because of certain factors to which I have referred. I suggest that a considerable number of people in Whyalla who are shown in the statistics as unemployed are unemployable.

Turning to the subject of unemployment generally, I have been criticised previously by certain people in my district who said that I did not care about the unemployed. I found that criticism hard to bear because at that time I had two sons who were unemployed, and I found it strange that, in those circumstances, people should say that I was not interested in the unemployed. I found such remarks personally repugnant and concluded that, indeed, some people say strange things these days.

I assure the House that it has not been for my lack of trying to solve the unemployment problem at Whyalla that it remains partly unsolved. In my humble opinion, too many people are espousing the philosophy that there are people in the community who do not wish to work. Generally speaking, however, I do not find that to be so, although I should be a fool if I did not admit that there are some such people. However, their number is very few and most people are eager to have some sort of a job. As I have said repeatedly, unemployment is the most degrading experience, apart from the fact that a person cannot find work, has little interest in life and does not know what to do with himself or herself. Certainly, I should not want anyone to experience unemployment if the problem could be solved.

Many efforts have been made to attract industry to Whyalla and certain projects have been and are being investigated. Enticing industry to Whyalla has not been easy and it will not be easy in the future. However, some success has been achieved. In this regard, I refer specifically to new contracts that have been obtained, largely at the instigation of Prime Minister Bob Hawke (about whom the press is not saying many kind things at present), for the export of BHP steel, especially to China. At present, the Chinese Government buys about 35 per cent of the steel manufactured in Whyalla. That is an important trade. Indeed, only yesterday I read in the press that the Chinese market is to be extended soon. Some success has also been achieved in supplying steel to other countries.

BHP has demonstrated a ready acceptance of new technology, and that is an important development in the manufacture of steel. However, unfortunately, the company has not played the role in employment that I should have liked to see it play.

Although the future for steel production and distribution has some bright aspects, BHP, like many of our manufacturing industries, can spend sums of up to \$60 million on new productive technology yet, after it spends that money, we invariably find that a reduction rather than an increase in employment results. Indeed, we realise that we must accept new technology whether we like it or not but, by accepting it, we do not seem to be able to solve the unemployment problem, which will continue to be a major problem in the future.

Regarding employment opportunities for Whyalla, the recent announcement that Betatyne is to establish a plant in Whyalla, probably in October this year, should ultimately provide employment for about 100 people. Although this will not occur for some time, I suggest that this development gives Whyalla hope.

Recently, contracts for the construction of road surfaces and bridges on the Stuart Highway have gone to a New South Wales company whose name escapes me for the moment. As a result of negotiations between that company and the South Australian Government, the company will set up a workplace in Whyalla and employ residents of that city. That is important to the people of Whyalla. Certainly, it is not the beginning or end of it all, but other possibilities are being examined continually.

One employment opportunity that promised to come to Whyalla has disappeared because of the grave and sad lack of understanding of the market and financial potential and what was required in testing the article to be produced, despite all the advice that was offered. I refer to Minnipa Machinery, which comes from a place near the district of the member for Flinders. I am disappointed that this firm has not established in Whyalla. I met an executive of the firm very early, when he came to my district.

He landed in the city of Whyalla with a great fanfare as to what he planned to do. I recall vividly being telephoned by the *Adelaide News* and being asked whether I wanted to make a statement because this gentleman had seen fit to tell the newspaper that he would employ 2 000 people. I found that quite remarkable. In fact, I said to the reporter, 'It's news to me', to which he replied that it was news to him too because if this man could employ 2 000 people it would certainly be news. In fact, 2 000 people would constitute half the workforce of the BHP steelworks at Whyalla, so I found that kind of statement quite outlandish.

Such a statement ill behoved the man, because it raises the hopes of the poor unfortunate people who have been unemployed for a long time and who were led to believe that somewhere there was an end to the tunnel and that they would be employed. However, their hopes were dashed again. It is inhumane to go about trying to establish an industry in such a way. I know that this gentleman would be only too pleased to have a go at me about saying these sorts of things, but my statements are correct. He was sent to the best financial brains that we could find, and he was told that his marketing should be looked at seriously.

We advised him what to do about it; we assisted him so far as moving from Minnipa to Whyalla was concerned; and we offered him further assistance as to employment ratios. However, as to one aspect of a financial hangover he told some of the best financial brains in the State to go and get lost; he did not want to know them.

Last I heard of him he was trying to make a deal with a millionaire in Sydney, and I assure him and everyone else that I have never known a millionaire to give anything

away. They always want something in return. We tried to help: it should have been a success, a goer, but because of lack of understanding of the problem he literally stepped away from it. People have been left with a nasty taste in their mouth.

I have inquired about where this industry stands at present, but have been told that its future is not particularly rosy. I read from an article in the local press, headed 'Farm firm auction':

The former home of failed farm machinery company McDonnells Agricultural is to be sold. Whyalla's industrial development officer Mr Graham Hill did not see the latest moves as an end to the project here.

That is one matter that I am endeavouring to chase up. The article continued:

There are a number of the original investors who are still interested in the development of the pickle machine, he said. It will not need the space available in the NEI building to continue in the immediate future and they could buy the company's assets.

They could buy the company's assets; however, the article concluded:

In August last year it was announced the NEI building would be used as the base for the manufacture of a 'revolutionary' new tillage implement. The keys to the building were handed over late in September and the first machine was manufactured in less than a month. First doubts about the company's future surfaced in November, when temporary stand-downs were initiated. The receivers were called in last December.

Talking about stand-downs, in that month there had already been about 40 people employed. The potential was there and the future would have been assured if only he had the common sense, decency and knowhow to sit down and listen to some good sound advice. It was an extraordinary situation.

Initially, the industry would have at least employed between 20 and 40 people. I would not have a clue as to its potential had it gone ahead. However, any industry that can be attracted to Whyalla, even if it only has a potential to employ 40 people, is a must if we are ever to get out of the stagnation that we are unfortunately experiencing.

In fairness to that gentleman, I hope that in some way the industry can be saved and that Whyalla people will be given an opportunity to work at this establishment. I do not care what anyone says, unemployed people do not deserve rash promises, then to find that they go home without any pay envelope at their disposal.

I want to deal with the other side of unemployment in Whyalla. I refer to the percentage of what I call welfare people in that unemployment figure. This is a separate problem and I am somewhat suspicious that it is a bigger one than we ever anticipated. I said recently in Whyalla that it had, unfortunately, become a welfare city, and I was honestly amazed at the reaction of some people in prominent positions in the city who either did not want me to make such a statement or to recognise the fact that we have a welfare element within our community.

For the reasons I outlined, I do not believe that we should stop using the word 'welfare'. I do not use it as some form of incurable disease: I use it as a word that we have, whether we like it or not. In the city of Whyalla we have a very small element of those people, but it appears to be a very powerful element that is using those welfare people as some bandwagon that they want to jump on and destructively criticise anybody and everybody who may be genuinely endeavouring to help overcome the problem.

I suspect that other members have these types of people in their electorates. I do not know what sort of pleasure they get from it; it might be some sort of warped pleasure, but I do not know. Over recent months I initiated an investigation into the need for a welfare co-ordinator—a person whose main job would be to co-ordinate welfare

organisations into one unit, rather than the present package of welfare organisations that genuinely believe they are helping.

However, I have some suspicions about whether they are providing the sort of assistance that they set out to provide. Recently I analysed some figures in relation to the amount of State Government finance being ploughed into some of these welfare organisations. I was amazed at the number of welfare organisations which have established themselves in Whyalla but which are duplicating various services. All sorts of people, who for reasons best known to themselves genuinely believe that they can do something to help people in need, are being assisted to set up welfare organisations.

They come to my door and ask me to find some financial assistance to help them. One can write to the Minister of Community Welfare, and lo and behold one has a grant. However, I point out that at least five of the welfare organisations that I know about have grants for the things such as: *ex gratia* payments for the rental of some Housing Trust home for an office; a typewriter, stationery and telephones; and an *ex gratia* payment for a wage, honorarium or something of that nature, for a person sitting by a telephone, and so forth. When it is all added up it comes to a considerable sum of money. We must look seriously at whether we will continue to provide that sort of assistance. Invariably, much of the money that is paid out simply goes towards something of a material nature and not towards helping the needy, although they are the ones we are trying to assist.

In my years of public life I have found that, of all the welfare agencies of which I have had experience, the Salvation Army and St Vincent de Paul are the organisations that deserve commendation of the highest order. Neither of those organisations spends its money on administration or on some other related angle. They get out and visit people and give them practical assistance. I cannot speak highly enough of them. I am not a religious sort of gentleman, and I am not part of either of those two religious orders.

**Mr Hamilton:** But you are a good living man!

**Mr MAX BROWN:** Of course. Those two organisations are down to earth and are comprised of very worthy people. I refer to an editorial published in the *Whyalla News* of 20 May. The Mayor of Whyalla called a meeting of service clubs and certain welfare organisations. It had been found in Whyalla that, because of the ready availability of low rental homes, there had been an influx into the city of disadvantaged people coming simply to get a house, although they had nothing to put into it. It was felt in Whyalla that endeavours had to be made to obtain supplies of furniture, blankets, and food, etc. It is a terrible thing to stand in this House and say that in this modern world of ours there are people without these things. But we must be realistic about it: it is a fact of life.

At one stage certain people in Whyalla were suggesting that the South Australian Housing Trust was deliberately sending these people to Whyalla. I refute that claim: there is no substance to it. These people were living in the metropolitan area, probably in a caravan park and paying about \$60 a week for that, or in some high tenement establishment paying even more than \$60 a week, and one would not need to be a financial wizard to deduce that sooner or later they would have nothing to live on at all, and so when given the opportunity of ready-made and easily obtainable low rental accommodation they certainly decided to move to Whyalla. I commend to the House the editorial in the *Whyalla News*. Whatever I have said about that paper in the past, I believe the editorial is very well written. Headed 'Price of Poverty' it stated, in part:

A meeting between Whyalla's welfare organisations and authorities early next month will be crucial to the future positive steps that need to be taken to alleviate the city's social welfare prob-

lems. The move was instigated because of the growing number of disadvantaged families coming to Whyalla seeking the ready availability of Housing Trust homes and cheap rents. Unfortunately, this has increased the burden on undermanned social workers.

It has also put a huge strain on such organisations as the Salvation Army and St Vincent de Paul. Demand for blankets, furniture and other household items from the influx of families to Whyalla has resulted in a Mayoral appeal to help meet the desperate needs of these families. As Salvation Army Captain Peter Fletcher summed up the situation: 'People are people and they have got to have a roof over their head.'

I cannot agree more with those sentiments. Incidentally, the meeting in Whyalla has been held, and I believe that goods, including blankets and furniture, and so on, as well as the services of many service clubs in Whyalla have been obtained to assist people in need in a practical way. It is to be hoped that the burden on the underprivileged people of the City of Whyalla will be relieved.

I want to deal briefly with the matter of what is referred to as privatisation, the selling off of the farm. I know that members opposite will appreciate my raising this matter. While members of the Liberal Party were in government from 1979 to 1982 one would have thought that they would have learnt that the 'selling of the farm' policy was not a good idea at all. However, members opposite have not learnt their lesson, and have indicated that they would sell everything off, and I refer to the bus services, probably the Glenelg tramway, and all sorts of other things. Of course some of these very longstanding Government organisations would be difficult to sell.

I recall very vividly something that the Liberal Government, under Dr Tonkin, tried to do in Whyalla, and I hope that the people of Whyalla remember that at the next election. When he was Minister of Industrial Affairs, the member for Davenport (the member who was thrown out of the Chamber yesterday) came to Whyalla to open extensions to the South Australian State Clothing Factory. Lo and behold, in his speech—and unfortunately I was present: I could not get away, although I wanted to disown him—he said that the Liberal Government was doing its best to sell the factory. That poured heaps of inspiration on the employees. One could see them immediately go downhill, so rapidly that I thought I would have to call in St John to rectify the position. However, that Government did not have the opportunity to sell that factory.

It might be of interest to honourable members to know that, after three years of Bannon Labor Government, that factory this year turned out its best production and generated its highest profit since its establishment. That did not happen because we wanted to sell the factory or because we left the employees disenchanted. It happened because we joined with the management of State Clothing Factory and went after lucrative markets. We assisted it to compete in the open market, thereby doing something positive.

What has been done for this factory should be on the record so that, hopefully, the people of Whyalla will remember that the policy of the Liberal Government, if because of some strange happening, it is returned to government, is that it will sell that factory. I quote an article headed 'Record sales for clothing factory':

The State Clothing Corporation is expected to have record sales of \$1.8 million by the of this financial year . . . [The Manager] estimated there already had been an increase on last year's sales figures by more than 200 000 garments. For the financial year ending June 1984, garments were sold to the value of \$1 610 000 and with two weeks left for this year, sales were estimated at \$1 750 000.

The important thing is that the article goes on to say:

Recently, an additional four people were employed by the company, bringing staff levels to 44.

That is an important statement, bearing in mind that nearly all of the staff members are women. The report continues:

Mr Ainsworth said two of the new employees were juniors—that is pleasing—

It was the company's policy to employ young unemployed people as trainees for the industry. Although profit figures had yet to be released, Mr Ainsworth said the corporation was likely to have another record increase on last year's figures. This reversed a trend two years ago when the company ran at a loss of almost \$150 000.

Why did the factory run at a loss? That is important to find out. It lost money because a Liberal Government saw fit to undermine its marketing opportunities. In fact, when an opportunity arose for the factory to gain contracts for police and nursing uniforms the New South Wales Government got the contract. That I could not understand, if for no other reason than that there was a Labor Government in New South Wales at the time. I found it extraordinary, to say the least, that we had established a clothing factory, we wanted it to succeed, and yet it was being undermined in a way that stopped it from getting its financial head above water.

My final point is that, because of the generosity of the Hawke Government, which has provided \$10 million in steel assistance money, Whyalla hopefully will benefit in a way that will in future see it attracting other industries. One of the projects is to be a technology centre. I was appalled when certain officers who came to Whyalla suggested to me that, because there was a technology industry at Regency Park and another at Wollongong, or somewhere, we did not need one at Whyalla. Whyalla does need a technology centre if it is ever to attract big industry. We invariably find, as we found with Santos (and will find with other companies), that employers want at their fingertips the best technology they can get. They want anyone they employ, their experts or their ordinary labour, to have a chance to learn the technology of their industry. I found the remarks made by the gentlemen in question quite unacceptable. We do want a technology industry in Whyalla.

If we are not able to attract industry to Whyalla in the short term, we certainly need technology available to attract industry when the opportunity arises. I will not be speaking at any length again in this House so I will conclude by saying that I do not want anyone in this House to run away with the idea that I will miss the joys of this debate, because I will not. I support the motion.

**Mr RODDA (Victoria):** I have some fellow feeling with the member for Whyalla, as this is probably the last time that I will speak in an Address in Reply debate in this House. There may be other moments when I address the House, but this is the last time that I will speak in this time honoured debate. When I think of the first speech I made in this place 21 years ago, I recall that it was made under very different circumstances. I was to speak within the first two days, but it was a month after the day I was prepared to make my speech before I finally spoke. By the time I was ready to speak I was like a gramophone: I could plug in anywhere and turn it on.

Then, about two days later, I had to support Mr Robin Millhouse in relation to some private members' business. For doing that I got a tremendous roasting. I thought that the people opposite were most unkind at that time, but I have learned since that that is not so. I can recall coming into this place in 1965 as the only new member, and it was a fairly lonely existence. I have noticed since that new members have comradeship and a fellow feeling but I was alone. As I became acquainted with the ways and means of this place I began to have a great and enjoyable experience.

I was interested to hear His Excellency's speech and, although one can criticise from this side of the House, at this late stage of my career I do not know that I am in the mood to do so. I acknowledge His Excellency the Governor

and Lady Dunstan for the great work they do: they have endeared themselves to the people of South Australia. They have made several visits to my district and to the South-East area in general, and they are always welcome. They grow closer to the people each time they visit, and that is a very great attribute. They have shown a great interest in my district, which is obviously very close to their hearts. One sees them on television during their visits around the State, and that is the way they discharge their duties. When they have visited my district they have wanted to see everything from shearing sheds to research stations and heritage buildings, and they have been interested in the wine industry. We are grateful for having such a wonderful couple in the viceregal office at Government House.

I join my colleagues in expressing condolences to the families of the late Jack Clark and Len Hunkin. When I first came here Mr Hunkin was on the Forestry Board, and that entailed trips to the South-East. I was very surprised to learn of his great age. He was formerly a Public Service Commissioner and also a member of Parliament. Although I met him only very late in his life, when he could not get out and do the things he enjoyed doing, it was a great joy to travel with him.

Mr Jack Clark, the late member for Gawler, served in this House for very many years. As a young member in this place I earned his disapproval on a number of occasions. I think he may have misjudged me: he thought I was a very brash young man and that I had a smile like a sharp knife. He later learnt that there was no knife, not even a blunt one. I wish to express my condolences to the respective families of those two former members and acknowledge the great contribution they made to this State.

As the member for Light mentioned, a number of Government members have been sick, and I join with him in expressing our regret at that fact. We do not like to see our colleagues suffering from ill health, and we hope that they are fully restored to good health in the near future. It is pleasing to see that the member for Price (Mr George Whitten) is again in attendance. As Chairman of the Public Works Committee, he does a great job. We have also missed the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr Ron Payne) and the Minister of Water Resources (Mr Jack Slater). Mr Slater is a very hardy soul: he has had a couple of operations, but he is back and seems to be full of vigour. We are pleased to see those members, along with the Hon. John Cornwall in another place, restored to full health.

The member for Adelaide (Mr Jack Wright) is going to retire because of ill health, and his Party will miss him. He has been a great character; he has played hard for his side, which one always admires. Jack would give no quarter politically, but as I found out he has a heart of gold. When I first came here I thought: what a tough customer we have here, but I soon found out that under that tough exterior was a very compassionate man.

When I had all my troubles in the Ministry with the Fire Brigade, I came to appreciate Jack Wright. The Select Committee in which we were involved went for some 11 months. We worked on that committee with Des Corcoran, Stan Evans and Bob Randall, the then member for Henley Beach, and it was a very happy committee. It was while serving on that committee that I came to appreciate Jack Wright's fine qualities. He has a very good brain, and he appreciated the very involved problems in the Fire Brigade. Although we did not go to Darwin, we saw every fire brigade in southern Australia. With the other members of that committee, he made a great contribution.

That committee published a report, which of course saw the creation of the Metropolitan Fire Service with a professional officer in charge and some major changes. Whilst on that subject, as I am leaving the House, I must pay tribute

to Mr George Joseph. Mr Corcoran, when he left this place, also mentioned Mr Joseph. We must pay a tribute to Mr Joseph and his board for the type of equipment which was installed in the Metropolitan Fire Service. It is as good as any in Australia, if not better. It was perhaps with a heavy heart that we took the decision in that area. I know that Mr Joseph was disappointed, but I can assure him in this last major speech that I make in this House that South Australia owes a great debt to him and his board for the wonderful service that they maintained. I attended the opening of the fire station a few weeks ago and it is a far cry from the previous one, although the service did a very great job.

Since I have served in this Parliament there have been some characters. I suppose one could list many people and describe the way they have served their electorates. I mention the survivors or the tough politicians: those people who have been elected and who should not have been. They have won their seats and hung on to them. You see Labor people honing in on Liberal strongholds and then hanging on to the seat, and vice versa.

I suppose one of the prizes must go to Mr Heini Becker. I remember when I was in the Premier's office in 1969 I received a phone call from a young bank manager called Heini Becker. He asked, 'How do you get into Parliament?' I said, 'The first thing you must do is find a seat that you think you can win, and the second thing is rather hard: you have to get endorsement for it.' He said, 'That is easy: I have a seat, and I think I can get endorsement. What do you do then?' I said, 'Then you go through the election and have to get 50 per cent of the votes. That is fairly easy, but then you have to get another one vote, and that is the hard thing.' I completely forgot about Heini Becker. After the election a very tall thin young man walking around Parliament House asked me, 'Are you Allan Rodda?' I replied, 'I am,' and he said, 'I got that 50 per cent, plus not much more than one.' I thought, 'By golly, here's a oncer.'

However, he has gone on from there and has hung on. As I told some legal people last year, he is a survivor. I said that he casts wide. Some of the legal eagles have not heard that term but it is something I have learnt from my rural background and the sheep dog. Heini Becker casts wide. He had a majority of fewer than 100—only about 39. That was not very much, but he has hung on.

Scott Ashenden seems to be in the same category. He is a different kettle of fish, but he hangs on. I received many deputations from him when I was Minister. The first thing that I said to him was that he should stick up for his people. I should not have given him that advice as he is a tough customer. Scott Ashenden and Heini Becker are the types that keep Premiers in office. On the Labor side, we saw Gil Langley come in when he won the purple patch of Unley. We said that we would have it back within a year, but we did not.

**The Hon. D.C. Wotton:** We will have it back next year.

**Mr RODDA:** Yes, but Gil is not there any more. I had occasion to canvass once in Unley, and soon found out why Gil Langley won his seat—because he was interested in people. I remember one dear lady from quite a toffy part of Unley telling me that they were being woken up by poultry being kept next door. Hens and roosters were crowing and cackling at all hours of the morning and night. She had spoken to our people without result and then spoke to Gil Langley. He said, 'Good God, what's the trouble? Have you got a ladder?' She said, 'No' and he said, 'Well, have you got two drums?' He rolled two drums down to the back fence, stood on them (he fell off once). He said that he would get the poultry shifted. Two hours later an inspector moved in and the chooks went. He cared for people in a simple way.



Stan Evans, who has just entered the Chamber, has been here for 18 years. He has hung on, and he is the fourth one that I put into that category of characters who hang on. Peter Lewis and Graham Gunn are also characters. Graham has been here almost as long as I have and, although Peter Lewis is a new boy, he has his own special design of politics. His 12 per cent margin compared with the rest of our seats last election points up that he has something special, also. I can look at John Meier and a few more of our people who are in the purple patches. I have served in a purple patch. There are some ups and downs, but I have always had enough to hold on, which is what other people look at.

Last year when speaking in this debate I had some words to say about the wool industry. I had been overseas and looked at the industry from the English market viewpoint. One of the issues concerning them was contamination of wool. My remarks did not seem to meet with much concern, but we have gone on from there and currently we are seeing the Stockowners Association, woolbrokers and stock and station agents mounting a campaign to make the farmer aware of the contaminant that comes from the polyethylene hay band.

The awful attribute of the hay band is that it will be very costly to the producer and to the Australian economy if we do not arrest it. Polyethylene is not degradable, does not rot, travels easily and falls off trucks with such ease that they make 'Dear John' letters look like real amateurs. The worst part is that it drops off vehicles and even a small portion 6in. long will fray out. Although light, it still retains its fibres and gets into the fleece quite easily. When it goes into processing it cannot be carboned out or picked out. When it gets to the dyeing process it will not take the dye.

We are seeing in the manufacturing area very fine worsted yarn with great streaks through it unable to be dyed, and the industry is facing very big compensation claims. It is becoming a very serious matter for the wool industry and right now a campaign is going on that farmers and manufacturers must take into account. Manufacturers of hay or twine used for tying farm articles should be banned from using polyethylene and some other form of packaging must be found that can be carbonised out of the wool clip. That is the big challenge that is worrying us all.

The Governor in his speech referred at clause 5 to the economic development of the State and the Navy establishment. As a former serviceman I know the value of defence and the submarine is very much part of our defence arms. I hope South Australia is selected as the site for some of the major developments in this important part of the country's defence. It has my blessing and I hope we will be chosen for such a development.

In paragraph 6 of his speech His Excellency refers to securing energy at competitive prices for the long-term development of the Cooper Basin. The Cooper Basin is like a good milking cow: the more we can take from it, the more we get out of it. We know that resources are not inexhaustible, but in conjunction with my colleague the then Deputy Premier. I had long and exhaustive discussions with Santos during our time in Government. We spent many nights in the haggle.

We now see Port Bonython (Stony Point to us) and I pay a tribute to Alex Carmichael. I was sorry and somewhat distressed to see that Mr Carmichael had resigned from the Santos board because, no doubt, he was the mainspring in development. He is a far-seeing man who did not realise what hard work was or what it was doing to him. He had the great physical capacity of being able to sit up all night and was a hard but fair bargainer. He had vision and he was helpful to the Government. He has been a great citizen of South Australia. He lives in New South Wales, but his heart was in this State and in the Cooper Basin. His depart-

ture from the scene of the Cooper Basin must be a great blow to us, and I hope that Alex Carmichael's great abilities are not lost to this State. He was very much part of the Cooper Basin. When one looks at the balance sheet of Santos one finds the hand of Alex Carmichael through it.

In paragraph 11 His Excellency spoke about the Government's concern in saying that it has a duty to the present generation and to the future to protect and conserve the integrity of the State's natural environment. I go along with that. In that there is the vexed question of scrub clearance. In my district, and in the South-East generally, many cases of hardship have resulted from decisions taken without proper consultation. Several young people with families are facing ruin and are leaving their properties. I understand that certain negotiations proceeding will mitigate the position, and we hope that they do. We should never lose sight of the fact that, when one pulls up a tree, one should plant another. Under the valuation of land legislation and in the general administration of all Acts applying to land usage, incentives should be provided and requirements prescribed for the replanting of trees. I have a daughter-in-law who over the past 10 years, by the use of green fingers, has produced, in deep sands, eucalypts up to 35 feet high. After such trees are given a start, they do not take much looking after: indeed, with proper nurturing and encouragement they tend to look after themselves. Further, the trees attract bird life, including wrens, which is a sight to see. I could cite many such examples in the South-East.

I am glad that the member for Mawson is in the House, because she can take a bow on behalf of farmers' wives, who have a special part to play in this revegetation program. They have a special touch: indeed, we see in the vineyards girls doing certain work on the vines that is best left alone by the men, who tend to be too clumsy and smash the tendrils.

I trust that the Minister of Education, who is in the House at the moment, will convey my remarks to his Cabinet colleagues. After all, whichever Party wins the next election, one of the main contributions to be made by the Government will be to provide for the revegetation of our land and roadsides with trees. There are enormously interesting varieties of eucalypt and other native trees. Pines are frowned on by some stockowners: indeed, one stockowner said that one would never hear a bird singing in a pine tree, and that is true. However, pine trees provide excellent shelter for stock, and recently we have seen freshly shorn sheep perishing in fenced paddocks without shelter, when the shelter given by the pine trees would have been welcome. Such shelter could be provided by the many varieties of eucalypt and other native trees that have been produced by plant breeders through cross pollination and selection methods. I trust that the Government will take note of my remarks on this subject.

The proper management of South Australia's water resources has been a matter of historic concern. Indeed, water is one of our most precious resources. This has been evidenced by the concern expressed about the proposed coal mine at Kingston in the South-East. Indeed, at times there has been almost a civil war waging in the district. The coal deposit is tied up there, and future generations will probably have to deal with this subject. The water covering that deposit is an extremely valuable asset to the State. Negotiations have been proceeding on the subject of the underground water between Victoria and South Australia. Underground water is a wonderful resource. Where I live, we can walk out into the paddock and, without looking for a possible supply, sink a bore knowing that we will get water.

There has been over-pumping in the Padthaway Basin and salinity has been creeping in. Those two factors are

linked with the growing of the red gum *e. camaldulensis* and *c. rostrata*. Over the years we have seen these grand old trees cleared so that wheat can be grown, and that is sacrilege in its worst form. There should be a marrying up of the preservation of our water resources and the planting of such trees. I am sure that the member for Mallee would have something to say on this subject if he were here.

Recently, I attended the reopening of the direct service of container ships between Japan and Outer Harbor. While I was Minister of Marine I had long discussions with the Japanese shipping authorities, as did Michael Wilson when he took over from me as Minister. Further, I know that the present Minister (Hon. Mr Abbott) has also had long talks on this subject. Indeed, the Japanese authorities appreciate the work of the present Minister in having the service reopened. It was a great milestone to see the Minister's efforts brought to fruition and the Japanese ship tying up and taking on 470 containers. The Japanese ships will now bring small containers which are the very life blood in the resiting of our warehouses.

One of the great setbacks that we in this State have suffered has been the necessity for cargo to come through Melbourne and, although the export merchants could get shipping on three days of the week by sending bulk goods through Melbourne, there was a delay of five weeks in respect of LCLs (limited container loads) which were unpacked in Melbourne and forwarded to Adelaide warehouses. When I was Minister, the entrepreneurs were happy with the land and the price, but their next question was 'Where's the warehouse?'. When I told them it was in Melbourne, they said that they might as well ship through Melbourne and they went there. Roy Abbott should get a bouquet for establishing the new service with Japan. We now hope for the North Line, so that we shall see our warehouses re-established and that will be a good thing that has been done by this Government. Irrespective of whichever Government is in power, the result is good for the warehouses at the port where the nuts and bolts and other knick-knacks make the shipping picture complete.

Looking back over 21 years in my District of Victoria, I have seen many roads completed. The South-Eastern Freeway will be completed as far as the Victorian border next year, and negotiations have been proceeding involving Roy Abbott, as the then Minister of Transport, and Gavin Keneally, the present Minister, regarding the connection with Mount Gambier. That road is a high speed road and must be kept in excellent order. Plans are now in hand to connect Keith with the Naracoorte section. This will take the tourist buses down to fill the motels that have been built by entrepreneurs, two from New Zealand, such as Chardonnay Lodge and the motels at Penola, Naracoorte and Mount Gambier. This development, which will step up tourism in this State, has resulted from the continued extension of satisfactory road surfaces.

In the past two decades that I have been in this place agricultural production has been aided and abetted by Western Australian plant breeders and their 90-day clovers. People who are other than practising agriculturalists would not see much difference between a 90-day clover and a 120-day clover, but there is a major significance in this—they all bear Western Australian names such as Narawong, or something. Each has a special attribute, that irrespective of whether they are planted in late July or even in August in wet weather which gets them through, they will set their seeds (which are hard seeds) and regerminate the following year. Mount Barker is an excellent clover and a great soil builder for establishing new pasture. However, if one has a dry September there is nothing left. That is the great problem, but the Western Australian plant breeders have made a great contribution in this area.

I pay a tribute to Frank Blevins for his action in keeping Kybybolite research station. Again, we have depended on Western Australia for the potent and strong development of oat rye, such as Swan oats, which is a wonderful stock feed from Victoria. They are better than a haystack, because they bridge carrying of livestock across wet grass. I know that the member for Peake is mindful of feeding horses and other livestock well. A young man called Andrew Barr, who is a plant breeder at Turretfield Research Station, has developed a couple of oats of the short straw variety, one of which is called the dolphin and the other the echidna. The echidna does not like wet feet, but last year we saw phenomenal yields at Hynam and throughout the South-East of up to 46 bags or 132 bushells per acre—the yield had to be seen to be believed.

The great thing about the echidna is that it grows corn on virtually three quarters of its stem. This points up the need for a research station at a place like Kybybolite. Turretfield has had some good rains and there is a nice dry end spring, but when it gets to summer it is a dry old argument. We want to see a plant breeder at Kybybolite who can grow the echidna variety of oat or a sport from it that will persist in wet conditions. I feel that if the Turretfield variety is put into wet conditions it might not be as good as Swan, which will yield a generous 19 to 20 bags per acre. On the one hand one has the 90-day clovers building up nitrogen, which is the cheapest nitrogen one can buy, and, on the other hand, the high producing oats providing stock to fill the ships and thereby the Treasury with moneys needed to improve this State.

I seem to have to run out of voice, but I cannot finish my speech without saying something about education. I will refer to the Lucindale school. The Minister of Education, who is in the Chamber, is the youngest Minister. He is the latest in a long line of very distinguished Ministers of Education who have been in this place since I have been here. I want to thank him and his predecessors for what they have done. When I was first a member of Parliament we had three old wooden buildings: they did a great job, but some have since fallen down and some flapped in the wind.

I remember Hugh Hudson ringing me on election night about halfway through one of my terms as a member of Parliament. I got that call at Bordertown, halfway through dinner, and this was what the lass said, 'Mr Hudson wants you.' I didn't realise it was the Minister of Education, I thought it was a fishing mate, so I said, 'Yes, Max.' He said, 'No, it is Hugh here.' He then said, 'Allan, you are having your last campaign meeting; I suppose you will get beaten.' I said, 'Maybe; you never know in this game.' He said, 'I am ringing to tell you, as you might like to make the announcement, that I have signed the documents this afternoon and we will be proceeding to build a new school at Naracoorte North. I would not do this for everybody, but seeing that we get on so well, you can announce it at your meeting.' Now we have the Naracoorte school!

We have had the good fortune that every major centre in my electorate has gained a new school since I have been a member. I thought that I was going to miss out, but the honourable Minister in the Chamber came to the party and Lucindale is fixed. Also, we have the great new building for TAFE at Naracoorte. I make a plea for Millicent, which is part and parcel of the Mount Gambier South-Eastern Regional College. People at Millicent are doing a wonderful job in tin sheds that I would not fix a motor bike in. They are running welding classes in those sorts of places. Honourable members can take it from me that Millicent is an industrial area having Mount Burr, Cellulose and Apcel, as well as a highly productive rural area. I know that they are on the queue, and they do not mind putting up with their

present accommodation as long as they eventually get that building, which they will appreciate and from which they will provide the Minister with good results. However, from the district of Victoria and *in situ* I express my thanks on behalf of the very many grateful people for the quality of the school buildings that they now enjoy.

I turn my attention now to hospitals. At Penola, Millicent, Kingston, Bordertown and Naracoorte we have excellent hospitals. We have also been treated very well by the Ministers of Health in all Governments in the past 21 years. We have excellent surgeons in the district. I see that my colleague, the Hon. Mrs Adamson, is present. She had the pleasure of opening the very big wing at Naracoorte hospital, which has resulted in the saving of many lives since then.

I conclude by making some remarks about the Public Works Standing Committee, of which I am a member. I used to say to my old friend Tom Sheridan, when I was Minister, 'You should have been a banker; you say no so nicely.' It was very effective, but he took the Public Works Standing Committee to task on three issues. I realise that he has a job to do, although some of us perhaps think that he went a bit too far. Problems did arise, and he had some things to say about us, the committee.

I will now refer to the TAFE college at Port Augusta. I know that members on your side, Sir, have mentioned this college and it is only fitting that someone on this side of the House should support it also. I went to the last meeting held there and was taken apart by a couple of girls about some of the things that had been said by members on my side of the House: their remarks did not fall on deaf ears. I would not like to put on record what one of them had to say, but she said it very well. However, the Port Augusta TAFE has a big hand in the future development of this State with regard to the Cooper Basin and Roxby Downs, because that is the springboard for those developments. Sufficient land has been set aside to make it a major centre of learning for tradesmen and also for those of us who like the arts.

I know that my colleague could not be there, but I went along and found out that those people also have in mind an extension of the theatre and perhaps an extension of the arts. However, the Auditor-General criticised the cost of some million dollars. The young women were strong in their protestations about what was said in respect of them by the Auditor-General and people in this House, yet they gave up some freehold land which was plumped right in the middle of the area and which had been there ever since Burke, Wills, Edward John Eyre, Wylie and the black dog had trudged over there.

They gladly gave that up, and went down to what I thought was going to be a pretty wishy-washy piece of ground, because there had to be some reclamation of it. While we were viewing that on one cold day a freight train came along (it seemed to be running across the roof). But when going back there today one finds that it is a great piece of suburbia. It has also provided a great lift to the people living there, and the houses and the gardens have been improved. It is a credit to the Minister what his department has done. It even exceeded my expectations. They got over a very nasty argument with a person from whom they were going to take half a back yard. That is all fixed up, and it has been very well done. The State made money out of that deal and it will continue to prosper from it, not only now but for the next 50 years.

In relation to the swimming centre, that has attracted a lot of criticism. It is on record that, due to my flying experience, I was in a position to give an opinion about the roof, about which I was concerned, because it just looked like a big aerofoil. The winds coming across from Port Adelaide make a bit of a venturi. I expressed doubts about

the roof, and a guy came down with the engineer and said, 'Who is this Rodda fellow? What is he talking about?' I was talking about the lift, but the main problem was the pressure on the pylons. We questioned the engineers very closely about that.

Of course problems will always arise, as we do not have eyes in the back of our heads, or X-ray vision, but we could anticipate the problems with the roof and perhaps in relation to the swimming pool which was a bit too short. Someone said that Dawn Fraser would bash her brains out when she was going too fast while doing the last 16 feet! It is a very nice complex, but it is a bit under-engineered. Having regard to the evidence given and the extra evidence we sought, we were mindful of the wind pressure that the roof of the complex could be subjected to.

I am not here to defend an issue on behalf of the Public Works Standing Committee, but in relation to the investigations, the Auditor-General would not know any more about it than I do, if he looked at the matter very fairly. I heard Winston Churchill say once, when he came out to our squadron, 'It is dammed difficult to look further than you can see; that is what can get you into trouble.' That stands good at all times.

I opened a big conference held at Coonawarra a few weeks ago, and I had something to say about redistribution in the interests of country people. I said that it behoved the John Olsens, the Roger Goldsworthys, all those good people that I have served with, and all the other people who will follow, to have a look at this matter. It also behoves Government members, such as the Lynn Arnolds, to consider this matter. I can also include in that the David Wottons or the Peter Arnolds. Someone called Peter Arnold a yeoman once—I looked it up and it defined a yeoman as being a 'sturdy type'!

Don Dunstan was very far seeing: he left the canoe tied up, and even though it rocks it is still tied up. There is a need for the Parliament to look at the matter of redistribution, because otherwise there will be only about three country members who will be running their feet off representing their constituents. They would be like Edward John Eyre. They are a dying race: there will be one or two in the South-East, perhaps one on the Far West coast, two in between, and the rest will be representing city electorates. That is the way the Act is, and it will be darn hard to alter because any Government (of whatever persuasion) that tries to alter it must not only get it through both Houses of Parliament but also have the matter agreed to by referendum. People do not like referendums; that is a recorded fact. That is the problem with which a Government would be faced.

It has been a wonderful experience to be part of this place, and I am going to miss it. I look forward to seeing what the Parliament does. I will take copies of *Hansard* just to have an occasional read, and I look forward to coming and seeing people here from time to time. Thank you, Sir, for having me at your place.

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** In supporting the motion I want to express my condolences to the relatives and friends of the late Leslie Claude Hunkin, who I understand was a Director of the Savings Bank of South Australia, and of the late John Stephen Clark, who was member for Gawler and subsequently the first member for Elizabeth.

On behalf of my constituents and the local branch of my Party I also want to place on record appreciation to the Hon. Jack Wright, in his capacities as Deputy Premier, Minister of Labour, Chief Secretary and Minister of Emergency Services, for his strong support for and promotion of the aims and aspirations of the working class movement in South Australia. Of course, Jack Wright will be remembered for major legislative initiatives in the Industrial Conciliation

and Arbitration Act, the Workers Compensation Act, and the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act. It is regrettable that my colleague the Hon. Jack Wright has had to retire from those ministerial portfolios, and I suggest that his experience will be sorely missed, particularly by those on this side of the House.

That will apply equally in relation to the pending retirement from this place of the member for Price, Mr George Whitten. He came into this place at the same time as Jack Wright did. He has been an active and strong proponent of the needs of the working class, and he has assisted them and understood their struggles through his work within the Labor Party and the trade union movement. I wish those members well in the future, and I know that all members of the Chamber would concur in that.

In relation to the Governor's speech, I congratulate the Premier for his strong and able leadership, supported by an able Cabinet. The Government has brought us from the brink of bankruptcy, as was the case under the incompetent regime of the Tonkin Administration. It is true that hard and unpopular economic decisions have been made by the Government in order to put South Australia back on the economic rails. Commonwealth statistics have revealed that South Australia has outclassed every other State in getting its financial house in order.

The May Commonwealth statistics reveal that South Australia has the best run Government finances in Australia. We have outclassed every other State in getting our house in order. The other States and the Federal Government could well learn a lesson from us on how to prune back waste. The Commonwealth has released figures showing what has happened in relation to State Government deficits between 1982-83 and 1984-85. The analysis shows that there has been a 65.9 per cent increase in the deficit of the Northern Territory; a 68.2 per cent increase in New South Wales; a 21.6 per cent increase in Tasmania; a 28.2 per cent increase in Victoria; and a 5.2 per cent increase in Queensland. South Australia was the odd man out. Instead of an increase in our deficit, during the same period South Australia recorded a reduction of 34.9 per cent, by far the best record of any State in Australia.

These figures represent a stunning turnaround from the appalling position which the present Government inherited after the last election. Our Liberal predecessors showed that they could not manage a cake stall which, incidentally, I understand a Liberal Government would sell off under its privatisation scheme. South Australia's public sector deficit is the lowest *per capita* of any State of Australia. Other economic reports clearly indicate the trend that South Australia is taking. In February, South Australia experienced a very dramatic boom in new housing, with approvals for new dwellings rising from the depressed level of 8 045 in 1982 to 10 845 in 1983 and 15 329 in 1984.

This State's share in 1984 of almost 160 000 total new approvals in Australia was 9.6 per cent, clearly above the population ratio. Commencements of new dwellings are expected to exceed 13 500 in 1984-85 and then fall back to between 11 000 and 11 500 in 1985-86—a level more sustainable in the medium term. The value of non-dwelling building approvals in South Australia in December 1984 lifted to \$114.3 million, a rise of 63.5 per cent on the same period a year earlier. The corresponding national rise was 32.5 per cent.

Motor vehicle registrations rose faster in South Australia than the national average growth. New vehicle registrations were up 17.5 per cent in the full year in 1984 compared with a very strong 12.8 per cent national rise. In relation to industrial disputation, South Australia once again leads the country. According to the economic report of 2 May 1984 unemployment for the three months fell from 705 300 to

653 200 in Australia and from 62 200 to 57 600 in South Australia—a 7.4 per cent fall in each case. Advertised job vacancies, as compiled by the ANZ Bank, are showing a striking rise: the indicator showed a 42 per cent increase for Australia between April 1984 and April 1985 and a 34 per cent increase in South Australia. This job advertisements level was the highest since October 1984.

In relation to industrial disputes, in May 1985 days lost in industrial disputes around Australia, low during 1984, increased dramatically in February, mainly in Queensland, that great 'Labor' State. South Australia's record, always excellent, has dropped below 2 per cent of national total losses in the last year when compared with an 8.6 per cent share of employed wage and salary earners. Once again, new motor vehicle registration figures in the March quarter of 1985 were 15.4 per cent higher for Australia than a year earlier and 13 per cent higher in this State. This is helpful in a State such as South Australia where the motor vehicle and parts making industries remain important employers.

Retail sales figures showed an excellent 1.3 per cent growth in the March quarter of 1985. The same report shows that in July 1985 the unemployment downtrend was sharper in South Australia—from 11.2 per cent in the June quarter of 1983 to 9.1 per cent in the March quarter 1985 and then down again to 8.6 per cent in the June quarter. Other labour market indicators such as job vacancies advertised and overtime, which usually suggest likely future trends, are encouraging.

Again, new motor vehicle registrations remained buoyant in the latest three-month period to May 1985, with an annual growth rate for Australia of 12.9 per cent and a South Australian increase of 10.5 per cent. The non-housing sector of the building industry appears to be accelerating sharply and the dollar values for the latest three month period to May 1985, when compared to those of a year ago, were up 36.9 per cent for Australia and 42.4 per cent for South Australia.

Private enterprise capital investment expenditure appears set at least to meet the 5 per cent increase in 1984-85 predicted in the Federal Budget. An earlier forecast by business for 1985-86 looked very encouraging. The South Australian share of such increased expenditure looks set to rise from about 7.6 per cent in 1984-85 to 8.9 per cent in the year to June 1986. In terms of industrial disputes, once again this State's share of Australia's total days lost through industrial disputes was only 1.7 per cent in the latest 12-month period as compared with an 8.5 per cent share of wage and salary earners. Clearly that lays to rest the garbage that has been peddled by the incompetent Opposition sitting opposite us.

Despite the Opposition's advertisements, despite its rhetoric, and despite its gloom and doom, it is seen quite clearly—even among its own conservative supporters—that South Australia certainly has picked up its game under the Bannon Administration. Nothing demonstrates that more clearly than an article that appeared in the *Sunday Mail* of 2 June 1985 in the 'Onlooker' column 'Sunday Opinion'. Headed 'State of Stagnation? Don't you believe it,' it states:

The current crop of Liberal Party television commercials, for example, claims South Australia is stagnating because of the burden of State taxes. The bold statistics indicate nothing could be further from the truth.

Not a bad sort of statement from the *Sunday Mail*, a paper certainly not renowned for supporting the Labor Party. The article continues:

Twice in as many weeks, a senior liberal MP has volunteered to me his opinion that SA's economic recovery is remarkably sound. The simple fact is that on most impartial economic indicators, South Australia is recovering at a faster rate than other States. Production is up and bankruptcies are down: employment is up and unemployment is down. That is not to say things could

not be better—much better. But, somewhere, there is something illogical in everyone claiming substantial tax cuts are an economic necessity when the economy is bounding ahead.

The report continues:

Mr Olsen's Opposition has done a splendid job in carefully nurturing the public perception that his opponents are a high-taxing regime. On the surface, at least, the Opposition's argument has some validity. Total tax collections in South Australia are up significantly. But how much is due to the actual rate of tax and how much to the growing economic activity.

Analysing the latest Treasury figures last week, the Opposition concluded 30 June would see total tax receipts up by about 46 per cent in just two years. They predicted Mr Bannon would reap a \$35 million windfall by the end of the month.

The Opposition claims the biggest jumps will be in stamp duties (up \$26 million on last year's budget estimates), payroll tax (\$3 million) and contributions from statutory authorities (up \$7.2 million). All of which is extremely good news, not bad. The rate of stamp duties, for example, was not changed in the 1984 Budget. The increase in stamp duty collections is related directly to economic recovery.

Just digressing, this proves not only what we have been saying for many years, that South Australia has picked up its game, but that we have made the hard and unpopular decisions and have brought back prosperity to South Australia despite the rantings and ravings of the incompetent Opposition. The article continues:

More business is being done, more transactions are taking place and the total amount collected has soared even though the actual rate has not changed.

Then, later:

The incidence of industrial disputes and the level of bankruptcies are way down—neither of which can be said of Queensland, for example—

that great, if you like, 'Labor State'—

South Australia's overall tax rates place it about fourth in the national list, our level of public debt is very much lower than the national average, and the rate of growth of Government expenditure is the second lowest in the country.

The Liberal Party does not like to read that sort of thing. The article goes on to state:

But, despite what seems to be an enviable financial position, South Australia is the only State seriously talking about tax cuts in this year's Budget. There will be further payroll tax exemptions for business, which is fair enough.

It is likely there will be land tax relief . . . Some months ago, the Opposition distributed a selected list of how land taxes have jumped to the point where they are a serious burden on small business.

That is a real joke. It goes on to state:

The list cited examples of big percentage increases. In reality, they were examples of a rise of \$100 or \$200 a year—and to qualify for that sort of a hike the value of the property taxed had to have increased by thousands of dollars. Is a \$100 land tax bite on an otherwise tax-free capital gain of more than \$10 000 really so odious?

This Opposition, which has constantly carped, criticised, knocked and tried to put South Australia down, has been shown in these articles to be telling untruths. The latest report, which appeared in the *Australian* of 8 August, is a terrific article. I suggest not many Opposition members have read it—they would have died with fright if they read the first few paragraphs. The article is headed, 'No budget blues in South Australia'. The article states:

The Premier of South Australia has bitten his tax bullet.

Just as they are in Canberra, taxes and charges were a looming electoral problem for the Bannon Government and had been since its first Budget in 1983 when it broke an election promise not to raise them.

At the time Premier Bannon argued that the increases had been forced upon him by a budget blow-out of major proportions that the outgoing Tonkin Government had concealed. Inevitably the Opposition charge, from the day the 1983 State budget was handed down until this week, has been that the Bannon Government was a high tax Government that broke its promises.

But on Monday that politically corrosive charge for a Government which is expected to go to the polls within four months was clearly destroyed when Mr Bannon announced a \$41 million tax-cut package. He called it his first 'major riposte' to Opposition

attacks on the revenue issue and considerably raised the political temperature by appearing all this week in a series of election-style television advertisements ending with the message: 'We're winning again.'

Indeed we are. I commend the article to members of the Opposition. If they have any sense of pragmatism or honesty, perhaps they ought to read and digest what is contained in it. The article further states:

But recent surveys by the Government and the South Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry have shown the State is leading the national economic recovery and of the three manufacturing States seems best insulated against any short-term downturn. These surveys are backed up by Australian Bureau of Statistics figures released yesterday showing South Australia heading the list of forecast new capital spending by the private sector with an expected increase of 43 per cent to \$1 251 million next financial year.

In fact so good is the economic news from South Australia that Mr Bannon has been able to make his tax cuts, including a drop in electricity charges, without having to be concerned about creating his own deficit blowout.

Housing and construction sectors in the State are enjoying boom conditions, total unemployment is down and employment growth up, and there has been a significant increase in new fixed capital expenditure by private enterprises.

As a result revenue from land taxes and stamp duty has markedly increased and despite increases in payroll tax exemption levels the increase in employment has meant no revenue loss in that sector.

That is not a bad sort of management. The article goes on to state:

The net result of this is a State whose finances are healthy and whose economy has not been in a better shape for more than seven years. Mr Bannon must be pleased.

Indeed, I suggest that the whole of South Australia would be pleased with that article, with the exception of the blinkered Opposition. It continues:

He could not have hoped for a better story to sell to the electorate.

That article is in marked contrast to the negative approach and gross untruths that have been peddled not only by this Opposition but also by its predecessors. The touch of Valderism is starting to seep through to the electorate at long last. At least there is someone in the Liberal Party who has some guts and honesty and is prepared to say what they really intend to do to this country should they gain power. God help us if they do. I think Valderism, amongst the troops, is commonly known as foot and mouth disease.

I commend an article published in the *Bulletin* of 13 August 1985 to all members of the Opposition and also to my colleagues, not that they need any edification in this arena, because they are well versed in the garbage peddled by the negative people on the other side. The article states:

Valder is in trouble with Peacock for saying that a Liberal Government, if it were to reduce public spending significantly, would have to cut social welfare. The comments that aroused Peacock's ire also included the observation that the Opposition's 'privatisation' policies were merely 'fiddling at the edges.'

The privatisation policy is an interesting one. The Liberal Party was prepared to go to the extent of selling the cake stall on the Adelaide Railway Station. I suggest that would make a tremendous impact on the economy of this State. What piffle!

**Mr Gregory:** What rot!

**Mr HAMILTON:** Indeed, as my colleague said, what rot! The article goes on to state:

There also was the controversial suggestion that the assets test was a step in the direction a Liberal Administration would have to travel if it was fair dinkum about getting Government expenditure down. Peacock, in September 1981, told the National Press Club that the 'burgeoning area' of social welfare 'has to be cut.'

So much for this bunch of hypocrites. The article continues:

That was a few days after he had made the same point in a speech to Parliament criticising the Fraser Government's recently presented budget. Peacock, at that stage, was in self-imposed exile on the back bench, planning his own leadership challenge. In the

same Press Club speech, Peacock said proposed spending cuts recommended by the Fraser Government's 'razor gang' largely involved the sale of Government assets.

I will come back to that later on. The article goes on:

That meant, he asserted, that 'the hard decisions are therefore yet to be taken.' And he conceded that the essential task of getting—

this is the kernel of what this mob of hypocrites is about—the social welfare bill down 'means perhaps some form of income or means testing.' In ringing tones, he added: 'I am not in a position to implement the changes but, if ever I become in a position to implement change, I certainly will be seeking to see that the sort of things I am giving voice to . . . will become a reality.'

In his budget speech, Peacock had told the House of Representatives that cuts in Government spending had to be brought under control. 'So much of Government spending goes to people who demonstrably do not need government assistance,' he said. And he specifically mentioned family allowances, dependant spouse rebates, the first home buyers scheme and health insurance as areas where this occurred.

'Needed decisions will demand a good deal of courage from Government leaders,' Peacock told the House. 'I think a start could be made by making all assistance to families and individuals income-related.'

We then come to the guts of it, as it states:

Valder's comments were a faithful echo of those sentiments. But, as Peacock would argue, the circumstances are different.

God, how pathetic! It concludes:

One of the changes is that Peacock is the one being embarrassed, not doing the embarrassing.

That is worthwhile reading into the record to show the hypocrisy and deceit being foisted upon this community. This Opposition, in cohorts with its Federal colleagues, is prepared to get into the working man, the elderly and all the disadvantaged groups in the community. Members opposite stand here and talk about how they reckon the State and the economy is going. They are not concerned—they are a bunch of hypocrites and very deceitful people. Talking of deceit, let us look at some of the stupid statements that have come from this Opposition and the Liberal Party over the years. Let us look at one matter that really concerns me and about which I am fierce in terms of the policies of the Liberal Party—its privatisation scheme.

I can remember that when I was in Opposition the member for Hanson stood up here one night and said he believed that the South Australian Film Corporation should be sold off to private enterprise. Not long after that he was taken to task on national ABC television and was carved up by John Morris from the South Australian Film Corporation. I have never seen a bloke look such a berk in all my life as he looked on the night that John Morris carved him up on television. The point I make is that under privatisation by this Opposition, if it came to office after the next State election, one of the first things it would do is sell off the South Australian Film Corporation.

*Mr Mayes interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON:** Indeed, that is one of the many things. I challenge him in this House to state quite categorically that, under his privatisation program, they will not sell off the South Australian Film Corporation to private enterprise if they get into Government. I believe, despite the protests and assurances given by Murray Hill some time ago when in Government that they would not sell it off, that under the Opposition's privatisation policy it wants to sell off Government and semi-Government instrumentalities. It would sell off anything to look after its mates with a big quid.

*The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON:** The shearer will get his turn in a minute, so he should not get excited. It is interesting to note what the South Australian Film Corporation has done under Labor Party initiatives in South Australia. We raised it from

virtually nothing to being one of the top film making corporations in Australia—if not the best. It is recognised as such in the Western world. *Breaker Morant*, *Storm Boy* and so on are recognised as top films all over the world, including in the United States. Yet, this Opposition, given half a chance, would sell it down the gurgler to some of its mates. That is what it is all about.

The Opposition does not give a damn about the people employed in my electorate. It does not care about carpenters, joiners, labourers, seamstresses or the local supermarket, all of which benefit from people who come there to work. It does not care about the local service station proprietor who picks up \$3 000 or \$4 000 per month from petrol purchased by the South Australian Film Corporation. It does not care about the shopkeepers or delicatessen owners who pick up a quid. They would sell off the corporation to their mates. What would happen then? It is likely to be sold interstate and South Australia would be left without a film corporation. That is the policy and attitude of this Opposition that talks about getting into Government. As I said before, God help us if that happens after the next State election!

A matter of concern to me about the Labor Party involves my Federal colleagues. I refer to concessions for the film industry. I have been concerned for some time about the stated attitude of some of my Federal colleagues in terms of tax concessions. I am not a believer in tax evasion measures, but here is a clear example of where my Federal colleagues should give favourable consideration to the South Australia Film Corporation. The latest film made by the South Australian Film Corporation attracted \$7 million. I refer to *Breaker Morant*. With a multiplying factor of at least three to one, that has benefited South Australia to the tune of \$21 million.

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** How do you work that out?

**Mr HAMILTON:** If the honourable member is so thick that he does not understand, he can come and see me later and I will explain it to him.

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** You can't do it here.

**Mr HAMILTON:** The honourable member cannot run a farm, let alone understand what I am talking about. I wrote to the Premier some months ago on this issue expressing my concern about those concessions and I seriously hope that they will be kept in place for the South Australian Film Corporation. I understand that there are interested investors and I believe that one group from Western Australia has expressed some interest in another film being made in South Australia involving millions of dollars. I cannot say any more on that subject, but I am aware—

*Mr Whitten interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON:** Yes, indeed, as my colleague the member for Price intelligently states, it will benefit South Australia. It was pleasing also to see a press statement by our Premier—a very astute Premier on a whole range of issues, particularly in terms of benefits to South Australia—which came out in strong support for the South Australian film industry. The release stated:

The Premier and Minister for the Arts, Mr Bannon, today challenged the Opposition to say how many jobs in the State's film industry would be lost if the South Australian Film Corporation was sold off to private enterprise, in line with Liberal Party policy. Mr Bannon said it was high time the Opposition clarified its position over an important South Australian industry. The Opposition's position hangs like a sword of Damocles over one of the most creative and innovative film industries in the country. Mr Bannon said. There have been repeated threats from the Liberals' Mr Becker to hive off the Film Corporation, which is the lynchpin of all the creative talent of the State's film industry.

It is quite clear to those people what the Liberal Opposition, in conjunction with its Liberal cohorts, is prepared to do. It is my belief that, if it ever comes to office it will decimate

the film industry in South Australia. That would be a very sorry day, not only for the Film Corporation, but, indeed, for our international reputation, particularly in America, Japan and the Western world where recognition has been given to the tightly run tight-fisted activities of the South Australian Film Corporation in terms of its expenditure of money.

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

**Mr HAMILTON:** Prior to the dinner adjournment I was extolling the virtues of the great initiatives of the Dunstan era, particularly the South Australian Film Corporation. I hope that many South Australians will have an opportunity to see the set for the production of *Playing Beatie Bow* that is standing currently at the Hendon site of the South Australian Film Corporation. My wife and I were privileged to see part of the filming. I commend the production to all members of the House: It is a fantastic show.

**An honourable member:** Did you get a part in it?

**Mr HAMILTON:** Yes, I was even looking for a part to play. Unfortunately, they said, 'Hollywood, you can't get in there,' so I missed out. Nevertheless, if the Deputy Leader of the Opposition continues to call me Hollywood, it may well mean that I get a part in one of the film corporation's productions.

It is interesting to see that the member for Hanson—the man who wants to sell off the South Australian Film Corporation—graces the benches of the Parliament. As I said before the dinner adjournment, this man, who has Valder's Disease (foot and mouth disease), got the biggest bath of his life on ABC television when Mr John Morris from the South Australian Film Corporation carved him up into little pieces. It is possibly the worst embarrassment of his life. Heini is not a bad sort of bloke, but he got a hell of a carve up on that night.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON:** We know who is sick. Nevertheless, I extol the virtues of the South Australian Film Corporation. I hope that not only in the short term but in the long term those sets will be open to public view. That will not only provide more opportunities for employment within my electorate (part-time or long-term) but, as my colleague the member for Henley Beach—one of the strongest supporters of the South Australian Film Corporation—has correctly pointed out, it will bring very many tourists to South Australia.

We have heard very little from the Opposition over the years about the virtues of the film corporation, with one exception. I must be honest, because I understand that the Hon. Murray Hill from another place is held in high esteem by the South Australian Film Corporation. However, I have heard nothing from those other members on the other side of the House.

By agreement, I will speak only until 7.45 p.m., although I would like to take longer. Coming back to the state of the economy of South Australia, I hope that, for their edification, members opposite will read that most profound speech that I made before the adjournment. The *Business Review Weekly* of 12 July 1985 states:

Adelaide's retail market is strong, according to Hooker, with great investment interest and low vacancy rates, because demand from investors seems to be outstripping supply. All ranges of renewals of retail properties are selling well, including strip centres and small neighbourhood centres up to \$1.5 million with returns of about 8 to 11 per cent.

As I have said previously, there is no doubt that the economy of South Australia is firmly on the economic rails. Had sufficient time been available to me on this occasion I would have elaborated on the activities of the Government and of the Minister of Housing and Construction in terms of money that has been provided by the Government for

State housing in South Australia. There is no question that the Government has looked after disadvantaged people in this State. More than 65 per cent of South Australians in Housing Trust accommodation are paying rents lower than the normal market rents. My colleagues and I strongly believe that disadvantaged people should be looked after.

I challenge the Opposition to indicate to the people of South Australia prior to the forthcoming election whether or not a Liberal Government would increase Housing Trust rentals to market value. I challenge the Opposition to state that the Liberal Party does not intend to increase Housing Trust rents to market value. I have not heard much from them on this issue, and that is why I make that challenge.

During the time that the Government has been in office, since November 1982, my electorate has received considerable advantages from Government activities. The Opposition expresses a great deal of concern about workers compensation and industrial matters. Since October 1979, I have raised many times the matter of support for workers injured on the job. I vividly recall an incident that arose on 4 October 1979 at the opening of the Alfreda rehabilitation workshop. On that occasion Dr Bunt Burnell, well known in medical circles, asked then Premier Tonkin to make available \$300 000 to construct an orthopaedic swimming pool for the use of workers who had been injured on the job and who could use such a pool for rehabilitation. This was the first official opening function attended by newly elected Premier Tonkin, whose stupid response to the request made at that opening ceremony attended by many invited guests from the medical and professional field, was, 'I have learnt three new words since becoming Premier; the first two are, "How much?" and the third is "No".'

While in Opposition I pursued that issue whenever industrial Bills were being considered by the Parliament, and I reminded the hypocritical former Government of the needs of working class people who suffer injuries at work, but not one red cent was provided. I approached the then shadow Minister of Health, Dr Cornwall, who, after inspecting the area, gave an undertaking that a Labor Government would commit itself to that project.

Very shortly, that project will be officially opened. The facility is for the use of arthritic amputees, disabled and injured workers. The swimming pool has become a reality—that commitment made while in Opposition has now become a reality. I shall continue to remind the Liberal Party in South Australia of its hypocrisy in relation to industrial matters and the rehabilitation of workers in this State. The Liberal Party has been found wanting, and it is condemned for its lack of action in relation to disadvantaged people in the community. It will be a long time before I forget that.

Coming from the trade union movement and the working class in this State, I feel very strongly about this issue. However, as I have said, the pool at the rehabilitation centre has become a reality. I hope that I will have an opportunity to play some part in the opening of that facility. When I first came to this place in 1979, I asked the then Minister for Environment and Planning for assistance in the relocation of an engineering factory, Allied Engineering, at Royal Park. In Opposition I made repeated and persistent requests to that Government.

**The Hon. D.C. Wotton:** What has your Government done?

**Mr HAMILTON:** I will come to that in a moment. Despite repeated requests made to the Minister at the time (he is now present in the Chamber), his stupid response to the people who were annoyed by the heavy industrial noise from that factory was, 'Go to the psychiatric centre on Woodville Road and try and get relief from that stress.'

Upon coming to government, to their credit, the now Deputy Premier and the Premier provided assistance in the relocation of that factory, something which the previous

Government did not have the guts to do and was not prepared to take on, and I will tell members why: there were no votes in the disadvantaged area in my electorate, so the Liberal Government was not prepared to assist those people. History will show that the Liberal Government did nothing to assist those people. After the Labor Party came to office (the Deputy Premier is here and I thank him personally for his involvement in that area) it provided assistance in the relocation of that factory.

In relation to the West Lakes area, the development of the Hawkesbury Reserve is an issue that was brought to my attention when the West Lakes Community Club wanted a club and grounds located at that site. The club had no base, but it wanted bowling greens and facilities for those people in and around West Lakes and Semaphore Park. In the three years that I was in Opposition I ran up against brick wall after brick wall. Upon coming to office, despite all the promises that were made by the Liberal Party, the then Minister of Local Government and succeeding Minister of Local Government and the Minister of Recreation and Sport put their money where their mouths were. The land is already there for that community undertaking. We need the clubrooms, but the Federal and State Governments have, through local government, contributed towards that project, and that is to their credit. We put our money where our mouths are and do not make promise after promise but provide nothing. We work quietly. There is no question that we are achievers.

There is proof in my electorate of what this Government is prepared to do in trying to assist people within it. The saga of the lighting at Football Park, despite all the talking by the previous Government, was resolved by this Government. I can point to many issues in my electorate. I cite the example of the preparedness by the previous Minister of Transport to talk to the unions in order to resolve the problems relating to the access and facilities involved in the extension of West Lakes Boulevard. To his credit, he was prepared to sit down and talk with my old union and reach agreement to provide access which would involve the least disruptive proposal for Albert Park. I commend the previous Minister of Transport for his involvement in that area.

We have the record and the runs on the board. There are many things that need to be done in my electorate. There is the active promotion of the western suburbs for the purposes of tourism. The multi-million dollar development of a resort hotel will provide many jobs for South Australia and attract many people.

The waterway itself, despite some problems which will be resolved through the good offices of the Marine for Marine in a matter of time, has tremendous potential, especially when coupled with the development of the Port Adelaide area represented by my colleague the member for Price. My colleague the member for Henley Beach has also been actively involved, as have I, behind the scenes in trying to attract tourism interest down there with bus services during the Grand Prix and the sesquicentenary year. In those areas we will no doubt provide more jobs for people. We will provide more opportunities for tourists to come into the western suburbs and enjoy what is down there. The area has been neglected for many years in terms of tourist potential.

I look forward to that together with the member for Henley Beach, who unquestionably will be re-elected at the next State election. We had a goose in this Parliament between 1979 and 1982 who was not worth a cold pie and he has indicated that by his activities since his defeat. When it comes to ability the member for Henley Beach will buy and sell and play the Liberal bloke on a 40 beach. I look forward to working for many years with my colleague from

Henley Beach; through his hard activities the working class will show through. We are prepared to knock on doors and talk to small business people in particular about their needs. The support is there, despite the ringing around by the Liberal Party to small business people to ask for donations. In my electorate the number of people including butchers, drapers and the like were promised the policies of the Liberal Party, but those policies were not delivered. The Party solicited funds, but after a fortnight Liberal Party people rang back and asked whether they had the information. The butcher said, 'No way, and you will get no donations.'

I rest my case on the lack of policies and ineptness of the Liberal Opposition. It is one of the worst Oppositions I have seen since I have been involved in politics. Based on the record of the Bannon Government, I am sure that we will be returned at the next State election.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** We had more heat than light in the last effusion from the member for Albert Park.

**Mr Hamilton:** Chalky!

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I am not sure of the background of the member for Albert Park. I am nervous about inquiring into it. Judging by the contributions he makes here, I believe that it must have been rather short in real experience of what life is all about. We will pass over what we have just heard. Before I get to my main remarks in the Address in Reply, I point out that it is unfortunate that early in this session we do not seem to have sorted out reasonable sitting times for the House.

**Mr Gregory:** Whose fault is that?

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** There was a very good working arrangement between the Hon. Jack Wright and me, as manager for our side, whereby we would confer on civilised sitting times for the House. We have heard the Hon. Frank Blevins say with great gusto, as is his wont when he is in the public arena, that no way was he going to be in this place after 10.30 p.m.

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** That was the Hon. John Cornwall.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Sorry. Yes, John Cornwall. Well, they are all rather nondescript, so one can be excused for a degree of confusion between them. According to the Hon. Dr Cornwall there was no way in the world that he was going to be in this place after 10.30 p.m., because it was affecting his health and it was completely uncivilised. We received complaints from the Labor Party when we were in government. The Hon. Jack Wright, along with the then Whip (Dr Hopgood, who is now the Deputy Premier), came to us and said that there was no way that we should have sittings at uncivilised times; there was no way that we should sit after 10.30 at night unless there was pressing business that had to be dealt with and, certainly, we would only sit after midnight in the most extreme circumstances. There was to be a conference at the beginning of each week in relation to the sittings of the House.

The Opposition is not told what the Government has in mind, and there is no hint of a conference, despite the precedent established over the years. Instead, we heard around the corridors that we would sit until midnight last night and we hear again that we will sit until midnight tonight.

**Mr Becker:** Why?

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** That is a good question. There is nothing else on the Notice Paper but this debate. I suggest that, if we are to have amicable and sensible working arrangements, some of the qualities exhibited by the late Deputy Premier (Hon. Jack Wright) should be adopted fairly promptly by his successor.



**Mr Gregory:** 'Late' means he is dead. He's still around; he is still alive.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** 'Late' means 'ex'. Of course he is alive and kicking and I am sorry that he had to depart the scene, because he made the sittings of the House far more agreeable than they are with the present new chum. I can only say that we got on very harmoniously and the House ran sensibly. However, it appears that anything goes under the new regime. I now turn to a subject that is very close to the hearts of all taxpayers in the State and, in fact, everyone on even a modest household budget. I refer to the question of the charges that the Government is levying across the board.

By nature, the Labor Party is a great taxer—do not let anyone say anything to the contrary. The Labor Party is on about the redistribution of wealth and, by definition, it is a great taxer. The trouble is that members of the Labor Party have not learnt the fundamental lesson that, if one wants to raise significant revenue across the board, one must tax the man in the street. They are trying to con the man in the street into thinking that someone else is picking up the tab which is, in fact, not the case. The whole business about the tax summit was how the Federal Government could get more out of the fellow in the street so that the Government could come to terms with its burgeoning deficit.

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** And his wife.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Yes, and his' wife. That is going to bankrupt this country. This country is in the most serious economic plight that it has ever experienced in its history, and I defy anyone to refute that. We are paying for unemployment relief schemes to the tune of \$900 million with money which we are borrowing from overseas and on which we are paying a very large interest bill. The current Federal Labor Government is compounding this nation's problems in the way that it is running the affairs of this country. It is no wonder that the international financial community has lost faith in this nation.

When it comes to power the ALP has a whole Christmas stocking full of goodies. That happens without fail, and it is happening again in this State at the moment. It has an enormous Christmas stocking full of goodies. When it comes to power the Labor Party says that it does not matter whether it runs up a deficit. If members think back to the first year of the Federal Hawke Labor Government, the gurus were saying that it does not matter a damn if a deficit of \$7 billion or \$8 billion is run up.

**Mr Gregory:** What was Howard going to do?

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Nothing like that. Of course, the deficit blew out. The Labor Party said that it did not matter about the ballooning deficit, that it would fix it up later down the track. The result is that within three years, if we continue down this track, we will owe in excess of \$100 billion to overseas interests. We will have to pay enormous sums of interest on that. An enormous slab of the taxpayers' dollar will be required. Everyone in this country will be affected; even the household budget will be affected. Everyone will be paying an enormous slug in tax, because we are living beyond our means at an increasingly accelerated rate. To come to grips with that, we must increase our export earnings by one-third—no less.

There are only three areas in which we can do that: in rural production; in mineral production; or in the manufacturing sector. We do not have a hope in hell of increasing our total export earnings by one-third through the manufacturing area, because we have been priced out of world markets. We are living beyond our means in relation to all sectors. The rural community is being further and further hard pressed on the world scene by the EEC, which has some electoral clout. About one-third of the French, I think,

are rural producers, and they have significant political clout. The rural community in this country has been largely disfranchised and we were pace setters in South Australia with the one vote-one value system. With the EEC dumping on the world markets and the American Government entering into a price war in terms of subsidising rural production, the picture for Australian agriculture and rural production in general does not look rosy.

Therefore, we must look to the third area—the mineral sector. The one area where Australia and South Australia in particular could have made a mark on the world scene was in relation to uranium. But what do we see? The various factions in the Labor Party are still brawling amongst themselves. Premier Bannon went to Japan only days ago to secure uranium markets for South Australia; however, John Scott, MHR, was shooting him down behind his back, with a significant section of the Labor Party supporting him. And members opposite cannot comprehend why the Japanese do not understand Australia's position in relation to the security of markets.

I have said previously, and I repeat, that I was in London last year talking to the Central Energy Generating Board: I was told that it had written contracts to buy Australian uranium with Koongarra and Jabiluka, which were closed down because of faction fighting within the ALP. They were sacrificial lambs, as were Honeymoon and Beverley in South Australia. The people who were buying uranium said to me, 'We think that Australians are eccentric.' In relation to the one area where we have a chance to make hundreds of millions of dollars and to do something about the declining standard of living and international indebtedness, we are eccentric.

I asked, 'Where will you buy your uranium?' The contracts with Namibia had expired and, of course, with all the pressure in Africa at present (a lot of it illdirected) they did not want to keep those contracts going, and so they wanted to buy from Australia. I was told that they would buy their uranium from Canada. Canada is laughing all the way to the bank about the attitude of the ALP. It is pretty close to home here. The attitude of the Bannon Labor Government, with the compromises it has had to make all along the line to accommodate the brawling factions, is an example. What a spectacle there has been in relation to this so-called tax policy! What a debacle where, on the run, the Prime Minister said, in answer to a radio commentator, 'That is a bright idea. We will have a tax summit' to get him off the hook during an election campaign. There goes Keating.

I must say that Keating is one member of the Federal Government who at least has some glimmer of economic rationality. He sets out to take action to encourage incentive in this nation so that those who can produce something and sell it can do something about this enormous burgeoning deficit and are not taxed out of business. What happens? He has been killed off by the brawling factions within the Australian Labor Party. How would poor Mr Keating feel if he picked up the *Adelaide News* and read the editorial? I guess members must have read it, but what a complete shambles, what a way in which to try to run a country!

We are not being run by a political Party or a political organisation—we are being run by five political Parties that cannot agree among themselves. What an appalling state of affairs! We have the same scene in little old South Australia. When I say 'little old South Australia' I am not deprecating this State: we are proud of it, we are born and bred here, but we are going down precisely the same track in South Australia.

The Labor Party came into office in 1982 on the same platform of an over-brimful Christmas stocking full of goodies, of more people on the public payroll, of more perks and lurks for unions, and no increases in taxes to pay for

it. There it was in black and white. When a fairly perceptive interviewer asked how he would pay for it, the Premier said, 'I have good financial information. We will not have to introduce new taxes or increase taxes.'

What a sorry record! People went back on the public payroll very quickly. The Labor Party's solution to unemployment—and it has been singularly unsuccessful—is to put more people on the public payroll, but of course it is self-defeating: the Government has to raise more taxes to pay those people.

By Western standards we are most over-indulged in terms of public services. The Premier claims the public is clamouring for public services but, next to Sweden, which has had a socialist Government for years, and Denmark, Australia runs a close third. People went on the public payroll pronto and within weeks the State budget started to blow out.

The Premier describes it as the Tonkin budget but, in fact, he inherited it early in the life of the financial year. Is the Premier saying that Treasury officials were telling lies? Is he saying that we conned Treasury officials into putting up a budget that was false? Of course, by the end of that first year things had run wild.

Now what have we got? We have had record levels of tax increases. As usual, they do not tax the tall poppies—they cannot. That does not raise money. They tax the man in the street, and I would like to give an illustration of what has happened in relation to electricity tariffs. Many falsehoods have been promulgated by the Premier as he seeks to excuse what happened to electricity tariffs, but last year the Government imposed a new tax on electricity.

The Premier talks in that phoney election pamphlet about the Liberals' electricity tax, and he talked yesterday about falsehoods. That is a complete falsehood. Indeed, if I were allowed to say the word 'lie' I would but, as I am not allowed to say 'lie', I use the word 'falsehood'.

The Labor Party and the then Premier Dunstan came to power saying they were going to tax the tall poppies. What did he do? Did he put a tax on tall poppies? No—he put a tax on electricity. In two years we saw 3 per cent on turnover—tax the tall poppies! I ask the House, what did he do? Within a couple of years he upped it. That was a Labor Party tax through and through. And then they imposed the gas levy.

When we were in government we at least got rid of the gas levy and it was one of my aims over time to get rid of the turnover tax. I remind the House of all the other tax relief we had given especially in relation to succession duties, which we wiped out—a \$20 million saving to the public—and a whole range of other taxes.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Let me carry on with this sad litany of the taxes that the Labor Party have visited on every household and electricity user in South Australia. That was Premier Dunstan in the glorious 1970s taxing the tall poppies. He imposed a 5 per cent turnover tax on electricity which last year, in 1983-84, raised over \$22 million. That is a Labor Party tax. I throw back in the Premier's teeth the falsehood that the Liberal Party has ever put any tax on electricity. Every one of these items is a Labor Party tax, involving over \$22 million, and this year it will be about \$27 million.

Then we have payroll tax, which conforms to the law across the board. Then there are the royalty, land tax, stamp duty, vehicle registration and the financial institution duty—all Labor Party taxes—involving \$72 000. That may not sound a lot, but the next tax to be mentioned is a new one. Indeed the Labor Party imposes a burden on every electric-

ity user in South Australia. I refer also to the additional charge on Treasury loans, which was a new tax last year. The long-term loans are fiddled. It does not cost the State Treasury or the Labor Government an extra cent. With loans that have been in place and negotiated over many years, the Labor Party suddenly decides with the stroke of a pen to increase those interest rates. It is not costing the Government any more: the loans are still in place. It is like somebody who has a long-term housing loan which is in place and which is suddenly lumbered with an enormous increase because somebody wanted to raise some more money.

**Mr Ingerson:** How much did they get out of that?

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Out of last year's new tax on electricity, they raised \$8.8 million. But, on top of that, in the same basket they charged a guarantee fee on loans when, of course, the loans are guaranteed, anyway. They are charging a guarantee fee on longstanding loans which are guaranteed, anyway. However, because they want to tax them by a backdoor method, the Government charges the people \$3.5 million for a guarantee fee for guaranteeing nothing. How far can they stoop? That adds up to well in excess of \$12 million. It was a new tax last year for nothing on long-term loans. There was no change in interest rates but involved guaranteeing a loan that did not need to be guaranteed to raise, by the sneakiest excursion through the back door, the sneakiest tax that one could imagine. The Government taxes every electricity user in South Australia another \$12 to \$13 million. Here they have the gall in this completely untruthful election pamphlet with the Premier's visage on it to talk about Liberal taxes.

They are very liberal—put on by this Labor Government! What sort of double talk are we into? Now, we have the Premier announcing electricity cuts. In what context has this happened after this record tax effort. He said, in answer to a question earlier this week—he wants it all ways—that the Liberal Government was a high taxing Government, but we were criticised federally because we did not make enough tax effort. We reduced a whole range of taxes, including stamp duty on first homes, and the like, to let young home owners get into a home more easily, and we are criticised for it.

Only a day or so ago he said that we were criticised in Canberra because we did not make enough tax effort. Which story does he want to sell? The Premier has now announced these electricity tariffs: this year, a 2 per cent cut, that is, \$2 per \$100. It is not uncommon now for a quarterly household bill to be \$200, and in an all electric house it would be far in excess of that. It does not even get near the extra tax that he slugged them last year. And he will hold it down next year. In what context could he make that promise?

We asked some questions today in the light of a report in today's *Advertiser* that the Government is considering converting Torrens Island to burn black coal. Torrens Island produces 80 per cent of this State's base load electricity, and it is the cheapest power station that we have because it burns natural gas. ETSA cannot predict what its tariffs will be if it does not know what it will pay for fuel. We asked a couple of questions here today: what would be the effect on tariffs if Torrens Island was converted to burn coal? The Premier said, 'I don't know, but of course that will have to be a consideration when we work out whether we go down that track or not'. Yet, here we have in the *Advertiser* this morning a report, obviously emanating from the Government, that we will spend a lot of money.

*Mr Gregory interjecting.*

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I always know when I am getting close to the bone because it takes a lot to stir the honourable member from his usual state of torpor.

When I have, I know that I am getting very close to the bone. If Torrens Island is to be converted to burn black coal, imported from New South Wales at the going prices, which were quoted in the Stewart Committee report, commissioned by the Government: in excess of \$60 a tonne was the figure quoted (in government, I was quoted a figure somewhat less than that), down-grading (it is not as efficient—one has to down-grade the efficiency of those units) very significantly the output of that station and turning to other more expensive options, how on earth the Premier thinks that he will keep tabs on electricity tariffs I do not know.

We asked further questions today: we asked, 'Has the Premier concluded negotiations in relation to the gas price contracts (supply and price)? I know that the Government has been negotiating, unsuccessfully, for over 12 months, to renegotiate those completely hopeless contracts that were written by the Dunstan Government Ministers—absolutely hopeless! They gave gas to New South Wales to the year 2006, whereas ours runs out next year, and under pricing conditions that are so out of kilter to be unbelievable. Anyway, the Government has been going down this track, trying to negotiate a range of prices for gas over the next 10 years in the price range of \$1.50 (give a cent or two)—which is a reduction on the current year's price, which runs out at the end of this year—to \$2.50 in 1985 dollar terms in 10 years time.

Lord knows what the price of energy will be then, anyway. There they are without even addressing the problem of the Sydney contracts. It is absolute lunacy to agree to 10 years of prices for South Australia without addressing that fundamental question of what Sydney will pay for our gas. The Premier said, in answer to that question today, 'We are still locked in delicate negotiations about the price', let alone the supply. He announced cuts in electricity tariffs only a week ago and said that the Government would keep tariffs below the CPI, yet they have not got the faintest idea of what they will pay for fuel or where they will get it from.

**Mr Ingerson:** An election con.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** An election con; I am bereft of words.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** If ever there was a confidence trick visited on the public of South Australia when the Government has not done its homework, this is it. It does not know where it will get the fuel from or whether they will convert Torrens Island to burn coal, which will send electricity tariffs up, inevitably. The Government does not know what it will have to pay for gas for next year, let alone the next 10 years, but it is 'locked in negotiations'. The Government is not even addressing the fundamental problem: that Sydney has a guaranteed supply of gas until 2006 at a cheaper price than we can buy it, and this Government will perpetuate that situation. What sort of future has the State got with that sort of plan?

**The Hon. H. Allison:** They take our gas cheaply to buy their cold beer.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Deputy Leader.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The mind boggles at the con trick that the Premier seeks to revisit on the South Australian public. It is 1982 revisited—we will do all these things and we will not raise taxes. We will do this in relation to electricity. Not only that, part of this package is to remit—not remove—\$11 million of its \$50 million tax slug on ETSA for one year only to get it over the hump of this election. Let them off \$11 million, and the Government says that ETSA has agreed. I thought, 'What goes on down there?' But, of course, it has stacked the board with Labor Party fellow travellers. The Government sacked Bernie Lev-

erington, a hard-headed businessman, whom we put on the board to keep an eye on its financial affairs. Because he was President of the Chamber of Mines at the time and spoke out about closure, this Government is so small minded—

**Mr Trainer:** And he was a Liberal Party Treasurer too, before that.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Leader will resume his seat. In accordance with my policy, I warn the member for Ascot Park. The honourable Deputy Leader.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Mr Leverington, a well known and respected businessman in Australia, spoke out against closure of the Honeymoon and Beverley uranium mines. They were sacrificed on the altar of Labor Party's faction fighting in relation to uranium. That even threatens Roxby now. He was sacked. Who took his place—ex-Minister Virgo.

Then there was a retirement not so long ago this year. Who took his place? John Lesses, boss of the Trades and Labor Council of South Australia. I appointed Glen Broomhill, former Labor Minister, to the board because there was a tradition of doing that. I think in hindsight, the way things have gone in the last year or two under this Government, that that was not a very brilliant precedent. However, there had always been a custom in South Australia to have one former member from each side of Parliament on the Board of ETSA. For some years John Coumbe from this side and former Deputy Leader Hutchens from the other side were on that board. In due course, we had Tom Playford, who was there I think, with Cyril Hutchens. So it went on. Then I appointed the Hon. Glen Broomhill and the Labor Party, in due course, appointed John Carnie to that board. Since then, of course, we have seen the accession of the Hon. G. Virgo and, out of the blue, Mr Lesses.

I enlarged the board from five members to seven members to get a bit of hard headed expertise on it. But what happens to them if they speak out against what they think are ill-conceived Government policies? They get chopped off, and a fellow traveller is put on in their place. I have high regard for some members of the board but quite obviously—

**Mr Whitten:** All the members of the board!

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I certainly do not have a high regard for the decision that was made in this case where obviously the Government did not only twist an arm but shoved it up the back and broke an arm and a leg or two, and yet it was announced that the Board had agreed. I would bet that it was reluctantly agreed to by some members of the Board for whom I do have some respect for their independence from political pressure.

That is not the end of the story. Last year the Government not only lifted another \$12 million off the Trust by way of tax but pushed the Trust into a \$5 million deficit, for the first time in living memory. I have not yet found out the answer to this, but in order to sustain this tariff schedule that the Government has so proudly announced without having the faintest idea of where it will get its fuel from or what it will cost (and it will give the trust an \$11 million hand back for one year only) I will be interested to know how much the Government will push ETSA into deficit over and above \$5 million which it pushed them into last year to pay for an election gimmick to get it over a hump.

The Government talks about being responsible and trustworthy financial managers. We have had this sorry saga of the Labor Party with its grab bag full of promises, conning the public to get into office. But I do not think the public will buy it this time. They went through the same thrash federally, and within weeks the Federal Government had broken promises.

People in the electorate that I represent and in the member for Chaffey's electorate are very interested in the wine

industry, as are most South Australians. The Federal Government promised that there would be no tax on wine. Prime Minister Hawke is ageing fast, and rightly so, when he makes those sorts of promises and then breaks them. The Federal Government promised that it would build the railway to Darwin, that South Australia would be a great beneficiary from that. However, it did not take them long to forget about that one. And so the sorry litany goes on.

**Mr Meier:** They promised the same thing in Victoria, too.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Yes, I do not know how he survived, as he certainly did not cover himself with glory. We have these phoney tax cuts, announced by the Government, following a record tax effort, to use the Premier's own words. He was berating the fact that we were criticised because we did not make a good enough tax effort when we were in Government, which means to say that the former Liberal Government gave too much tax relief, and were losing out in Canberra because of our lack of tax effort. Well, there is no doubt in the world that the Premier and his Government will get first prize for tax effort. If it is looking to Canberra for a pat on the head for being a good and faithful servant, it will certainly get it, because the Government has made a record tax effort. The Government has slugged the taxpayers and households in South Australia record amounts, and electricity has certainly been on the receiving end of it.

I have dealt with that matter at some length, because I think it is important that we put into correct context these promises that the Government has made in relation to electricity. To sum up: the Government does not know where it is going, what the supply of fuel will be, or what it will cost, and yet here we have this proposal, and we do not know how much further the Government is pushing ETSA into debt.

In my opening remarks I have touched briefly on national economics. I think it is a great pity that there is such a loss of confidence by the international financial community in the Government of this country. Of course, the rot set in when the Prime Minister, on the run overseas, had to face the ignominy of telling the Americans that he had had to change his mind about the decision to allow them to replenish their ships in connection with the MX missile tests. In my opinion that is when the rot set in.

**Mr Gregory:** Can't even tell the truth.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** If the honourable member has been aroused from his torpor (I will not be unkind and say stupor) to interject, I am happy for him to put me right on any minor detail. Because the Prime Minister was subverted by another group within the Labor Party, he had to change his mind and break an undertaking that he had given to the Americans, and that is when the rot set in.

**The Hon. H. Allison:** It was slightly left of centre left, wasn't it?

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** We have the hard left (I think they just call themselves the left); in Victoria it is the socialist left; in South Australia it is the left, headed by our now departed friend, the Hon. Peter Duncan, now taken over by the Hon. Frank Blevins, ably supported by others within that Party. There is then the centre left, with that ill-fated former would-be Prime Minister, Bill Hayden, in the lead, busily white-anting his Leader. He has not forgotten the bloodied knife which was wielded against him by the now Prime Minister. We then have a group called the centre unity group. We then have the right wing group, which seems to collect the saner elements within the Labor Party, and a number of those reside in New South Wales.

I am digressing slightly, because that interjection interests me, as it no doubt interest other members of the House.

In South Australia it is the left that runs the show, and make no bones about that. We have all this talk about preselection within the Labor Party; but the left has the numbers and the left runs the show. However, it cannot get its candidate up to win, and that is the problem. What a sorry story. The member for Semaphore was elected, because the public would not wear George Apap.

*The Hon. J.W. Slater interjecting:*

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I need some help. There are so many interesting characters in the Labor Party that one tends to lose track of them. In recent days the Labor Party has not learnt from past experience because it put up Mr Roe. I am not well versed in Labor Party matters, except that I have the average layman's grasp of its factions.

**The Hon. H. Allison:** Except they put the wrong one up all the time.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Well, the organisation will not lie down. The left runs the show. The former Hon. Peter Duncan can thumb his nose at his Leader, who he said was as strong as orange-flower water. They managed to ease him out; he could not see much future here. Of course, poor Mr Roe got rolled. He did not win the election, so we now have the honourable member for Elizabeth. The Labor Party has been teetering on the knife edge with a replacement for Mr Jack Wright.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Deputy Leader will resume his seat. In accordance with Standing Orders I now warn the honourable member for Bragg.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** That is a little hard; very hard. Their man did not get up, because the public would not wear him. The left, which runs the organisation, was still playing with it, but the other fellow just sneaked in because the election was pretty close. Is it any wonder that we read:

ALP executive will write to at least four State MPs to ask why party membership in their electorates is so low?

Is it any wonder that Labor Party membership in South Australia is at an all time low? The graphs show a rapidly descending scale. I seek leave to have this purely statistical graph inserted in *Hansard*.

**The SPEAKER:** Does the honourable member assure me that it is purely statistical?

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Yes, it is a bar graph with figures on it.

Leave granted.



**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. It will look well in *Hansard*. The membership of the Labor Party since 1980-81 has declined alarmingly. If I were a member of the Labor Party I would have the wind

up. This organisation is on for a one vote one value system; but one union fellow can turn up with 100 000 votes in his hip pocket. In the preselection system the AWU, a strong union, can come along and say, 'Here is 100 000 votes for Joe Bloggs'.

There was a row within the Party between the factions, but the poor little sub-branch member who pays his annual fee, who wants to get a better part of the action and get something for his money, finds that he is completely dominated by the unions and the left wing. He has no say in preselection procedures because they are totally dominated by big unions and the left wing. So, he leaves the show. One of our members had a problem with mentioning that detail. However, I will mention another detail in relation to members of this House being pressured by their Party to lift their game and try to con more lay members—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member seems to attribute to me some embargo upon free speech. There is no such embargo.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. The latest membership figures on new boundaries show that four Labor seats have fewer than 100 members. This is the people's party! The lowest figure was for the electorate of Playford held by the Speaker, Mr McRae, with 48 members. I can understand that you, Mr Speaker, are busy with your speakership. Napier, held by the Minister for Housing and Construction, Mr Hemmings no less, had 77 members. Yet, he is the fellow who gets up and says how he in his halting way stands for the people. He can get only 77 of them to join his show.

**The Hon. P.B. Arnold:** Do you think they should close the branch?

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** They ought to close down the member: that would be more profitable, if the Labor Party wishes to attract members to its obviously faltering ship. I bet that if the member for Semaphore decided to set up his own Party within his electorate that he would beat the Labor Party hands down. We question his independence occasionally, but the electorate had the sense to send him here in preference to the left wing Mr Apap. The Labor Party wonders why its show is now faltering.

*The Hon. J.W. Slater interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Leader.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I do not know off-hand. Perhaps the honourable member does.

*The Hon. J.W. Slater interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Leader.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I do not know. Florey, held by Mr Gregory, has 75 members. He is the heart and soul of the show. He was the boss of the Trades and Labor Council for some period. He was the figurehead of the Party, the real power behind the throne. I am told that he is the bag man now. If the Party wants to whip around and get some money, he is the boy. That is why they cannot afford to break his leg too often. In fact, I was amused to read in the press the honourable member's comments when asked whether he would have a go for the Ministry. He did not say that he had been nobbled; he said that he was starting the race with a broken leg. I think that is a real flash of honesty. He was told that he was not wanted, despite the fact that he came through the right channels: he was the boss of the organisation, he had all the credentials, the breeding was right—it was all there. However, they broke his leg.

**The Hon. D.C. Wotton:** He didn't have a skirt.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** That is right. He was not good looking. They did not like the look of him. What a pity!

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I am not being personal at all. The member for Florey had flawless credentials, in the normal course of events, to be on a rocket to the top of the Labor Party, but that is by the by. As I have said, the member for Florey has only 75 members, and poor old Mr Klunder has only 86. The highest membership—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Deputy Leader will refer to other honourable members by their districts.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The member for Newland has 86.

**Mr Ingerson:** The temporary member.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Yes, very temporary.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I trust that that is not a reflection on the Chair.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** No, Sir, it is not a reflection on anyone; it is a statement of fact in relation to the political prospects of the member for Newland. He has two chances—and we know what they are. He will have the best record of anyone in this place for being in and out of here pronto—twice. The highest membership of 383 is in the Ross Smith electorate of the Premier, Mr Bannon. The Leader of this great band, with its rapidly declining membership, could only manage 383 members. It is no wonder, when there is the left, the socialist left, the hard left, or whatever one wants to call it, as well as the centre left, which has been trying to white-ant the Prime Minister when it does not like what he is up to. Along with the centre unity faction and the right wing, what hope does the nation have? In fact, what hope does this State have when the Government cannot move because the real powerbrokers from the left are pulling the strings behind the scenes? It is no wonder that the country is in a mess, and it is no wonder that this State has not made the progress it should have.

I would like to canvass a number of topics, but I will deal with only one more. No State or nation deserves to get on if it does not make the best of its opportunities. If ever there has been a Government with a saga of lost opportunities because it has been prepared to dither and because it is a casualty of its factions, it is the Labor Government both nationally and in South Australia. As the then Minister of Mines and Energy I visited Western Australia and had the opportunity of travelling north to visit the Pilbara, as well as looking at the offshore development and the enormous amount of construction work being generated. I then went south and looked over Western Mining's nickel mine at Kambalda, and I also looked at some gold mines. I came back firmly convinced that one area where this State could make rapid strides was in relation to developing that third major export earner, resources.

I know that it is now very unpopular to talk about resources. It was all the rage for a while, but it is now not so popular. In my judgment we were about 15 years behind Western Australia in terms of again becoming one of Australia's major resource States. If we seized every opportunity, as did Charles Court when he was Minister for Industry 15 years ago, we could add another important leg to this State's—indeed, the nation's—economy, as did Western Australia under that enlightened regime. However, we have frittered away major opportunities. I will enunciate them again. We could have been in the world uranium market if Honeymoon and Beverley had been allowed to flow on. In fact, Honeymoon could have been producing now.

We could have secured markets like those in London, as I said earlier, but they have been lost. We could have secured a uranium enrichment plant worth \$1 billion, which would have created not only employment but also investment and back-up activity in this State. I went to see the people involved (I know them well, because of our negotiations); they said that that would now be at least five or 10 years away. It was an opportunity lost, sacrificed on the altar of

Labor Party factionalism. There could have been oil exploration in the Pitjantjatjara lands: Haematite, the exploration arm of BHP, was ready to spend \$30 million. But that undertaking has now gone offshore China. After mucking around with the indecisiveness of this Government for well over 18 months, the company packed up and left.

**The Hon. D.C. Wotton:** I can well understand that.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Yes. Roxby Downs appears to be in jeopardy now because overseas people do not understand the Labor Party's uranium policy. What do we expect when a Premier says, a little over two years ago when we were battling to get through this House the arrangements to get that magnificent project up and running, that it is a mirage in the desert. However, the Premier is now trying to con people that Roxby is a magnificent development. He is trying to kid the public that he has taken it to his bosom, when two years ago he said that it was a mirage in the desert. At that time it was envisaged that the project would be somewhat larger than it is now although it is a considerable development. But even that development appears to be in jeopardy because of the attitude of the ALP.

There has been a sorry saga of lost opportunities over recent years. Once we lose them, we would be lucky to get them back, if at all. The so-called people's Party that wants to do something about the unemployed has lost opportunities. There are more young people unemployed now than ever before, or certainly in recent times, because of this Government's turning down the only real opportunities we have had of creating new investment, new opportunity and long term jobs. The Government has lost the opportunity to strengthen the economy and to add a new leg to the economy of South Australia. What an appalling record of lost opportunity! In my judgment, the Government has put back the development of this State 10 years.

When the Liberal Party is elected at the end of this year, as it surely will be, it cannot just pick up those lost opportunities that were about to be brought to fruition, because they have gone. That is the tragedy of this Labor Administration in this vitally important area, where we could have achieved new investment in this State and added a strong third leg to our economy. South Australia has always had and will continue to have an economy based on the rural sector, and, despite the Labor Party's continuing attempts to disfranchise that community (which has now run its full course and with which the ALP can no longer fiddle), agricultural and rural pursuits will continue to be the basis of our economy, to add to the general well-being of every man, woman and child in this State.

The second leg, of course, when one is talking not only about the Federal scene, is manufacturing. The Labor Party has done its best to make that sector uncompetitive. Its policies are precisely the same in South Australia as they are federally. The Labor Party is completely subservient to the trade union movement, which has a blinkered view and is fighting tooth and nail to gain benefits for its members—and to hell with every other sector of the community and the general well-being of the economy. There are no opportunities for massive expansion in South Australia. They are the two major legs of the State's economy, as is the case on the Federal scene.

The one area in which we could have made massive strides was resource development, including new exploration (and I have already referred to the massive effort that has left the State). Offshore exploration has virtually dried up, as has exploration for minerals, other than at Roxby Downs. The figures do not look too bad because Roxby Downs is a success—although it was a mirage in the desert, according to Mr Bannon two years ago. Apart from that, mineral exploration has virtually dried up in South Australia. I have

the figures to prove it. We have lost uranium processing plants, the safest part of the whole cycle, if people only had the brains to see it. In regard to the member for Florey, when in Government we offered the trade union movement the chance to send people overseas to look at the situation but, as I understand it, that was turned down.

**Mr Gregory:** No, it wasn't but when we asked you, you would not come up with the money.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** No way. You should have come and seen me.

*Mr Gregory interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Leader will resume his seat. In accordance with Standing Orders, I warn the honourable member for Florey.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** If that is not true, I would apologise to the honourable member. However, as it was put to me, the response was, 'Not now.' I would be interested to talk to the member for Florey about that. My point is that, if people were willing to go and look at the real world and see what is happening elsewhere, they would see that people were utterly dependent on some of this technology and they would see what the score was.

It is to the eternal credit of Norm Foster, a lifelong member of the Labor Party, who was under enormous pressure but who knew the facts. Indeed, he had the courage to get out of his Party at the eleventh hour to vote for something that would create employment in South Australia. It is to his enormous credit that we got that project at Roxby up and running.

If it had been left to the vassals in the Labor Party it would never have got off the ground. That is to Norm Foster's enormous credit. They broke his arm, just as they always do with anyone who shows any real spirit of independence—they broke his neck. If ever there was a man for whom I have a high regard in the Labor Party it is the Hon. Norm Foster, who said, 'I have never yet voted to put men out of work, and I will not start now.' What does the Labor Party say to that?

I conclude this Address in Reply speech by saying that the current situation grieves me greatly. The peacemaker from Unley will not be here long. I meant to deal with the peace movement in these remarks, but that will keep. The member for Unley is to the forefront of that. He will keep for a later debate. The fact is—

**Mr Mayes:** I will be around.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** You will be around—but not here. My great regret is that the history of this Labor Administration has been one of lost opportunities that could have resulted in something real and tangible to lift the standard of living in this State for every man, woman and child. That chance is out the window because of Labor faction fighting. It is an appalling record. Although these remarks might not be published, till my dying day my great regret will be that we will not be in 15 years hence where we should have been, that is, as a major resource State alongside Western Australia particularly and that much despised Queensland—much despised by the Labor Party.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray):** I have pleasure in supporting this Address in Reply. At the outset I want to express my condolences to the families of those past members of this place who have died since the last Address in Reply was brought down in this place. I refer to Mr Leslie Claude Hunkin, CMG, who was the member for East Torrens from 1921 to 1927, and to John Stephen Clark, who was a member of this House from 1952 to 1973. I knew Mr Hunkin briefly. I did not have the opportunity of knowing Mr Clark, but to the families of those two people who served this House very well indeed, I express my condolences.

The opportunity is provided in the Address in Reply debate to refer to a number of different subjects, and that is what I want to do tonight. I want to refer particularly to the responsibilities that I have in Opposition in the shadow portfolios that I carry of Correctional Services, Police and Environment and Planning in particular. Before I do that, there are a number of my colleagues who have contributed in this debate so far. One of those who have contributed is the member for Victoria.

This evening we heard the last Address in Reply speech that will be delivered by the member for Victoria, who has indicated his intention to retire at the next election. I just want to place on record my thanks to the member for Victoria who, certainly on this side of the House, has been regarded for some time as the father of the Parliament, for the support that he has given members I am sure on both sides of the House. I was one who some 10 years ago in 1975 as a new member came to lean on Allan Rodda very much indeed. He was always able to give advice and always had time to listen. He served his electorate very well indeed and can stand on that record with a considerable amount of pride. He certainly is an example to many others who will follow him. He has also served the State and two Governments as a Minister. I just place on record my thanks to the member for Victoria for the support that he has given this House and the contribution that he has made to the Parliament of South Australia.

First, I want to refer to correctional services. There is always plenty to talk about when it comes to the correctional service institutions in this State. In fact, the file that I now have on matters pertaining particularly to Yatala is quite extensive indeed. Just recently there has been much said about conditions at the Yatala Labour Prison. We have learnt in recent times, only last night in the evening paper, that there are now four South Australian prisoners who have been diagnosed as AIDS carriers. We have also learnt about the cases of hepatitis in the prisons.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! If honourable members wish to have a discussion, would they leave the Chamber?

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** This matter has been raised on a number of occasions. I have asked questions of the Minister responsible to find out what the authorities were doing about it, but I have received very little information. The incredible situation is that we have seen industrial disputes at Yatala as a result of the AIDS scare. We have seen prison officers repeatedly requesting the Government and the Minister of the day to take more positive action.

The situation that sickens me is that since 1983 there has been a 12-bed hospital, part of the Northfield complex, that can cater for male and female prisoners, but this facility which cost \$750 000 to be built has never been used and still stands idle today. It remains there as a white elephant of Government indifference. If the facility had been operational, then the prisoners that were regarded as carriers of the AIDS virus and hepatitis could have been placed in the security hospital. They would have been isolated from the other prisoners and there would be no need for the problems that have arisen over the past few months.

Earlier this year, in reply to a question, the Minister of Health (Dr Cornwall) told the Parliament that the Health Commission would not fund a prison infirmary because it was not regarded as having a high enough priority. This is \$750 000 of taxpayers' money tied up in a facility that would cater well for the problems that are currently being experienced in Yatala, and we have a Minister who informs the Parliament and the people of South Australia that it is not a high enough priority to provide staff to ensure that that facility works efficiently.

Repeatedly, the Liberal Party has asked the Government to act with some priority in this matter to alleviate industrial

problems that have been experienced at Yatala and, regardless of whether or not AIDS had been contracted, there is certainly a problem with the fear of prisoners about the uncertainty of the disease within the closed walls of a prison establishment. Certainly, that fear causes severe problems with the morale of the prisoners and of the staff. Meanwhile, the Government sits on \$750 000 of wasted taxpayers' money because a prison infirmary does not have a high enough priority to be opened and staffed.

That is only part of it. I refer again to the article that was in the *News* last night, where a prison officers representative—the Australian Government Workers Association organiser, Mr Peter Neagle—has called for some action on the part of the responsible Minister in regard to the sexual activities within the hospital. He referred particularly to homosexual activities, stating that homosexual activity, overcrowding, and the use of unsterilised tattooing needles in our gaols was causing the spread of AIDS. He called on the South Australian Government to provide a separate area for AIDS prisoners. I have just indicated that that facility is there—\$750 000 worth—to provide just that.

Mr Neagle went on to talk about hepatitis B and AIDS cases in the gaols, leading to a situation where these people would have to be isolated to protect the rest of the inmates and prison officers. He indicated that last June the prison officers had demanded compulsory AIDS screening for prisoners entering gaols, but that the Government had rejected the proposal at that time. I know—I have been told—that the Government tends to turn a blind eye to homosexual activities in our prisons.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** It is all very well for the Minister to say, 'Come on!' If that is not the case, let the Minister responsible say that it is not, but I am led to believe that if two prisoners request to share the same cell that will be granted. If that is not right, let the Minister say so, and I challenge the Minister to say that. However, I believe that that is the case. That being the case, it is a ridiculous situation when we are expressing concern about the possibility of the spread of AIDS in our institutions.

The other thing to which I will refer is the statement that I made some months ago about the drug problem in Yatala. I indicated that I had been informed that there was extensive drug abuse within the prisons, and particularly at Yatala. I referred to the fact that recently a prisoner from the Yatala Labour Prison had attended the Adelaide Magistrates Court. When he was searched by police on arrival at the court, having come from Yatala, a quantity of marihuana was found in his possession. It appears that the use of drugs by prisoners is condoned by senior management, and that senior management knows that there is this drug abuse.

As a result of that, I was accused of making vile accusations and of attempting to destabilise the South Australian prison system with allegations of drug abuse at Yatala Labour Prison. I asked that a number of matters be looked into. I called on the Minister to tell the taxpayers of South Australia, for example, the number of utensils used for drug abuse that had been confiscated in the prison system within the past six months.

I also asked Hon. Mr Blevins to reassure the public that any prisoners who had had such items confiscated from their cells had been punished either through loss of remission days or through the internal prison system. We all know what a farce the remission system is within our correctional services institutions at present. When, in the month that the six prisoners escaped from Yatala Labour Prison, we found that every prisoner within the prison received his full remission for that month it shows what an absolute farce it is that we are told that prisoners are supposedly given remission for good behaviour while spending their

term in prison. It is an absolute farce; that is recognised. However, I asked that the Minister provide me with that information. Of course, we have heard absolutely nothing.

We have heard not a whimper from the Minister about that information to provide any of those facts or statistics. All we have had is a mouthful of abuse from him, as we have come to expect, of course, and nothing constructive at all. While we are on that subject, I want to refer to the lack of activities at Yatala. Let us go back to November 1984, when we saw the start of the extended evening hours out of cells from 5.30 p.m. to 9 p.m.

Let us remember that that was the lever used to get prisoners back to work. It was part of the resocialisation program, part of which promised increased activities within the Yatala Labour Prison. The authorities appointed an activities officer to coordinate the program. That person left. Then they appointed a temporary replacement. The fact is that no activities, except those organised by the GROW and OARS organisations, are in existence at Yatala.

Even those that are there are very limited, as far as their involvement is concerned. We read not very long ago about education facilities now available at Yatala. We realise that they are used by prisoners only when they do not want to work. They have the alternative of either going to work or of taking part in an education course.

One does not need to be a Rhodes scholar to realise that a number of prisoners would prefer to take classes rather than to work. Again, I ask the question, because it has been asked on a number of occasions, just why are we not involving more volunteers within our prison systems? I was pleased to receive an invitation the other day to attend a concert at the Yatala Labour Prison. Unfortunately, I could not attend but I have spoken to people who did and I was told it was very well received. I am pleased to see that, because not so long ago concerts, drama and similar activities, were made available for prisoners.

We now find that a group of people have been employed who are supposed to identify group activities, although some 10 months down the track there is very little to suggest that they are achieving very much at all. There is now a situation where prisoners are spending that extra time outside from 5.30 to 9 p.m. with very little to do. They are bored; they have nothing positive with which to involve themselves. That goes totally against what should be considered as a priority by any Government, namely, the provision of activities in correctional institutions. I urge the Minister to reconsider this situation and to look seriously at the need for the provision of appropriate facilities.

I was intrigued by a statement made recently by my colleague in another place, the shadow Attorney-General, Mr Griffin, concerning a person who was taken to the Adelaide Gaol to serve 10 days but who was able to walk away because he was refused admission as it was the prison officers' lunch time. I am told that this is not something new—that this has been the case for some time. In fact, a police officer telephoned me a day or so after this matter was reported in the paper, and he suggested that for some time it had been recognised that a person to be admitted to a prison should not be delivered during the lunch hour. I find this quite incredible. I will not go into the details that were set out in the article dealing with this matter. It is an absolute farce that a person to be delivered to a prison (and particularly having regard to the circumstances that surrounded the case to which I refer) is able to go free because prison officers are enjoying their lunch break.

I now refer to a matter that is perhaps a little more positive as far as the prisons are concerned. Recently I was pleased to receive a copy of a brochure relating to prisons in South Australia. I guess this provides something of a welcome card for prisoners as they go into gaol. It tells

them what they can or cannot do, explains something of the gaol, refers to the canteen, recreational facilities, accommodation, and work that is available, etc.

The matter of communication is referred to, and the brochure states that prisoners may send any number of letters. The Department of Correctional Services pays the postage on a limited number of letters. The brochure states that public telephones for use by prisoners are available to enable contact to be maintained with family and friends and that prisoners may make any number of calls. Normal telephone charges apply. However, it is pointed out that prisoners cannot receive telephone calls.

On many occasions in this House when I have had the opportunity to do so I have referred to the red phones at Yatala. There is the incredible situation where by putting 20 cents into the phone, a prisoner can ring any person that he wants to contact, in the same manner as any free person in society can do. This can be done without any check on the part of prison officers or anyone in authority. I know what that has meant to me and to my family. I am sure that this must be of considerable concern to the Minister of the day in charge of prisons.

I do not intend to remove my telephone number from the public directory. I must admit that there have been occasions when I have thought about doing just that, but I do not think it is appropriate. My constituents should be able to make contact with me at any time. My wife and members of my family have received abusive telephone calls from Yatala prisoners. That has caused concern to the members of my family, and it indicates how ridiculous it is that prisoners are free to make those phone calls without any check at all. I am not suggesting that all prisoners are irresponsible; some are responsible, but many are not and have a chip on their shoulder. Many prisoners will take any opportunity they can to get back to those in any form of authority at all.

I am not suggesting that means of communications should be removed from the prisoners and that prisoners should not be able to make outside contact, particularly with their families. But, if that is to happen, I do not believe it is too much for those prisoners to go to a prison officer, as is the case in New South Wales and Victoria, give the telephone number to that prison officer and then make the call. The prison officer asks the receiver of the call whether that person is prepared to accept the call and, if so, the call goes through direct. I can see no problem with that.

When I have told members of the public that this extreme freedom exists, those people have expressed concern. I do not know how many times we must request that something be done about it, but it is a very serious situation, and I hope that the Minister will recognise that.

I have wondered (and it has been put to me by people who are involved in the prison system) what would happen if there was no contingency plan in the correctional services institutions and the senior staff should walk out. Unfortunately, we have come to expect industrial disputation and nobody knows when that may happen. I sincerely hope that it never happens in relation to correctional services, and I am not suggesting that that should happen. But, if the chiefs did walk out, there should be some contingency plan to enable people to take over those responsible positions. I would be interested to receive some information from the Minister in that regard.

I now refer to the remand centre. We have read a lot about the new remand centre. We understand that it is going to be one of the best facilities of its kind in Australia. It is costing a lot of money and will be an expensive facility. However, it is much needed and has been for some time. The concern I have is that we are now told that there are more persons under remand currently than can be housed



in the new remand centre. Already we find a situation where the new remand centre will not be big enough to house the number of people on remand. I do not know what the Government intends to do about that.

I am aware that recently the Minister for Environment and Planning indicated in a press release that the Government was getting very excited about developing the gaol built in 1841 as one of South Australia's premier heritage sites. I am very much aware of the architectural and historical significance of this building. Indeed, we would totally support the redevelopment of that gaol as a tourist facility. In fact, while in Government we suggested that that should happen.

I am also concerned about the conditions currently experienced within the Adelaide Gaol with overcrowding, sharing of cells and so on. I do not want to see that continue. I am concerned that we might be heading down the track of redeveloping the Adelaide Gaol without giving consideration to what might happen to those persons currently on remand who will not be able to be housed in the new remand centre. Again, the Minister might indicate to the House what he has in mind in that regard.

It seems an incredible situation that we have a new facility—one being hailed as the best in Australia—which we are told is not big enough to cater for those persons on remand at this time. One could talk about correctional services for hours. So many subjects could be referred to, but it is not my intention to go further into those matters this evening.

To be positive, I was pleased to see major changes to police operations in the metropolitan area as announced yesterday. Those changes will come into force on 1 January. They of course follow a two-year review and incorporate police moves back into the local community. That is something that we certainly support. A need exists for greater identification of police officers within the community in which they operate.

I am certainly aware of that in my own electorate and that is the general attitude of the public in various parts of the State. A Liberal Government certainly will foster community participation through interaction with local government, service and community groups, professional bodies and parent organisations. I also indicate that I am of the opinion that further consideration must be given to the recruitment and training of more personnel in the Police Force.

The matter of law and order is important to many people in the community. More and more people feel unsafe at the present time in their own homes and walking down the streets. They are uncertain about the safety of their property, whether their homes will be burgled, and whether they will be mugged while returning from a function at night. Rape is another matter for concern, and I could go on. There is considerable concern in the community. To match that concern I am of the opinion that further consideration must be given to the recruitment and training of more police personnel. I was particularly pleased to learn of that announcement by the Police Commissioner, Mr Hunt, yesterday.

I am also pleased that the Police Commissioner has established a fitness evaluation program working party to consider health and fitness standards within the Police Department. Substantial long-term benefits for all members of the Police Force will result from such a program. I for one will be interested to learn of the results and recommendations that come from that working party. I am also aware, if the program is to go down the track a little further, that there may be a need for financial assistance. I commend the program and I am sure that it will be welcomed by the majority of police officers in this State.

I turn briefly to the complaints authority. The complaints authority or the need for the establishment of an authority to enable members of the public to place their complaints against the police before an authority has been of importance for a considerable amount of time. When I first became responsible for this portfolio I received many representations from both the police, who had specific concerns about the type of authority that might be established, and from members of the public, who felt very strongly that there was a need for the establishment of such an authority. We now know that that has occurred and that, as a result of legislation, the authority has been set up and an appointment has been made.

I am a little concerned about the resources that are being made available to the authority. In fact, I have placed a question on notice to try and ascertain just what assistance will be provided and what resources will be given to the authority to enable it to carry out its work properly in looking at complaints that will be brought forward. I understand that that responsibility will commence from 1 September. Therefore, if the Government is genuine about the need for such an authority, it does not have very much time to provide the appropriate facilities to ensure that that happens.

I now turn to the Department of Environment and Planning. I will refer to this area only briefly, because in the next few days I will have an opportunity to say much more. I am pleased that the Government has come to its senses and that the Minister has recognised the need to introduce legislation setting up a new authority responsible for vegetation clearance in this State.

On a number of occasions I have expressed concern that the regulations controlling vegetation clearance in this State should come under the Planning Act. When introducing that legislation I, as the Minister responsible at that time, did not intend that the vegetation clearance regulations should be seen as part of development. That was not envisaged by the Opposition, and it was never intended. I have been very concerned because of the hardship suffered by a considerable number of people who, for one reason or another, have wanted to clear part of their property but have found that they could not do so and, as a result, were financially disadvantaged.

For months and months we attempted to convince the Government that it should do something about compensating those people who have been disadvantaged. I am pleased that, although rather reluctantly I believe, the Government has now decided to bring down legislation in that regard. In fact, it is quite incredible that that legislation is almost identical to a private member's Bill that was introduced by one of my colleagues in another place last year. There have been some changes, but we will have the opportunity to talk about that later. It is ironic that at that time the Government refused to acknowledge, accept or support the Bill, but it now intends to bring down very similar legislation under its own hand.

I am also disappointed that it has been emphasised that the legislation will be introduced as a result of communications between the Government and the United Farmers and Stockowners. Such communication is good, and I do not condemn it. That is the way it should be. However, I am certainly disappointed that there has been no mention of the extensive involvement of the Liberal Party and the Opposition in the preparation of that legislation in the early days.

I refer now to heritage. I have the greatest respect for the senior officers of the heritage branch of the Department of Environment and Planning. We are extremely lucky to have as the head of that unit in South Australia a very dedicated and committed person. However, I have been concerned as

a result of receiving a letter from one of my constituents who lives in Hahndorf. The writer has written to the Minister about a number of matters relating to the twenty-eighth interim list for the State heritage register that was published in the *Advertiser* on Friday 2 August 1985. The writer indicates that his principal concerns are a number of inaccuracies and the method of naming items on the list.

He refers to the second matter first and states that it is peculiar that names of current owners or occupiers have been used in many cases when a small amount of fairly elementary research and reading would have revealed the name of the original owners or occupiers. He states that the practice of using current owners' names is dangerous, because, as soon as the property is sold, the naming becomes obsolete and it is confusing. He mentions a few situations that illustrate this point in relation to the listing in question.

The first is Kuchel House, owned by the Kuchel family since 1910. In fact, it was built by a Mr Schach and was lived in by him and by his widow for about 40 or 50 years. It is suggested by the writer that that house should be listed as 'Schach house'. Habisch house is spelt incorrectly in the advertisement. In the listing it is 'Habich'.

'Detmold' was named by its current owners after the town or region in Germany. There is already another home that was given the same name by another member of the family in earlier years, so there will be confusion at a later time, and so it goes on.

A number of examples are quoted in the letter that has been forwarded to the Minister. One example refers to the former German Arms hotel. The writer indicates that there was a major bungle in regard to this building because the former German Arms hotel stood on the adjacent allotment and was partially burnt down in 1861. The new German Arms, on the other side of the street, was built in 1862-63, and the building in question was almost certainly the home of Christian Jaensch senior, who was the owner of the allotment for many years.

It is interesting to note that part of that person's home was demolished in about 1930 when the shop next door was erected. The letter goes on further to indicate that that is even the wrong building. When the writer made contact with officers of the heritage branch they indicated that they were uncertain about what was happening. The first person the writer contacted suggested that the German Arms was a two-storey stone building—that is correct—but in fact it was on the wrong side of the main street.

That person referred the writer to another very courteous gentleman (according to the writer) who was most cooperative and indicated that he would try to get more information. After some discussion he concluded that a couple of files must have been mixed up, and probably that is what happened. However, as the writer of the letter indicates, that is not good enough in such circumstances.

Some of the facts quoted in regard to the German Arms, built in the 1880, are patently wrong and could have been proven so by a small amount of reference to primary sources and not secondary collatings by the National Trust and other writers who just copy each other, according to the writer. These lists are important. They become legal. It is vital that they be accurate as they affect people's rights and what they can do with their properties.

I am concerned that I find that there are so many inaccuracies in regard to this listing, and only as it refers to Hahndorf. As far as I know, there may be many other inaccuracies in regard to other buildings in different parts of the State. I am told that at least those lists relating to Hahndorf contain a number of inaccuracies.

The status of the supplementary development plan has been raised publicly and frequently in recent times. While I am still talking about Hahndorf, I am concerned because

it has been brought to my notice that Mount Barker District Council is to face a test case following its refusal of an application for home units in Hahndorf.

These home units were to be built in an area that according to the supplementary development plan did not provide for such development, and we now find that an appeal has been lodged by the developers against the council over its refusal of an application to erect 10 home units in John's Lane, Hahndorf. The Mayor has stated (if the appeal is upheld):

'We won't be able to stop any applications for home units in Hahndorf or any supplementary development plan areas. Council normally defends its own appeals but, because of the importance of this particular appeal, has appointed a legal practitioner to represent it. Council refused the original application on the grounds that the units were not in keeping with the character and amenity of Hahndorf.'

I have had a fair bit to say about this matter. In fact I was instrumental in arranging for a deputation of Hahndorf residents to meet with the Minister for Environment and Planning, because those people were so concerned that they wanted the opportunity to be able to speak quite frankly with the Minister and express their views and concerns at that time. Let us look in a little more detail at the appeal that has been lodged as a result of the council refusing to allow those home units to be built.

On 23 May this year, application 580/326/85 for 10 detached dwellings on lot 2, John's Lane, Hahndorf, was received. The Planning Commission wrote to the Mount Barker council stating that, since the site lacked State significance, the commission was in favour of the proposal. On 3 June 1985, the application was refused by the Mount Barker Council on the grounds that it conflicted with the supplementary development plan. On 17 July 1985, I took the deputation to the Minister on behalf of the National Trust of Hahndorf with regard to the supplementary development plan and its status. On 18 July the Crown Solicitor's office wrote to the Mount Barker council stating that they would not be represented at the planning appeal since they, the Crown Solicitor's office, were in favour of the proposal. That is as it has been put to me.

Here, we have a case where the council has tried to uphold the spirit of the supplementary development plan only to find itself stuck with an appeal in which the Planning Commission and the Crown Solicitor are indicating that they do not see the need to make representation. Apart from that fact, multiple dwellings are foreign to the town and there is so much against them; they contradict so much that has been written into the supplementary development plan. I could go on with a lot of detail about that, but the point that was made to the Minister during that deputation was that if we are really genuine about the need to conserve places like Hahndorf (I know that plenty of people are saying it is too late; the damage has been done, there has been a lot of work carried out in Hahndorf that has in fact been detrimental rather than being seen as actually conserving part of the town), there is still a lot there that should be conserved.

Many thousands of dollars have been spent in the preparation of development plans and other private plans and reports by various people who have indicated the importance and significance of the heritage of that town in the Adelaide Hills. We all know how important it is as a tourist venue. Many thousands of people visit Hahndorf and it should be protected. Here we have, with that supplementary development plan having been prepared, a situation where nobody is sure what should be happening—whether we should preserve the town as it is, or whether we should do more to protect it—and now we find that the council, which, in this case, has done the right thing, is facing a considerable challenge.

**The Hon. G.J. Crafter:** Preserve the people as well.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** There are some very fine people in Hahndorf, as the Minister at the front bench would know, and again I refer to his grandmother. I again raise the matter of the Monarto open range zoo. I do not know how many times I have referred to this matter in this House. I announced the concept of an open range zoo back in 1982 when we were in government. It is about time that the present Government firmly indicated what the future of that open range zoo is.

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** Do you still want an open range zoo?

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Yes, I certainly do. Many reasons have been indicated on a number of occasions why that should proceed, but I have not got time to go into all that now. The current Government has had ample time to determine the future of that zoo, and it should advise the public what it intends. The Minister for Environment and Planning made a commitment on coming into government that it would proceed with the zoo, but now I presume that the Government has run out of money and cannot proceed. So it thinks that silence is golden and that if it does not say anything about it people may forget about it and it will disappear. But, it is far too far advanced for that to happen and far too important to South Australia to allow it to happen.

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** Would it ever be a profitable outfit?

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I do not know whether it will be profitable, but I am sure that it will be a great asset to South Australia as a tourist venture, and it is very much needed. The agistment area has already been completed. It should be going into the next stage and it is vitally important that it does. The Government has set up committees and feasibility studies have been placed before Cabinet. Everything is rolling on, but nobody is saying anything about it. I am scared stiff that the whole thing will come to a sudden halt and that all those people who have put so much into it will find that the bottom has fallen out of the whole thing, and it is too important a project to allow that to happen.

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** Don't you think that the private sector would pick it up?

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Appleby):** Order! I do not think we need the honourable member's assistance.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I have referred on a number of occasions to the need for the Government to take a few decisions in relation to the clean air legislation. When the legislation was brought before this House, I moved an amendment which would have given councils the opportunity to decide whether or not the whole or part of their areas should be exempt from the provisions of the Bill. We foreshadowed at that time problems that would occur if rural towns or areas that were not built up were forced to work under these regulations, which allowed, for example, the burning of rubbish in incinerators only between 10 a.m. and 3 p.m. from Monday to Saturday. By now, we all know what these regulations are, so I do not want to go into that. The Minister, as usual, in his dogmatic way refused to accept any advice from anyone else.

So, we have gone down the track. Time after time we find pleas from country local government authorities to do something about amending the legislation. Recently, there was a request by the South-East Local Government Association for its member councils to be exempted from administering the clean air legislation: that was rejected by the Minister for Environment and Planning.

Also, there was a request from the Eyre Peninsula Local Government Association. At a meeting of that association a resolution was put forward requesting the Minister for

Environment and Planning to implement the necessary enabling legislation to permit country councils to be exempted from the Clean Air Act and regulations. That has not happened, nor will it happen, because the Minister has indicated that he does not see that it is necessary.

All I know is that it is necessary. I do not know how many more examples the Minister needs, how many more letters and resolutions the Minister needs put before him requesting that such changes be made. It is about time that the Minister recognised some of the problems that are being caused and, instead of being so dogmatic, he should decide to give some country councils a go. That is apart from the cost that those councils incur in administering that legislation. That, too, is causing considerable problems in some councils.

I want to refer to a large number of things, but I will not have the time to do so. On another occasion I want to talk about the Supplementary Development Plan which is being brought down to control development in the Hills, supposedly to protect the Mount Lofty Ranges watershed. I see those controls as a serious threat to the continuation of viable full-time primary production in the Hills and I will have more to say about that on another occasion.

I am still particularly concerned about the lack of action by the Government in regard to the European wasp, because I read in my local paper only this week under the heading 'Battle of European wasp already lost' that people who know about the problems being experienced as a result of the introduction and the spread of this wasp are indicating already that it is too late: the Government has not taken the action it should have taken many months ago. Many people will be disadvantaged as a result of that in years to come. I only hope that the Government recognises its responsibility and does something about that serious matter as well. I wanted to refer to many other matters but I am afraid that I do not have the time to do so.

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

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** I call the member for Unley.  
*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! I have called the member for Unley, not every other member in the Chamber.

**Mr MAYES (Unley):** Thank you, Madam Acting Speaker. Irrespective of comments across the floor, I assure honourable members that I will be here. If they looked in Unley and did some door knocking, they would find the same result.

It is my pleasure to support the motion. In doing so, I pass on my good wishes to those retiring members of this House who will not be returning after the next election, of their own decision. I wish them and their families well in their future years—particularly the member for Adelaide, whom I wish well. As everyone knows, his contribution to this House, to the Government and to people of this State has been significant.

I wish the member for Price, who is currently Chairman of the Public Works Standing Committee, and his family well in the future. Again, everyone knows that the contribution of the honourable member over the years to the House, the Parliament, the people of South Australia and the Labor Party too has to be acknowledged by all Government members. I am sure that all members of the Labor Party would join with me in wishing him and his family well.

I wish the member for Whyalla, who is retiring of his own decision, and his family well. I look forward to seeing him over the years. I am sure that he will be around, certainly down here on certain days to enjoy company of his former colleagues in Adelaide. I have come to know the member for Victoria over the past three years while serving as a member of the Public Works Standing Committee and I have come to respect his experience and ability. Although he is a member of the Liberal Party, I will not hold that against him. I have found his contributions to be very timely and useful, and certainly for someone commencing to serve on the Public Works Standing Committee his experience has been helpful. On his retirement, I wish him and his family well. I know that he will certainly be very active for many years to come down on his farming property in the South-East.

I now turn my attention to some Government achievements in the electorate of Unley over the past three years. There have been some significant achievements. During the speech which I made during a grievance debate last week (it is rare for Government backbenchers to be given the chance to speak in those debates as the competition is pretty fierce, as you would appreciate, Madam Acting Speaker) I referred to matters pertaining to the electorate of Unley. I want to acknowledge some of the things which have happened and which will happen in my electorate. Significantly, there have been some constructional changes made to the local schools.

The Black Forest school now has its new administration and toilet blocks. I am very pleased and delighted that the Minister of Education saw fit to support that undertaking. Further, the proposed redevelopment of the resource centre and the rebuilding, due to unfortunate circumstances, of the junior primary area will be undertaken, it is hoped, in 1985-86. I am confident that, with the support of the Minister, that will occur. It will provide a significant improvement to the facilities available and will benefit the children of Black Forest. As a one-time scholar of the Black Forest school many years ago, I am delighted to see that that school has first grade facilities attached to it.

Work of significant benefit to the Parkside Kindergarten, with the assistance of CEP funds, has been undertaken with the upgrading of the old tennis courts and what has now been recognised by the Civil Trust as being an excellent open space area/playground for the kindergarten children who use it. The kindergarten is highly regarded in the Parkside area. It is supported well by its director and committee, and now with those additional facilities I think it will be one of the best kindergartens in the area, and certainly one of the top kindergartens in the State.

A significant event that occurred was the move of Friendly Transport from South Road, Black Forest. I am delighted by the outcome, and I want to place on record my thanks to Deputy Premier, the Minister for Environment and Planning, the Premier, the former Minister of Transport and the residents of the area for their support.

**The Hon. D.C. Wotton:** It sounds like a swansong.

**Mr MAYES:** No, it is an acknowledgement of what I have achieved in three years.

*Mr Baker interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr MAYES:** The member for Mitcham suggested blackmail. Perhaps I should record what a Liberal candidate promised down there in 1981. The Liberal candidate for the area was running around like a chook without its head. It was a hopeless case. The then Minister of Transport (the member for Torrens) was trying desperately to find another solution to the problem. However, it was the present Government which found a solution to the problem. The reason

we found a solution is quite clear: we acted responsibly and before there was a serious accident at the location involved.

It is essential that we record that this Government has taken action to relocate, in an arrangement which is acceptable to the Friendly Transport Company, which is a very large organisation in this State, the company's whole enterprise and activities to the Richmond site. If anyone has travelled there (I am sure the member for Peake is fully aware of the location, as are other members), he would be quite pleased to see the Highways Department work which has been undertaken and completed and the current physical restructuring of the buildings for the Friendly Transport Company. I think that is a very significant achievement, and no doubt the sceptics on the other side were very surprised when this Government achieved that goal, because it was one of those problems that the Liberal Party had put in the too hard basket in 1980-81.

There are plans for the relocation of the resource centre at Unley Primary School. That action is essential for the security of the school and for the benefit of the children. We have achieved significant additions to some of the aged care facilities within the area, and we are currently working on a number of programs which will benefit the local Unley electorate in the form of community information services. Very briefly, we have achieved quite significant improvements in the quality of life in the local Unley community. I would like to spend more time on that topic, but I am limited and I would like to turn to the current topic that seems to have been dredged up by the Leader of the Opposition in his attempt to gain Government.

We look at the issue of privatisation. We have had a lot of information put forward by the other side about the benefit—

**Mr Baker:** This is like a broken record.

**Mr MAYES:** There is only one broken record here, and that is the member for Mitcham. It has been put forward as the taxation salvation for South Australia and two so-called experts from the Thatcher Government have been invited to South Australia. It ought to be placed on record how well the Thatcher Government is doing. I asked Gill Langley, who is known for his economy of words, how Thatcher was going. Having spent two months there, I accept what he said. He said, 'She has gone.' In political terms, I think his judgment is as good as anyone's. All the reports we are receiving from people who have been to the United Kingdom recently indicate that that Government is on the nose and is on the way out.

The Opposition has turned to the United Kingdom for economic advice. That is a rather large insult to the member for Mitcham, who regards himself as an expert on virtually everything which comes through this House. He has regarded himself as a statistician and economist of some note. They could have employed him. He has worked in this area and the Opposition could have asked his advice on what should be privatised, but they are inviting two of Thatcher's experts. The Opposition is asking for advice from a country with record unemployment, record inflation and a balance of payments deficit. If you have an ailing economy, you go to one spot; you go to Great Britain. I have nothing against Great Britain—I hope it gets out of its troubles—but it certainly will not get out of its troubles with Thatcher or the people employed as her expert advisers.

If the Tory backbench is any indication, it is not too sure about the Thatcher philosophy in relation to pulling the British economy out of its economic woes. British Telecom was sold. If we refer to any of the articles that appeared in the mediocre, middle-of-the-road press, or even the right wing press of the United Kingdom—headlines such as 'How Maggie sold us two billion short' appeared in the *Financial Times* and the *Guardian* on Tuesday 4 December after the

Telecom shares had been issued—we get some ideas of these so-called experts. The people of South Australia ought to be aware that people who are expert in bringing about unemployment, dividing the country, and bringing about record budget deficits and record inflation are being asked to come to South Australia to advise the Leader of the Opposition on how to privatise South Australian industry.

**Mr Baker:** Don't you import Russians for your advice?

**Mr MAYES:** With the pattern the Opposition is setting, I am surprised it has not brought in the tourism minister for Afghanistan to give advice. We are faced with a situation where the announcements I heard the Leader of the Opposition make through the press that the nursery at Belair was going to be privatised, along with the STA Roadliner service, the linen service and the cake stall at the Adelaide railway station. What is the philosophy behind this? Is it to save the taxpayers' money? I have yet to see where \$50 million is going to be saved from the sale of the nursery at Belair, one of the best facilities of its kind in the State, providing the best information—

**Mr Baker:** Come on, have you ever been there?

**Mr MAYES:** Yes, quite regularly, in fact. We also have the cake stall at the Adelaide railway station and the STA Roadliner service. If we look at these philosophies, they have been hacked around and put out before. It is not uncommon in Western democracies for conservative Parties, for example, the Opposition, to put out this sort of philosophy in order to con the taxpayer into believing that there is some euphoria at the end of this road. It achieves basically the sale to the very large business interests of these very important public utilities.

In fact, we had the Leader of the Opposition referring to Telecom staff who purchased British Telecom shares. He was right. He referred to 95 per cent of the Telecom work force taking up Telecom shares. However, he did not refer to the quantity of the sale and the fact that three quarters of the Telecom staff sold those shares within two days to profiteer on the market. We had Thatcher's Government putting British Telecom on the market at 50 pence a share and, within eight hours of its going on the market, the share price had gone up to 90 pence and then up to 150 pence. We had profiteering on a basic public utility. So, it was basically the Thatcher Government's undervaluing the Telecom shares and flogging them off cheap in the community, so the taxpayer lost. If one calculates—

**Mr Baker:** Telecom workers gained—you wouldn't be against that.

**Mr MAYES:** No, but the public lost. I am not talking about individuals gaining but about the community as a whole benefiting. However, the taxpayer lost. That is quite clear, if the honourable member has taken the trouble to read the *New Statesman* or the *Economist* for that period. I can refer the honourable member to articles that would enlighten him.

**Mr Baker:** I have read them.

**Mr MAYES:** I am sure that the honourable member has not, as he does not exhibit that knowledge in discussing the issue. If one looks at those magazines between 1 and 4 December one would get a full picture of what happened with the floating of British Telecom shares.

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** Which year?

**Mr MAYES:** What is the honourable member talking about? He must have known when Telecom came onto the market. Thatcher was saying that it was economic euphoria. It has done nothing for the economy or the deficit. It has done nothing for the economic growth factor in the United Kingdom, because it is still in an appalling situation and unemployment continues to grow. Instead of showing the pattern that other Western economies have shown of some real growth, it is showing a real decline. The British economy

is not responding to this so called economic result, the pure monetarist theory being put forward.

**Mr Baker:** It's got nothing to do with monetarism.

**Mr MAYES:** If the honourable member understood Milton Friedman, he would know that he does not want Government interference in the economic process. It must be open to a *laissez-faire* free enterprise situation. Government enterprises—

*Mr Baker interjecting:*

**Mr MAYES:** Indeed it has. If the honourable member had studied the texts, he would understand that. We have a situation where the philosophy being put forward to continue to keep Government enterprises out of these areas, which interferes with pure economic trading, has had no impact at all on economic growth, and it has had no impact on recovery in the United Kingdom.

I will now deal with the Telecom issue in detail, and I refer to the *Times* of Saturday 1 December 1984 and an article headed, 'Telecom staff rush for free shares', as follows:

All but 8 000 of British Telecom's 230 000 employees have opted to become shareholders in the newly privatised corporation. . . Figures disclosed yesterday show that more than 95 per cent of Telecom work force has decided to take up some or all of the free and cut-price shares on offer to them in the £3 900 million flotation, which closed on Wednesday morning.

So, those people took up those shares on the float. When the float was opened to the market, the level of trading was quite enormous. Most Telecom employees who took up the shares had traded themselves out of those limited shares within 24 hours.

**Mr Baker:** How many of them were involved?

**Mr MAYES:** Ten per cent of the 3 000 million shares on offer this week were reserved for the work force—most on a highly favourable term. Therefore, it was 10 per cent of the 3 000 million. The remaining 90 per cent went in the free float to the market.

**Mr Baker:** How many of the 10 per cent actually sold their shares?

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! Will the member for Mitcham please allow the member for Unley to make his speech?

**Mr MAYES:** Thank you, Madam Acting Speaker. I refer to the response of the Telecom employees and to the article in order to give the full picture. It States:

On top of this, 61 000 Telecom employees—more than one in four—have also decided to buy extra shares at 90 per cent of the public offer price.

Meanwhile the two million or more members of the public who applied for shares in Telecom are expected to be given a broad indication this weekend of how many shares they stand to receive.

Because the share issue was oversubscribed, it is expected that those who applied for the minimum number of shares will receive what they asked for, but those making bigger applications will receive only a fraction of their requests.

That gives the picture in relation to what happened prior to the floating of British Telecom on the market.

I now turn to the *Financial Guardian* of 4 December 1984, for the benefit of the member for Alexandra, so he knows when British Telecom was floated. The article is headed, 'How Maggie sold us £2 billion short. Michael Smith questions the Tory way of doing the taxpayers business' as follows:

Each 1p of the massive 43p premium afforded to British Telecom shares on their stock market debut yesterday can be translated into a £80 million loss for the taxpayers.

This is how Thatcher flogged off this public enterprise. The article continues:

By the end of its debut day, the Telecom premium of 48p over the effective 50p issue price indicates that the Government has sold BT for £1.8 billion less than it is worth this morning.

The huge gap between what the Government received for Telecom shares yesterday and what they are worth today is further widened by the additional sum of £323 million which the Government has spent inducing the public to buy BT shares in the first place.

So, this is efficient privatisation! The article continues:

Yesterday's substantial premium on first-day dealings in Telecom confirms the general suspicion that BT was underpriced in order to ensure that the issue did not flop.

In fact, the Thatcher Government gave away British Telecom shares because it did not want the embarrassment of not being able to get them on the market and actually having people take up the subscription. The report continues:

More seriously it continues a depressingly long line of unhappy privatisation pricing and ensures that we, the taxpayers, have lost £2.1 billion through the entire five-year privatisation program.

Taxpayers funds are being given away to selective individuals who can afford to buy the instrumentalities on the market. It was further stated:

The Telecom flotation marks the climax so far of a five-year campaign to roll back the frontiers of public ownership, a campaign which has significantly gathered pace in Mrs Thatcher's second term.

Since the 1979 election, the Thatcher Government has sold close on £4 billion worth of shares in State-owned corporations like British Aerospace, Cable and Wireless and Jaguar and yesterday's sale of British Telecom, through an initial down payment of 50p on the 130p issue price, brings in another £1.5 billion.

In every case, except one, the shares of privatised public corporations now stand above the price at which the Government initially sold the shares. The taxpayer has lost most in the case of selling shares in British Aerospace . . . and Associated British Ports with the privatisations of Jaguar, British Petroleum and National Freight not far behind.

British Aerospace, the biggest defence company in Western Europe, was sold off into private hands at a time when the West was pouring increasing sums into defence. The shares, floated at 150p a share, opened for trade on the stock exchange yesterday at 375p. The net result is that BA shares, initially sold for £150 million, are today worth £375 million—a net loss to the taxpayer of £225 million.

So the story goes on. It indicates quite clearly that, in order to achieve privatisation, the Government had to flog off instrumentalities at a give away sale. Who would miss out on a sale but the public utilities? The article highlights the way in which the taxpayers, because of the Thatcher Government's philosophies, paid through the nose to benefit a few wealthy individuals who had the power, influence and money to collect these shares. An article on the front page of the *Guardian* of 4 December, under the heading 'MPs furious at BT shares rise', stated:

The Government was accused of criminal incompetence in the Commons yesterday as the share price of the newly-privatised British Telecom commanded an opening premium of 90 per cent when official stock market dealings opened. The partly-paid BT shares changed hands in frenzied trading at 95p, compared with the down-payment of 50p made by investors.

The stock market price put a value of £5.2 billion on the 50.2 per cent of the telecommunications group sold by the Government, £1.3 billion more than the Government has received from investors. The difference matches exactly Government overspending this year, and could almost fund a 1½p cut in the basic rate of income tax.

That is a salient lesson. Instead of income tax savings, the Thatcher Government, by its own decision on privatisation and its incompetence in selling these public utilities, ensured not a reduction but a maintenance of taxation at that level. However, if the Government had kept those utilities it could have saved the 1½p in the basic income tax rate. It was further stated that this sale has been one of many that were valued out at something like \$4 billion, having cost the taxpayer through the sale of public utilities.

We have heard of the brilliance of the Thatcher Government's privatisation, but it is worth putting on the record that it is not the economic salvation that is being heralded by the Leader of the Opposition. We must consider what has been happening in Australia when we talk about South

Australia as well as comments made by certain members of the Liberal Party. I heard the Leader of the Opposition on the Philip Satchell program heralding the wonderful savings to the taxpayer that would come about through the sale of the Woods and Forests Department Belair nursery, the STA roadliner, the Central Linen Service (which is making a slight profit) and the cake stall at the Adelaide Railway Station, all of which would add up to a saving of \$50 000 000. Even Philip Satchell picked up that there were major holes in the Leader's philosophy, and I believe that these holes will become major chasms as we get further into this debate.

I could refer the Leader of the Opposition to comments made by the Federal Deputy Leader in a report in the *Australian* of Monday 12 August, under the heading 'Government sell-off would not raise enough for tax cuts', as follows:

The privatisation of government groups would not be enough to allow a Liberal government to cut taxes, the party's federal deputy leader, Mr Howard, said. He is believed to have told a private workshop on the economy that the party would have to abandon its promises of cutting government spending unless it could identify, within 12 months, programs to be cut. His comments echoed those of the party's national president, Mr John Valder, who recently described privatisation as 'fiddling at the edges' . . .

There is another famous saying about fiddling—that perhaps the Leader of the Opposition might take into account. Again, Mr Valder has shown a great dose of honesty, which his colleagues never seem to be able to either digest or encompass.

**The Hon. D.C. Wotton:** This is a recording.

**Mr MAYES:** The honourable member may believe it is a recording, but it is one he will continue to hear if he continues to flog this privatisation line.

**The Hon. D.C. Wotton:** It is getting monotonous.

**Mr MAYES:** You will find out. The report states:

His comments echoed those of the Party's national President, Mr John Valder—

Obviously the honourable member wants to hear this report again—

who recently described privatisation as 'fiddling at the edges' of government spending and that welfare spending would have to be cut.

Watch the Liberal Party duck for cover when this comes up. John Valder is having a good dose of honesty, unlike his Federal colleagues and his colleagues here in South Australia, and has set a cat among the pigeons. There must be honesty about what is happening with privatisation. It is fiddling at the edges; it is window dressing; it is something on which they try to hang their hat in order to raise an issue. It is not an issue that will ever get off the ground because it does not have any economic rationale behind it. It does not achieve the sorts of things sought by the Leader of the Opposition; that is, saving large quantities of taxation or providing alternatives in efficient use of resources.

The *Advertiser* picked this up in its editorial of 24 July when it stated, under the heading 'Auctioning State assets':

Auctioning State assets. The Liberal Party, taking a lead from the Thatcher Government in Britain—

Look at what we are faced with if we get the Liberal Party in Government here—massive inflation and massive unemployment. We have been through that experience—has decided to embrace 'privatisation,' the selling of Government-owned enterprises and functions to private enterprise as a major policy.

It goes on:

But before the idea is embraced too eagerly, a hard examination is necessary of the gains and losses from selling State assets, of what Government alone can do for the community, and what functions are unnecessary or duplicated in the private sector. . . In a country with a widely-dispersed, socially and economically diverse population, and relatively limited resources, cost-effectiveness is

not the only criterion on which the transfer of State assets should be judged.

Before a Liberal Government moves to auction its assets, it will have to develop firm guidelines to ensure that a good philosophy does not produce inequitable or undesirable results.

That is the sort of background that we have here. I refer to the sale of State Roadliner, the Belair Nursery, the cake stall and the linen service. It will bring in \$50 million in savings. Anyone with any nose in the electorate will pick holes in that argument. In addition, another Liberal Party figure spoke at the Melbourne University Liberal Club and his comments were reported under the heading 'Privatisation Debate Rolls On'. Senator Short addressed that gathering and conceded that privatisation might lead to some short-term unemployment. I want to pick up that theme because it is something that the Leader of the Opposition commented about last night in this debate. Last night we heard from the Leader of the Opposition statements guaranteeing employment.

He will sell off Government utilities but is guaranteeing everyone employment. I am talking about records—this is the oldest record because this is the Tonkin Government philosophy. We have already been through this exercise. We have seen people sitting idly in depots after work was put out to private contractors—work that they were employed to undertake. Those people were underemployed while on the Government's payroll. They were doing no useful work and sat whittling away their day while being encouraged to retire, resign or get out of the work force.

Where is the efficiency? Where is the economic gain in that? We have two work forces employed to do the one job. I will leave that question to be answered, because it has not yet been answered. The Tonkin Government did not answer that question and we found mass waste and inefficiency as a consequence of those decisions—we guarantee the work force their jobs and yet we let out to private contractors the work that those same employees would have performed.

**Mr Baker:** Because it was cheaper.

**Mr MAYES:** That is also a question that is open to debate. I am, for the sake of the honourable member for Mitcham, picking up the point that the Leader made last night. In fact, we will have a duplication, a doubling of costs—any person can work out that that will occur. It is an important point to consider because the philosophy put forward by Senator Short is obviously that you do not guarantee the work force job security, that you suddenly dismiss, retrench or say, 'Don't come Monday', because that is the way to gain economies of scale, or to gain economies from the relocation to private enterprise of those particular utilities or the functions that they perform. We find the analysis again (and I suppose Senator Short has a case of Valderism) put forward on the basis of no guarantees of employment because public employees can be dismissed or removed from their positions in order to make immediate cost savings.

The philosophy put forward by the Leader of the Opposition last night would result in the maintaining of one workforce, on one hand in a public utility, and another work force, on the other hand, so that they would be working on one job thus duplicating and doubling costs. I will look at the experience of the Tonkin Government, in which the Leader of the Opposition was a Minister, and reflect on what occurred.

What experience did we gain as a community from the policies and directions taken by that Government with regard to privatisation and, in particular, job security? The shadow Minister for Education yesterday said that there were no retrenchments, no dismissals, and that everyone was guaranteed their position. I have direct information that contradicts that statement. In fact, what happened? For example,

let us consider school assistants who suffered a 4 per cent real cut in hours. There were school assistants who were offered part time employment in each of two schools. Mostly, the school assistants were women who were forced into a situation, if they did not have transport, where they had to resign from one position or the other. In effect, a subtle form—although not too subtle—of retrenchment of those women, and in particular of those school assistants.

That was the way in which retrenchments were achieved within the public sector. Then there was the infamous clause 13 (3)—and I am sorry that the former Minister of Education, the member for Mount Gambier, is not here to enjoy these comments, as he was the one responsible for the cuts to school assistants' hours, and to teachers' hours, as well, which occurred during the time of the Tonkin Government. So there were retrenchments, disguised, but retrenchments occurred in the school assistants' area, as most members would be aware, because most schools had cuts in one form or another to their schools assistants' hours—whether the maintenance gardener or the administrative person in the school. Those people were forced into a situation where they had no alternative but to leave their employment because they did not have the transport or facilities to move from one site to another.

If we consider what happened during the period of the Tonkin Government, in which the Leader of the Opposition was a Minister, we look at the experiences that we went through because of the philosophies being followed by that Government. We have been through this old, tired, worn-out privatisation argument. In the 80-81 period, the time of the first major Tonkin budget, there was a cut of \$22 million in expenditure by Government departments.

We had a cut of over 3 000 jobs in the public sector from 1979. We had cuts in family day care funding—an area that we regarded as being desperately needy. We had cuts in staffing in the national parks and in school assistants hours and we had cuts in the capital works expenditure. All of those things affecting the health and welfare of our community were previously put forward last night by the Leader of the Opposition as things that would not be touched.

Those people who were around during the Tonkin Government experience heard all of these rhetorical, hollow statements from the Government, saying that nothing would be touched and everything would be fine and good. We had growth in use of the hospital system: about 6 per cent growth in the Royal Adelaide Hospital and about 4½ per cent cut in the staff—effectively about a 10 per cent increase in demand in the RAH. When I was out campaigning prior to the last election not a day would pass without there being a complaint about the waiting periods and delays incurred in the RAH.

We are faced with what the Tonkin Government did in its period of office. It brought in cuts and forced retrenchments; it used regulation 13 (3) of the School Assistants Award to force people out of their employment. The community ought to be aware of what the Leader of the Opposition says because it has all been said before. It was said by the Tonkin Government, which promised that no-one would be affected. I recall the then Minister of Education assuring us of that, yet people were receiving notices about their change of employment, forcing them to leave their jobs on the very day on which we were talking to him. I recall that explicitly.

All of that led to a major deterioration in the quality of services and facilities in the community of South Australia. That puts the community of South Australia on notice about what a Liberal Government would do if it was returned to office. If we look at the philosophies that follow in the privatisation debate, it obviously has not been developed; it has no meat; it is shallow; it is a hollow promise. The

Liberal Party is basically casting around for issues on which to hang and build up for an election. This is one issue that the community of South Australia will judge as being hollow and shallow.

**Mr Baker:** What are you perspiring for?

**Mr MAYES:** I am not perspiring. I have been out in your electorate, which you have never been into, door-knocking. They do not even know who you are. They know who I am.

*Mr Baker interjecting:*

**Mr MAYES:** Your old electorate, my friend. They would not know who you were.

**Mr Baker:** They do not need to, do they?

**Mr MAYES:** That is a fair indictment of yourself. You are their member. You faced an election in that area.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! Will the member for Unley resume his speech and the member for Mitcham please maintain his silence?

**Mr MAYES:** Thank you. I turn finally to some comments regarding the letter that I referred to yesterday during Question Time. A number of local businesses had received a letter from the Leader of the Opposition, outlining some pretty outrageous comments and setting out a claim and a demand for funds to the Liberal Party campaign. He specifically highlighted the seats of Unley, Hayward and Todd as a focus for campaign funding. I refer to page 2 of the letter, which was handed to me by one of the local Unley business people.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr MAYES:** He was not too impressed with it. Business people who have contacted me with regard to this letter are not too impressed with the style or the approach that has been made to them. It is very patronising and treats them in a very juvenile way, which probably reflects the attitude that the Leader has towards some of these business people. At page 2, he denigrates the Premier and attacks the Government's record:

That's why he sells out to union officials and doesn't understand small business... why Mr Bannon has opposed policies we have announced to ensure our wage setting tribunals are far more attuned to the effects of their decisions upon business confidence, and to allow employers and employees to enter into voluntary contracts covering all aspects of employment.

That is very interesting, because the member for Mitcham was singing out praise for reduced youth wages as a panacea to bring increased employment.

**Mr Baker:** Get it right.

**Mr MAYES:** It is on the record. I have got it, as a matter of fact. We listened to members on the other side who initially started singing out for reduced wages in the youth area to create jobs.

I recall that during one debate I brought in some facts that had been collected in France, Canada and America, which indicated that over the period 1970 to 1983 the reduction in youth wages—and there has been a relative drop in youth wages compared with adult wages—had not brought about the growth in youth employment that people of a more conservative economic strain had been heralding. We find that this phraseology—gobbledygook as it is—underlying the thread of this is that youth wages are to be reduced. There is no question about that.

That means voluntary contracts, and that means that people will be able to negotiate their own contracts. We will have a breakdown of the award structure and what would obviously be a depreciation of the youth wage structure in this State. It is a subtle attempt to undermine what has been so hard and well fought for by those who have been involved in industrial tribunals over the years—those people who have struggled to maintain what they see as a real wage.

This would be an attempt to undermine the structure of that youth wage. To anyone who is experienced in the industrial area the wording is quite clear. It is a subtle attempt to undermine what I see as being the fabric of wage fixation in this State. Our excellent industrial record in this State is the envy of other States of Australia. This form of backdoor attack on the Industrial Commission, which is what it is and what it represents—an attack on the wage fixing tribunal—is to be deplored and condemned. The Leader of the Opposition, referring to Mr Bannon as Premier, further asks why he stopped the deregulation program established by the Liberals.

The Premier commented yesterday, in answer to a question I raised regarding this letter, that we should reflect on what happened under the deregulation program of the Tonkin Government. He was quite right, because senior public servants have told me that it became a joke: one received a request, referred it to the deregulation unit, and it just disappeared.

This Government has taken active steps to enjoy and look forward to deregulating many areas. As a member of Parliament I concede that there are areas that need to be rationalised. There needs to be a serious review of regulations. As members of Parliament we all come into contact and have been frustrated by certain regulations and, to some degree, the bureaucracy we face in overcoming problems. However, this Government is attacking that problem in an active way—not pushing it aside or putting it into a committee like the Liberal Government did, so that it would disappear. The letter also asks why he has refused to give relief to small business from soaring rates of land tax.

The first letter I received was dated 9 August, the very day on which the Premier announced those tax reliefs, particularly to small business. Between 76 000 and 100 000 people will not have to pay land tax in 1985-86, so the Leader of the Opposition is peddling untruths. In the previous letter to which I referred, dated 9 August, which was sent to one of my local business people, he continued to peddle that philosophy—a deliberate untruth.

In summary, we ought to very clearly examine the philosophies put forward by the Liberal Opposition in relation to privatisation and selling off the State's assets. I am sure that the South Australian public, as it has done in the past, will assess this as being a sham and a con and not worth the paper it is written on.

I want to make one final comment about a matter that has been referred to by the Opposition time and time again. It is hypocritical of members opposite to refer to problems that taxpayers and ETSA consumers have faced due to rising charges, because in July 1980 ETSA tariffs were increased by 12.5 per cent; in July 1981, by 19.8 per cent; and in May 1982, by 16 per cent, during which time the former Liberal Government was in office. During the present Government's period of office there has been a 36 per cent increase, although the rate will drop by 2 per cent for the next ETSA rating period.

Under the former Government for a similar period a 48 per cent increase was enforced and inflicted on the residents of this State. So, I say to members opposite that they should stop the hypocrisy. Let us have a bit of honesty about what happened during the term of the Tonkin Government. We will find out how the public assesses what is being done to assist the community as a whole. I am pleased to support the motion.

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** I, too, support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. In so doing I convey my condolences to the families of those former members who



have passed on. I also wish those members who are going to voluntarily retire at the next election the best of luck for the future. This includes the members for Price, Adelaide and Victoria and the member for Whyalla, who came into Parliament at the same time as I did. The member for Victoria has been the father of the House, and I have enjoyed his friendship for a long time. I hope that those members enjoy a long and healthy retirement.

I have listened at length to the member for Unley's speech which was what could only be described as a whingeing contribution. He peddled deliberate untruths, misrepresentation and absolute nonsense, which only a socialist like him could produce. If ever there was a load of nonsense, it was what we have listened to tonight. A few days ago we had the Deputy Premier talking about yesterday's men. If ever there was an arrogant statement, that was it. One could not help suddenly coming to the conclusion that the members opposite really are a Dad's Army. Look at them: if you lined them up man for man and looked at them (I do not want to go into the personalities of why many members are not here) one would come to the conclusion that they really are like Dad's Army.

I would classify the member for Peake, who is trying to interject, as Captain Mainwaring of Dad's Army. He can interject as much as he likes, but really some members opposite have been performing like the members of Dad's Army. I refer to this line that they have latched onto: to attack the privatisation policy of the Liberal Party. It is really pathetic to think that a so-called responsible Government is attempting to mislead and misinform the public. What they have not been saying is that with the privatisation policy goes the policy of deregulation, which is an integral part of that privatisation policy. No-one can be satisfied with the manner in which people have been fooled around with unnecessary Acts of Parliament, regulations, licences and proclamations.

**Mr Mayes:** Are you going to sell off the Department of Agriculture?

**Mr GUNN:** That really does display to the people of this State the sort of nonsense that the honourable member peddles.

**Mr Mayes:** That is privatisation.

**Mr GUNN:** And the honourable member really is a hypocrite, because the Minister of Health has been privatising a number of things in the past few days, and the Minister of Agriculture has got himself into real strife trying to privatise Sims farm. We are talking about sensible privatisation. The question which has to be asked is: will it be in the interests of the people of this State? We know that the honourable member does not know what he is talking about and is trying to hang his hat on the United Kingdom situation. I am pleased that the honourable member raised that situation, because in the last day or two I received some most interesting information from a friend in the House of Commons, and in another debate I will give that information to the House.

The publication in question goes into great detail about how the Secretary of the Trade Union Congress has deliberately set out to tell untruths and misrepresent that policy. The member for Unley is on the same band-wagon. We know that he was involved with the Public Service Association. He caused the first strike of school teachers in this State. He misrepresented the policy of the previous Government, but we have heard his last Address in Reply speech in this House; he is a temporary member and is on his way out—farewell! If there was ever a member who was displaying all the characteristics of a fellow on the skids, it is the member for Unley. He is showing all the signs.

**Mr Mayes:** Get back to privatisation; you might know something about that. You don't know much about Unley.

**Mr GUNN:** I have certain contacts in Unley, and they tell me that the honourable member has been skating on thin ice. But let me go to more important things than the member for Unley, because the honourable member is not going to be with us much longer, and therefore we need not worry about him. There are also one or two other members on the backbench who will not be with us.

*Mr Plunkett interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** I am telling the member for Peake a fact. I know that it is difficult for him to comprehend, but it is a fact. If Mr Scott continues to undermine the Premier, it may effect the District of Peake, and the honourable member may be on the skids. I understand that he has approximately a 10 per cent margin in his electorate. We have not heard from the member for Peake in this key debate, so I look forward to his enlightened contribution, which I hope will be in the relatively near future if he is permitted to say a few words.

During the attack on the Opposition frontbench a few days ago, the now Deputy Premier referred to yesterday's men. A few weeks ago the Minister of Water Resources had the audacity to write to my constituents at Ceduna and tell them that the Government was not in a financial situation to supply them with a water scheme because there would be no social benefits by spending the amount of money in question and there would be little or no economic benefit. Of course, both statements were absolute nonsense, because here is a Minister who has presided over one of the greatest white elephants and fiascos that I can remember in my time as a member of Parliament. It would have to run a close second to the frozen food factory and to the proposal for a dial-a-bus service in this State which were both well known Labor fiascos.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** What about the Liberal Movement?

**Mr GUNN:** That has passed into oblivion and has finished. I am talking about a public works program. I recognise that any Government does not have the amount of money that the public would like it to spend in meeting even the reasonable demands of the community and that it is a matter of setting priorities. Anyone who does not recognise that fact is not prepared to face reality.

In dealing with those priorities, one has to ensure that the programs in which the Government is involved have a clear advantage for the people of this State and that they do not entail wasteful or unnecessary expenditure. In my view, it is an absolute disgrace that the Government can spend up to \$8 million on a fool of a swimming centre at North Adelaide on land that they do not even own, but people like my constituents are discriminated against and told, 'You cannot have a water scheme.' Hawker is one of the gateways to the Flinders Ranges, which is one of the prime tourist areas of this State, and that town has one of the worst quality water supplies one would find anywhere.

There is no money to do anything about that or to make a real effort to find alternative supplies and pipe them into the town. However, the Government can continue to waste the taxpayers' money on the aquatic centre. I do not know whether it even holds water at this stage. The Government spent \$700 000 to shift tennis courts at Port Augusta because it happens to be in the electorate of the Minister of Transport. The Auditor-General has had a fair bit to say about that matter.

**Mr Mayes:** Fair go!

**Mr GUNN:** I am asking for a fair go. If the honourable member, who is a member of the Public Works Committee, thinks that the aquatic centre is a good investment for the people of this State and that the taxpayers are getting good return for their money, he is a bigger fool than I thought he was. No wonder he does not understand privatisation!

The member for Unley is telling me that the taxpayers of this State are getting a good return on their investment in that fool of a thing at North Adelaide, whilst people in isolated communities such as those I represent are being denied the opportunity of a reasonable supply of water.

We have one of the fastest growing towns in South Australia at Ceduna and a very large tourist and recreation area at Smoky Bay, yet the Government does not have the money to replace the water mains up our way at a cost of \$750 000. However this fool of a Minister goes on wasting the taxpayers' money. I challenge the member for Unley to debate those issues with me on any platform he likes. Blind Freddy knows that we must deal with bread and butter issues first.

The Minister wanted to get a nice park at the North Adelaide swimming centre so that he could beat his chest and say that he had built it, even though it does not hold water. I understand that the roof is no good at the moment. That is the sort of Government involvement the member for Unley is advocating. I am sure that people in Unley would be interested in his economic management if that is the sort of program he approves. No wonder he is on his way! He only has a few weeks left in this House. Goodbye to the member for Unley!

*The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** Yes, I would like to take him where I was on Monday week at Charilla where a group of people are wanting water west of Ceduna. They were horrified when made aware of the Government's priorities. The honourable member should tell them about the swimming pool at North Adelaide that will cost \$8 million before those people can have \$1 million for a water supply. There is no water for Denial Bay or Penong and no adequate supply for Koonibba. Tell us why we should have this fool of a swimming pool before they can have a water pipeline. I look forward to the occasion.

I refer to a number of other matters in relation to my electorate. I represent basically a rural electorate. Things are not very rosy in the agricultural scene presently. The outlook is not as good as it has been in the past and the unfortunate dry spell just concluded has created a situation where the grain harvest will not be as good. The real problem has been in relation to costs.

*Mr Plunkett interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** I was elected to this Parliament to represent the people living in my electorate and, if the honourable member does not recognise that, I feel sorry for him. The problem these people are facing is the high cost of fuel. The fuel parity program is completely out of control. People are no longer prepared to accept those high charges inflicted upon them. One only has to look at the newspaper to see articles on the high cost of fuel. On Wednesday 22 May the *Transcontinental*, as I am sure the Minister of Transport would be aware, stated that petrol was up to 60 cents a litre.

They are the costs that people are being forced to pay for a basic essential item such as petrol. People employed in primary industry, the fishing industry and the mining industry use huge amounts of diesel fuel. They fully appreciate what the world parity pricing policy has done. They also appreciate how the Government removed the freight subsidy on fuel. They have not forgiven Mr Hawke for that course of action; not only was it unnecessary, it was unfair.

I say to the member for Peake and his colleagues that, if the Labor Party thinks that it is going to get away with introducing a capital gains tax to tax the hard earned assets of people in primary industry, they have another thing coming. Make no mistake about that. I am not making idle threats. You will see the greatest disruption by rural people that has ever been seen in this country. We have already

seen the disgraceful actions of Governments maintaining succession and death duties in this country for years and the effect that that has on viable agricultural units and small businesses. They are no longer prepared to accept it. Make no mistake about what will happen to the Government if it thinks it can get away with plundering those hard earned assets and turning those properties into uneconomic units. There will be a violent reaction. The fighting fund organised by Mr McLaughlin will be used effectively. Mr Hawke and his Federal Labor colleagues in marginal electorates will pay the price. I am telling members opposite, those enthusiastic supporters of capital taxes, what the end result will be.

In my district I have seen many cases of unnecessary hardship caused by these policies. For a considerable time I have been most concerned about over regulation of the transport system of this State. On numerous occasions I have brought to the attention of the House the problems that my constituents have in carting livestock, particularly from the North. I sincerely hope that the new Minister of Transport does better than he did in a recent letter I received from him in relation to some of my constituents who were having problems with overloading. The time is long overdue for commonsense to be applied. The inspectors involved should be counselled by the head of their section and have it brought home to them that it is not in the interests of the people of this State for inspectors to continue their harassment.

There is another controversy raging in my district. In fact, I have been overwhelmed by the number of people complaining to me that, because of an outdated regulation, they are not allowed to board Stateliner buses which in many cases go right past their doors at places such as Whyte Yarcowie, Burra, and so on. This regulation has been in place since the days of the old South Australian Railways. I will never agree to that concept because I believe in an open policy. The Stateliner bus service would be second to none compared to anywhere in the world in relation to the service it provides to its clients. My constituents, who have children attending schools, and others have been told that they cannot use the Stateliner service.

I draw to the attention of the House the foolishness of this. People do not want to be dumped at the railway station at Keswick and, in fact, the buses are quicker, cheaper and more comfortable. If people are dumped at Keswick, they must then get a taxi to the city or wherever they are going. I hope that the new Minister of Transport will address this matter in the very near future. I have received a tremendous amount of correspondence and contact from my constituents as far away as Yunta in relation to this matter. I look forward to the Minister addressing this problem in the near future.

I now turn to problems in relation to schools, school libraries and preschools. There is an urgent need to build a new preschool at Leigh Creek, and I hope that it will be part of a community complex. The existing facility is completely overtaxed. It is situated on the school campus and those buildings could be put to very good use by the Leigh Creek school. As far as I am aware, those people have been making well researched representations to the Government but they have not yet been advised about when the matter will be rectified. I thought that all problems would be solved quite rapidly when the Parliament eventually passed the legislation providing for the new organisation to deal with preschool children and the problems in that area, but I am yet to see the magic wand waved across South Australia to rectify the problems.

I have been approached by the Orroroo school, the Jamestown High School and the Quorn Area School in relation to school community libraries. I want to cite a letter that I

received at my Peterborough office dealing with the Orroroo school, as follows:

I refer to your correspondence of 26 April 1985 . . . but received on 12 June 1985, concerning the delay to the proposed extension to the Orroroo school community library and upgrading of the administration area. Unfortunately, the project has now been delayed indefinitely as it has not been possible for it to hold a place on the revised major works program. This information has already been forwarded to the school by the Director. . .

However, part of the project was the provision of a gymnasium under the terms of the capital works assistance scheme and I am pleased to advise that this proposal will continue to be supported.

The school was promised those facilities last year, and the district council set aside money, but unfortunately nothing has happened. Again, I refer to the interesting Auditor-General's Report. The Government seems to have money *ad infinitum* to fund projects such as the Aquatic Centre, to move the tennis courts, at Port Augusta, \$3.5 million to repair the tank trap at the Festival Theatre plaza, and so it goes on. There is no shortage of money: it just rolls on.

However, obtaining a few dollars for some of my isolated communities (and the member for Mallee would have the same experience) for these very worthwhile projects is like getting hold of the crown jewels. It is about time the Government got its priorities right. That is why it is so important that Ministers should be fully aware of what is going on. I am horrified when from time to time I read in the newspapers about some of the organisations and programs funded by the State Government.

**Mr Lewis:** It is the greedy, not the needy.

**Mr GUNN:** Yes. I am horrified by the priorities. People have no idea of the problems of isolation in small country towns. There are problems relating to school bus routes, but the Government is prepared to save a few dollars a day by cutting a school bus service in mid term. Yet the Ministers are engaged in crazy public spending programs, and that horrifies me. The member for Unley should address himself to that matter: does he think it is good to waste the taxpayers' money? He should think of the effects in some of my communities.

What about the parents who have to send their children to private schools in Adelaide because they have no alternative? In Queensland people receive considerable assistance from the Government, but here they receive only \$500 from the State Government and a maximum of \$1 500 from the Commonwealth Government, although the costs involved are considerable, particularly if the children have to board. It is bad enough if there is one child in the family, but it is worse if there are two or three. Extra funds are long overdue. We spend more than \$700 million on education in this State, and it is not too much to ask that a little more be spent to assist those isolated communities so that the children can obtain an adequate secondary education. Many of the children must be taught by their mothers or by correspondence. Many people would not be prepared to teach their children, let alone face the very severe financial penalty for living in these isolated communities.

I believe that the time is long overdue when the Government ought to look closely at some of these irrational programs in which it is presently involved. There must be careful consideration of priorities. Certainly, I have problems in the preschool area where preschools cannot get an extra session a week. I was at one preschool the other day where a person is conducting a play group on a voluntary basis. Excellent facilities are available at Booleroo Centre and they want an extra session a week, but it is impossible.

**The Hon. Michael Wilson:** It has not been helped by the Federal cutbacks.

**Mr GUNN:** No. We were told that this would be the Government that would look after the elderly and the young. This is how Mr Hawke has looked after them—by cutting

back a few million dollars from that program. The preschool has excellent facilities and it is a crying shame they cannot be put to their maximum use, when they have enthusiastic parents.

**Mr Lewis:** That's why Murphy's High Court trial—

**Mr GUNN:** I will allow the honourable member to comment on that. I could comment on that matter at length. I refer to the situation at Streaky Bay and at Port Kenny, and I could talk about that at length. However, I want to talk at length about a matter that has caused me concern, and I am pleased that the Minister is now in the House. I refer to the problem of dealing with bushfires in national parks and on Government land.

Indeed, the time is long overdue for appropriate action to be taken. I cannot understand why the Government has not amended the Country Fires Services Act to allow CFS officers the power to take control of fires in national parks. Not only should they have the authority to control fires in national parks, but they should have the authority to give directions to national parks officers to clear those parks and to clear Government and other land. The Deputy Leader has spoken about the Hills face zone and the member for Todd has spoken about this problem on many occasions.

I say to the Minister that if he is not willing to take action then we will test him in the next few weeks, because I intend to introduce legislation to put those suggestions into effect. I know that people in the National Parks and Wildlife Service and their friends will get on their pushbikes and race around the community like roosters with their heads chopped off, but these are the facts. They have had their opportunities, and they have failed miserably. Indeed, I could relate stories about the actions of some of these people in some of the fires in my electorate in recent years.

It is deplorable that volunteers have had to be subjected to such behaviour. The National Parks and Wildlife Service has a valuable role to play in South Australia and there are many dedicated and hard working people involved. I am not against national parks, but I am certainly against poor management. I am one person who really could lay into a few people because the treatment I received from a former Director of Country Fire Services and other officers in the National Parks and Wildlife Service was deplorable; it should not be tolerated in a civilised community. Perhaps I should not go into that tonight but I advise the House that anyone with knowledge of this area would agree with me. The member for Mallee has had problems in his electorate. I have had problems in my electorate, and there have been other problems on Eyre Peninsula. Last year when I was in America I had a brief look at the problem of the control of fires in the United States. We need to have control of burning, otherwise large areas will be burnt off at the worst possible time.

In regard to the road funding program in my electorate, I have been concerned in recent times that a number of councils believe they may have their road funding reduced. If that happens they will have to start retrenching staff. The District Council of Mount Remarkable has already put off two people, I understand, which is most unfortunate, but it encountered a reduction in its funding. I have been told that the council was chastised by the new Minister.

These people received a letter saying that they had not increased their rates sufficiently. This is a high taxing Government and wants to rip the money in and then spend it on swimming pools that will not hold water. However, the rest of the community does not want to be involved in that sort of nonsense. Why should this group of people who are managing their area quite effectively have to put up with this impertinent action by the new Minister? She is obviously going to flex her muscles early in her time as Minister because she probably realises that she is going to enjoy the

fruits of office for only a few weeks. Another problem in the Flinders Ranges that we have recently had brought to our attention—

*Mr Plunkett interjecting:*

**MR GUNN:** I did not quite catch the honourable member's interjection, but it was obviously not worth a reply. I have received a considerable amount of comment from constituents of mine concerning the Flinders Ranges management plan. I believe that the best people to manage the Flinders Ranges are basically those councils and people who are living in them. They do not want instant experts and academics in the Department sitting in judgment on how they should operate their affairs. Meetings have been held, and certain Government departments seem keen on continually holding meetings.

All these people want is to be left to their own devices. They do not need unnecessary meetings. They will make the right decisions. They are the ones who must live in the area. It is very well for people in Adelaide who are not trying to make a living to want to sit in judgment upon them and enforce their views unnecessarily on these people. I sincerely hope that the views of the Mt Remarkable Council and those of my constituents in that area will be taken into consideration before any final decision is made.

If the Government has plans to move in this area without taking into account the views of those people, I can assure it that it is in for a fight or two, because those people will not idly sit by. I can assure the House that, as their local member, I intend to do everything possible to ensure that their views are not only given proper consideration but also are put into law.

Having been in this House for many years, and having had the opportunity of seeing many Government departments shifted into new office accommodation around the State—I am not against good office accommodation—I think that the conditions that the members have to operate under, particularly on the second floor, are deplorable. When one looks at Parliaments around Australia and at the sort of accommodation in some of these new Government buildings or the facilities that private enterprise use, one is quite horrified as are people when they come to Parliament House and see these poky offices on the second floor. I am not advocating that these offices should be palatial or that they should be the best, but I believe that they should be reasonable. If private enterprise was to house its staff in the sort of accommodation that exists on the second floor, it would be in trouble with the Department of Labour and Industry.

I would hate to think what would happen if a fire started up there, particularly in that poky back corridor. The time has come for the Government and Parliament to address this matter and take some action to upgrade and improve the facilities. More space should be provided and it should be of a better standard. At least a member who must have an electoral secretary in Parliament House should have a reasonable area for the secretary to work in, and the members should at least be able to have small offices in which they can interview people and do their work as members of Parliament. I consider the current arrangements to be grossly unsatisfactory and well below what the public would expect their elected representatives to have. If one goes around the city one sees some of the new office accommodation. I sometimes go down to the office of the Registrar of Motor Vehicles. It is a beautiful building, and I am not objecting to that.

One can go to the big new PBD building and a number of other Government departments that have been upgraded. I do not object to that, although some are a bit overdone. It is not unreasonable that something should be done in this building. I am not sure what the ultimate is, but in the

long run some sort of building should be built out the back of it. There ought to be a new building to house the members and staff so that some of those dog boxes upstairs can be improved.

When one compares the facilities that members of Parliament and the Opposition have in New South Wales with those here, it is hard to believe that we are in the same sort of system. I know that it is not popular to spend money on politicians, but people expect members of Parliament to be well informed, to be able to move rapidly around the State, to be able to provide them with information, to be able to make objective comments on legislation and to be able to interview constituents and others. Therefore, it is not unreasonable that they have reasonable accommodation and facilities.

It is crazy that there is not a telex machine in this building. Some of us have to book lots of accommodation around the State, and nearly every motel has a telex. It is absolutely crazy that we cannot contact the media or Ministers. The most efficient way of doing it is with a telex. It is absolutely deplorable that there is not a telex at Parliament House for the use of members and for the public to contact members. I sometimes receive telexes as they have come through the Premier's Department. An average, medium-sized business would be amazed that people have not this sort of facility in Parliament House. It is hard enough to get two telephone lines in one's office. All the Government departments have Commandomatic push-button telephones, no matter where—the long-suffering taxpayers pay for them—but if one tries to get one for a member of Parliament it is not on. We are the people who vote and appropriate the budget, and it is deplorable.

*Mr Hamilton interjecting:*

**MR GUNN:** I am not aware of the honourable member's position, but it is time that some bipartisan approach was taken to these matters, some commonsense applied and the problems resolved once and for all. One of the things that has been brought to my attention in my electorate in recent times has been the effects of the assets test on people. From my doorknocking and from people who have come to my electoral offices, I have found that they have been absolutely devastated by the effects of the assets test. I do not know who was the architect of this so-called enlightened piece of legislation, but what it has done to elderly people in my electorate and in other parts of the State is horrific.

About three months ago I read in the *Port Lincoln Times*—and I am sure that the member for Flinders would have read it—an article that referred to a quadriplegic who was 'robbed of his pension'. I happened to know the case, as did the member for Flinders. It is deplorable that cases of that nature occur and that people should be placed in that position.

I had a constituent who lost nearly all his pension: the sort of unrealistic valuations that have been put on some of these properties is mind boggling. The only good thing that has come out of the assets test is that thousands more people will vote for the Liberal Party. I make no apology for saying that, because it is a fact. People are enraged about this sort of attitude. Members write letters for them and contact the department. The number of contacts by concerned people, members of Parliament and others representing these people must have had a devastating effect on the efficiency of the department. It is absolutely disgraceful that the department should suddenly have had inflicted on it this sort of unnecessary action against the elderly people of this State.

If this is the best way that the Labor Party can cut back on costs, it proves once and for all that they are certainly not economic managers and that they have no understanding of how to allocate available finances properly. I do not

know how much it cost to hold that tax summit in Canberra, but one would not describe that as a roaring success. It must have cost a lot of money.

However, when we are considering taking away from people existing benefits, a more careful analysis of the effects should be made, because some of the people who came to see me in my office at Peterborough have been quite devastated by the Government's action.

I have referred at length to problems with water in schools. I have been very concerned for some time about the effects of the Adelaide plus 10 per cent charge on electricity. People who live in isolated communities and who receive little from the State Government have, for the honour of living in country areas, had to pay Adelaide plus 10 per cent. I call on the Government during the current budget to take the necessary action to repeal this provision.

I am pleased to say that my Leader has committed the Liberal Party to that course of action, which is long overdue. There is no necessity for that system these days. The Government appears to be able to juggle the books in relation to the Electricity Trust to provide very minimal relief in other areas, but it cannot put charging on a fair and reasonable basis.

Another action that is long overdue is extending the electricity grid system from Hawker to Wilpena and on to Blinman. I am disappointed that the Labor Party Caucus committee went up into those areas and attempted to make good fellows of themselves, but obviously have not honoured the promise. I had a question on notice in the last session and again in this session and, for some unknown reason, the Government cannot see its way clear to answer it. I have even had to put another question, asking when my question will be answered. I do not know whether the Minister of Transport is embarrassed.

I understood that the member for Mawson was one of those who made that trip. She rapidly went to press, and of course let the cat out of the bag. I made some inquiries and found out that this commitment had been made, but I and my constituents want to see it honoured. When the Minister, obviously with the support of the total Cabinet, makes these statements people want to see them honoured. I have always found it unwise to go around the country making outlandish promises if one has not the goods to support them.

On this occasion, perhaps they got a little carried away with enthusiasm, but this project is long overdue. The only reason it has been delayed is that people have not had the courage to take on a few of those irresponsible conservationists and others who do not live in the area and who have electricity connected to their homes and properties, but who want to prevent my constituents from receiving the benefits.

I look forward to my question's being answered. The member for Mawson was in that group and I would like to know what action she has taken. She made a number of other promises to become familiar with problems in those areas. I have been telling honourable members about those problems for years.

The member for Mawson voted against my motion calling on the Government to provide this facility, yet at the very time it was on the Notice Paper up they went to Wilpena to make good fellows of themselves. I am pleased to see that the member for Mawson is now back in her seat, because she went to press—

*Ms Lenehan:* What have I done?

**Mr GUNN:** The honourable member has made promises to put electricity through to Wilpena.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** It is all right for the member for Peake. I refer to him as a member of Dad's Army—Captain Mainwaring. The promise was made. Incidentally, the Clerk of the council is pretty good on this subject. We want to see the promise honoured. I want to know why my Question on Notice has not been answered. I know that it has been there for a long time.

*Ms Lenehan interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** The honourable member is great on press statements, but when it comes to anything of substance she is lacking in providing the goods. For a long time I have been fully aware that, although the Minister of Transport means well and likes to talk to people, and so on, he does not provide a great deal of action. However, I shall not let him forget this matter, and I will raise the matter as much as possible. The best way that he can dispose of this matter is to ensure that appropriate funds are provided. The current cost of funding these diesel generating plants is astronomical, and the money used to provide alternative power supplies could be recouped in a few years. I am disappointed that the Labor Party has made these promises but has not honoured them.

*Mr Plunkett interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** I have not run out of material; there is no worry about that. The honourable member ought to know that for those who have been in this place for a long time it is not difficult to utilise the time available to make a contribution. The member for Peake may not be able to do that, but I have other matters to which I want to refer briefly. I appreciate this opportunity to participate in this debate, which enables me to bring to the attention of the House a number matters of concern pertaining to my electorate. I would be failing in my obligation as a member if I did not raise these matters.

*Mr Plunkett interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** The member for Peake can make all the cheap interjections that he likes, but I just want to point out that I am concerned about the discrimination that occurs in relation to country people. I aim to ensure that wherever possible country people are treated fairly. To not extend water supplies to various rural areas cannot be justified. Why should the people of Hawker have to have a bad water supply? Why shouldn't some improvements be made at Terowie? Why should the people at Ceduna and those in the District Council of Murat Bay not have an adequate water supply? There is no justification for these inadequate water supplies.

Further, why should they pay extra for their power, and why should we have these problems with school buses and education facilities? I do not think it is reasonable, particularly when the Government can find money for other unnecessary projects. I have already referred to matters in relation to that, but this is particularly pertinent when the Government has had the benefit of raising massive amounts of money from the people of South Australia.

In recent times I have been concerned about some of the quite outrageous statements made by some of the people opposed to the Olympic Dam/Roxby Downs project, and by those people who are living at Alberrie Creek, which is in my electorate. I do not know what benefit they think their actions will achieve for the people of this State. They have made quite outrageous statements in relation to the water supply. I suppose they have gained some pleasure in writing letters attacking me—if that gives them pleasure, that is all right. I do not take a great deal of notice of those sorts of people, because no matter what facts one provides to rebut an argument, they are not prepared to accept them.

However, I want to point out that the Roxby Downs project will be of great benefit to the people of South

Australia and Australia. I do not intend to allow those people to sway me at all in my support for the project. All the tricks of the trade have been used to frustrate the people involved with the project. We have had claims in relation to the Aboriginal land rights, fears expressed about pollution, statements that the project will not be viable, assertions that large quantities of water will be taken from the Great Artesian Basin, and so it all goes on. It is all designed to frustrate and make it difficult for the people who want to develop this very large resource that we have.

In conclusion, I look forward to a few weeks time when the people are given an opportunity to elect an Olsen Government. If the performances of the members for Unley and for Hartley are a forerunner of the sort of defence that the Government is going to use and if the privatisation policy is going to be used as one of the election issues, I look forward to that. If the standard of the debate in which they have engaged is an indication of what we can expect to hear, it will be a one-sided race. There is no doubt in my mind what the result will be on polling day. Therefore, I look forward to the next State election, whenever it may be.

It concerns me that the Labor Party is attacking the policies of the Liberal Party. It would appear that it does not have any constructive alternative policies to put before the people of this State. It has no new innovations or programs. We have a swimming pool that does not hold water and matters of that nature, but there are no new initiatives which are going to be of benefit.

*Mr Plunkett interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** Yes, more taxes, but the public is no longer prepared to accept that philosophy. The sooner the election occurs, the better it will be for the people of this State. It will put the member for Unley and other members opposite out of their misery. They will be able to look for new endeavours in which to involve themselves. I hope that they have enjoyed their short time in the House and they will obviously—

**Mr Lewis:** Some of us certainly haven't.

**Mr GUNN:** No, it has been rather jarring.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** You have looked forward to every election we have had since 1970, haven't you?

**Mr GUNN:** I am still here.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Precisely.

**Mr GUNN:** I have had people tell me that I would not be returned here, but the Labor Party had to run two candidates against me at one stage. They performed all sorts of tricks, but they still did not work. The honourable member does not frighten me with remarks about me not enjoying elections. I enjoyed the 1979 election and I look forward to the next election.

*The Hon. D.J. Hopgood interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** The honourable member will have his opportunity on the election platform to defend before the people of this State the actions of his Government. I think he will have some difficulty. I do not think that I need to go down that track in an Address in Reply speech at this time of night, because there will be plenty of opportunity at the appropriate time for that. I support the motion for the Address in Reply. I hope that the Government will take some positive action on some of those matters which I have drawn to the attention of the House. There are many other matters which I could raise, and which I will raise in the near future.

*Mr Plunkett interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** For the benefit of the member for Peake, he and his colleagues could provide the necessary funds to build reasonable school facilities at Coober Pedy. The technical section at that school is deplorable. There is an urgent need for better facilities and buildings at that school, but the Government's priorities are such that it will divert those funds to other unnecessary areas of expenditure. I look forward to the budget debate and the Estimates Committee so that I can highlight those areas and bring them to the attention of the Ministers and their officers.

**Mr S.G. EVANS** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 11.30 p.m. the House adjourned to Thursday 15 August at 2 p.m.