

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 13 February 1986

The **SPEAKER** (Hon. J.P. Trainer) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1)

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make provision by Bill for defraying the salaries and other expenses of the Government of South Australia during the year ending 30 June 1987.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Augmentation of the EL 137 and EL 172C Water Supply Pressure Zones,
Hallett Cove School (Construction),
Port Lincoln Community College of Technical and Further Education (Establishment).
Ordered that reports be printed.

QUESTION TIME

BUILDERS LABOURERS FEDERATION

Mr OLSEN: Why is the Minister of Labour continuing to treat the Builders Labourers Federation with kid gloves when that union's activities are causing massive disruption and adding huge expense to a number of construction sites around Adelaide, including the ASER project? Construction work at the ASER project is now 15 weeks behind schedule as a result of continuing strike action by members of the BLF. The cost of the disruption amounts to \$850 000 a month in holding charges alone and the delay means it will cost the Government, and therefore taxpayers, more to lease the convention centre and the car park.

A further result of the BLF's chaotic behaviour is that a number of conventions pre-booked for early 1987 have been cancelled, now that the convention centre will be unable to open as scheduled for December this year. The loss in revenue to date of those conventions amounts to \$600 000. Further, no bookings are being accepted before March 1987. This seriously jeopardises South Australia's reputation as a reliable host for such functions. I also understand that groups arranging conventions for early 1987 are being discouraged from booking at the convention centre due to uncertainty over a completion date for the project.

The South Australian public became aware of the special relationship which exists between the State Government and the BLF during a television interview last week, in which no less a person than Mr Norm Gallagher revealed that he had instructed the South Australian branch of the BLF to work for the return of the Bannon Government because it had not taken deregistration proceedings against the BLF. He added, and I quote:

As far as I am concerned, a Government that does that needs our support and should get it.

Whilst these comments perhaps go some way to explaining the Minister's obvious reluctance to deal with the disruptive demands of the BLF, I ask him to inform the House when

the future of the State's economy and employment prospects might take precedence over his apparent loyalty to his rogue union colleagues.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The position is that this Government does not, and I in particular do not, handle the Builders Labourers Federation with kid gloves. I was rather amused to hear the Leader say that this Government was supported by and endorsed by Norm Gallagher. I did not read that article, but that may well have been the case. It is quite possible that if that was the case, and it was widely publicised, that may have been the reason that we did not win Hanson, because I do not believe that any endorsement by Norm Gallagher, with the greatest respect to the gentleman, would be terribly useful to us at the polls.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: He loves you!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Apparently so. I have not met him—I would be pleased to do so. As regards the BLF and this dispute, it is a very, very difficult dispute indeed, and one that has taken me and this Government a fair bit of effort to attempt to resolve.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: It's blackmail.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I beg your pardon?

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: It's blackmail of the State.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Who is blackmailing whom?

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: The BLF.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: What the BLF is doing is engaging in an industrial dispute, in my opinion outside the guidelines.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order, and it is not appropriate for the Minister to encourage interjections by responding to them.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank you very much, Mr Speaker, but I was brought up always to be polite, and I think it would have been rude not to have answered the member for Light; I was taught particularly to respond to my elders. As I said, the position is an extraordinarily difficult one, which has taken a great deal of time and effort. I suppose that, if we discount some of the nonsense and rhetoric that was contained in the question, the essential issue is the deregistration of the Builders Labourers Federation.

If the Leader had kept his question to that specific matter, he would have received a much briefer answer. The position is this: of course the State Government can enter into deregistration proceedings against the BLF in this State, and so can the Master Builders Association, incidentally. It is not only the Government that can enter into those proceedings. It is a decision that we could make, and it would not be a very difficult decision to make. We could take that action tomorrow. The problem that I have and that the Government has with that decision (as has the building industry in this State, which, incidentally has not requested us to do that) is what happens then. Looking back not too many years, the builders labourers in this State were deregistered from 1974 to 1976.

Mr Olsen: That is what they are looking for.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Leader interjects by saying that that is what they are looking for: if that was so, surely they should have written to us and asked for that action to be taken. However, they have not done so, and I am about to tell members why. If we knew precisely what would happen if the Builders Labourers Federation was deregistered, I am quite sure the Cabinet would give the matter very serious consideration. However, I can tell members (and I do not need to tell the builders) what would happen in this State. Contrary to what is occurring in the eastern States, the trade union movement in this State has

an official policy, through the Trades and Labor Council, of not doing the work which would not then be covered by a registered organisation, the Builders Labourers Federation.

The position is that we would have a situation similar to that which occurred between 1974 and 1976, where the builders labourers were outside any control by any commission; their membership increased during that time, as did their power and their rates of pay, because there was no control over them whatsoever. The difference in the eastern States is, of course, that the trade union movement takes a completely different view. That is the difference. As I have said, if this simple notion of initiating deregistration proceedings would solve the problem, of course the Government would have to give it very serious consideration.

However, I believe very strongly that at this stage it would exacerbate the problem, and not solve it, and through various other unions it may well increase and spread the problem to other unions, and that is something that we do not want, because there is an agreement between the Builders Labourers Federation and the Transport Workers Union that the Transport Workers Union will not deliver to any site that is not covered by the Builders Labourers Federation.

So, if the Builders Labourers Federation is deregistered, and banned from building sites (not that that would occur) there would be no delivery whatsoever to building sites. Would one then deregister the Transport Workers Union? If one attempted to do that, that would precipitate the industrial chaos that members opposite want. However, they will not get it from any action of this Government.

Before I sit down, let me talk for a moment about the industrial relations scene in this State compared to that in the other States, and the industrial relations policy of this Government compared to the industrial relations policy (if one can call it that) of members opposite. This State has the lowest level of industrial disputes by far in Australia. Our closest competitor is Victoria, and that State has five times the level of industrial disputes that we have. South Australia has somewhere in the order of 1 per cent of the industrial disputes in this country when we have about 9 per cent of the work force.

Let us make no mistake about the industrial relations record of this Government: it is superb, and we will keep it that way. However, that does not mean that there will be no industrial disputes from time to time, but means that there will be fewer industrial disputes in this State while this Government is in office. We aim to keep it that way despite the provocation of members opposite.

Let us look at the industrial relations record of members opposite. At a meeting in Canberra (or was it Melbourne?) a couple of days ago the Business Council of Australia talked to Mr Howard and his colleagues. The newspapers carried what that council told them. It said that if that is the Opposition's policy on industrial relations it will be many years before it is even capable of being considered an alternative government. Because of some of the garbage they are spouting and some of the mid-'50s rhetoric from this bunch of reactionary hacks (and members opposite support their friends in Canberra) the Business Council told them this very clearly. For those who do not know, the Business Council of Australia represents the top 60 companies in Australia—big powerful business. That council in effect told members opposite and their federal colleagues that they were a joke. The Leader of the Opposition led his forces—and what is left of them is here—to glorious defeat at the last State election. He must not come in here telling us how to run industrial relations in this State.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

ADOPTED CHILDREN'S CONTACT REGISTER

Mr ROBERTSON: I direct my question to the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Community Welfare in another place. Is it intended to include on the agenda of the Community Welfare Ministers' conference to be held in Adelaide in April the issue of a national contact register for adopted children? If the issue of a national contact register is not on the agenda, does the Minister intend to include it? There has been a good deal of media coverage of late on the issue of adoptions and of the frequent heart-ache caused in earlier generations by the adoption of children at a early age. I have been advised by several of my constituents, who are relinquishing parents, that they have suffered great distress at not being able to trace and make contact with their biological children. Ironically, many adoptees also report that they have had difficulty in establishing contact with their biological parents. It is for this reason that my constituents have urged that the Minister consider moving at that meeting in April for the establishment of a nationwide register.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The honourable member's interest in the area of relinquishing parents is well known and has been given some publicity in the media in South Australia. He needs to be congratulated for his stand on it. Ministers of Community Welfare, both past and present, have indicated their concern in this very complex but sensitive and important area. I will be happy to take the matter up with my colleague in another place and bring back a reply, because the whole concept of a national contact register is currently a matter of debate throughout Australia. I am sure that South Australia, at the initiative of the honourable member and his Minister, will be playing a key role in that decision, when it is made.

BLF DEREGISTRATION

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: To facilitate deregistration proceedings against the Builders Labourers Federation will the Minister of Labour ask the Trades and Labor Council to review its policy of preventing other unions taking over work now performed by BLF members?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The short answer is, 'No, I will not do that.' However, I am quite happy to spend some time explaining my very brief answer to the House. I will not do it because the Trades and Labor Council is entirely responsible for its own affairs—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will come to that in a moment because that is an interesting interjection. I do not in any way attempt to interfere with the way in which the Trades and Labor Council runs its business—any more than I would attempt to interfere in the internal affairs of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, the Employers Federation, the Metal Industry Association of South Australia or any other body. From time to time I discuss some of these very important issues with the Trades and Labor Council and such bodies as the Master Builders Association. I attempt, on behalf of the Government, to play a very even-handed role. It seems that, if the Builders Labourers Federation is prepared to take a chance on the solidarity of the rest of the trade union movement, perhaps it is skating on rather thin ice.

My information, for what it is worth, is that if this dispute is prolonged for any great period the solidarity that at present exists with the builders labourers will perhaps evaporate. That is something about which I cannot be categorical, but that is the information that I have to date. The interjection of the Deputy Leader was that this Government

is run by the Trades and Labor Council. That is a very interesting interjection and certainly it would be the impression—in fact, I suppose the firm belief—of members opposite that that is the case. I hope that the member for Mitcham will develop a genuine interest in this area over the next few years, as it will make life a little less tedious if he gains some knowledge in the area, rather than sitting there and shouting in his infantile style. I will certainly introduce him to the Trades and Labor Council.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am delighted that the honourable member is, because it will make the debate much more productive if he learns something about the issue. It will make him look a little less foolish every time he stands up. That will be to the benefit of the people of South Australia in general.

An argument abroad, which I am sure the honourable member has heard, is that since the accord has been in place nationally (and as a State Government we are strongly in support of it, as is the Trades and Labor Council in this State), in fact the reverse is happening. There is a lot of criticism in the trade union movement that, in effect, more so than at any other time in its history, it is being controlled by Labor Governments. There is a great deal of resentment in some quarters of the trade union movement that that is the case. I will leave my answer to the question on that note—it is food for thought. I hope that the member for Mitcham will think about it, as perhaps members will on this side of the House.

SCHOOL OF THE FUTURE

Mr RANN: Will the Minister of Education advise the House what action is being taken to implement the Government's election policy of establishing a school of the future at Technology Park as part of the Government's intention to assist school leavers to become more technologically literate?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question. This matter was announced prior to the last State election, and, indeed, it has received considerable interest in the community and the school community throughout the State. It represents very much an innovative approach to the ability of senior secondary students in our schools to gain the benefits of learning in an environment in which new technology predominates. In the School of the Future students will have an opportunity to experience learning delivered by advanced and innovative uses of modern technology, particularly computers, video discs and telecommunication devices, and to study sophisticated technological equipment demonstrating principles of science and related subjects which, because of the expense, cannot be provided in conventional schools.

I might add that this facility is not intended to be limited to those who are particularly gifted or are advancing their careers in particular disciplines but it will apply right across the spectrum of senior secondary students. The school would not have permanent students as such, but rather students from all schools would have an opportunity to visit the School of the Future for a program extending over several days. Some accommodation facility might well be required to enable country students who attend the school to be catered for.

It is intended that the school will be located at Technology Park and, obviously, the honourable member has a particular interest in that facility as it is in his district. There are many reasons why that is the most appropriate site, but I should mention that that site is in close proximity to the Adelaide Innovation Centre and the Micro-electronics

Application Centre in Technology Park. In addition, relationships can be developed between Technology Park and the adjacent SAIT campus. Further, in that northern metropolitan area there are a large number of medium to high technology industries, and they are increasing all the time. As I have said, it is intended that some accommodation will be provided for country students who wish to gain access to that facility.

This is a very innovative and exciting project in which, obviously, there will be great interest throughout Australia. The Education Department has undertaken the preliminary planning and there will be discussions with all sections of the education system, with other ministries (such as the Ministry for Technology) and the private sector whilst the planning stages of this school are being undertaken.

STOREMEN AND PACKERS UNION

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Will the Minister of Labour ask his department to investigate the employment practices of the Storemen and Packers Union as owners of the Coorong Caravan Park, which members will recall received almost \$200 000 worth of taxpayers' money in the form of a Commonwealth Employment Program grant? The former manager of the park sought the assistance of his local MP, the member for Murray Mallee, and other members of the Opposition in the desperate plight in which he found himself as an employee of the union. I note that the Minister is getting his riding instructions from the member for Florey.

When the former manager took on the job 18 months ago, he was promised \$200 a week, or one-third of the takings, whichever was the greater, plus a house to live in when the park was upgraded. When he took the job there were two cleaners employed to do the indoor cleaning of the park but, following a disagreement with Mr Apap, Secretary of the union, over their wages, they left. This meant that the manager, as well as working seven days a week on call 24 hours a day, had to do all the cleaning as well as supervise the upgrading (with the \$200 000 grant), which included organising materials, labour and wages as well as working on cementing, building and carpentry. This additional work was performed immediately following a triple by-pass operation after he suffered a heart attack at the park while pushing a lawn mower around the park for three days.

Following the upgrading the manager had the extra responsibility of the cleaning and maintenance of the George Apap Hall, the swimming pool and sauna. The manager, who has since been sacked, claims that he received numerous abusive phone calls from Mr Apap, together with a series of letters which some observers might consider as setting the scene for the eventual sacking. The manager was told that there would never be a house for him to live in in the park and that his family could not stay with him unless they were paying clients of the park, the only exception being that permission was granted for one child to be there at a time, providing he or she was prepared to work in the park.

The manager had no recourse to the management committee, as he was not allowed to attend their meetings (an interesting example of worker participation, Apap style) and, as he said, 'I cannot go to a union as I am not in one, only employed by one.' In view of the serious nature of the allegations, will the Minister assure the House that the Department of Labour will investigate the claims, and will the Minister be alert to any possible danger of retribution that could be suffered by the former manager following the raising of this matter publicly?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the honourable member for her question. I had the pleasure of officially opening the caravan park.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Members must realise that, when they are being clever by way of interjection, I cannot hear them, so they will have to speak up if they hope that their brilliant wit will have an impact on me. I am sure that they feel that their interjections are worth while but, because of the strange quirk of the acoustics in this place, those interjections are completely wasted on me. When opening the caravan park, I gave the honourable lady opposite a mention during my address.

It is a pity when someone comes into the Chamber with a prepared explanation to a question that gives only one half of the story. I should have much preferred the honourable member's contacting me privately with this information, and I could have had the department investigate it. I shall do that now, obviously, but I am concerned that now only one side of the question has been aired publicly. I have been around long enough to know that there are always two sides, and the other side of the story will now require a public airing. I do not know whether the honourable lady knows the other side of the story. If she does, and if she can assure me that she does, that is fine and I respect what she has done. If she does not, I do not respect what she has done, because pressure will now be applied on other members to put the other side of the story in this Chamber. I do not believe that a slanging match between the aggrieved parties is resolved by pursuing the matter under parliamentary privilege in the Chamber. I must be careful what I say on this issue, as I understand that it may be put before the police and the courts, if not now then at some future date. If that is not the case, I assure the honourable member that next Tuesday I will have a full and detailed response to her allegations.

HOUSING

Mr HAMILTON: May I congratulate you on your appointment, Mr Speaker. Is the Minister of Housing and Construction aware of the misleading statements made by Liberal candidates during the recent State election campaign concerning South Australian Housing Trust accommodation, which have led to a build up of false expectations among retired and elderly tenants? During the lead up to the election—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Albert Park will resume his seat. The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr GUNN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker. As neither the member for Albert Park nor the Minister can make comments on behalf of the Liberal Party or Liberal candidates, this question must surely be out of order.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The honourable member for Albert Park.

Mr HAMILTON: In the West Lakes Mall on the Thursday—

Mr S.J. BAKER: I rise on a point of order, Sir. The point of order is that really the honourable member is asking the Minister to comment. We are all aware of the Standing Orders in the House which do not permit that.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order, because I did not understand the question as being one directly soliciting comment from the Minister.

Mr HAMILTON: In the West Lakes Mall on the Thursday week before the last State election, I was approached by two elderly women, residents of the Woodville West area, who informed me that they were tenants of the South

Australian Housing Trust and put to me certain comments which will be supported by what I am about to say.

After the election, on 23 December 1985 I was approached by a Mrs M., who lives in Woodville West (I will provide this information to the Minister from the worksheet that I have in my possession), and who said that during the election campaign the Liberal candidate told her that a future Liberal Government would work towards providing rent free accommodation for Housing Trust widows and pensioners who have been resident in those houses for 20 to 30 years. My constituent, who was very upset about this matter, told me that she believed the Liberal Party candidate was preying on—

Mr OSWALD: I rise on a point of order, Sir. If the honourable member is trying to ascertain whether or not the statements made by that private individual were accurate, I turn your attention to a list of inadmissible questions which was published by your predecessor. One of the statements there is quite clear that it is an inadmissible question if a member is asking whether any statements in the press or of any private individual are accurate. In this case the honourable member is trying to get the Minister to say whether or not certain statements are accurate. In actual fact, it is specifically stated in this list that it is inadmissible to ask a question as to whether or not statements made by a private individual are accurate.

The SPEAKER: This point of order hinges very precisely on the wording of the question as originally put by the member for Albert Park. For clarification of the situation and for the benefit of the Chair and members, I ask the honourable member to repeat his question.

Mr HAMILTON: I would be delighted, Sir. Is the Minister aware of the misleading statements made by Liberal candidates during the last State election in relation to South Australian Housing Trust accommodation which led to the build up of false expectations by retired and elderly tenants?

The SPEAKER: On the strength of that wording, the question does not justify the objection raised by the member for Morphett. I ask the member to continue with his question.

Mr HAMILTON: Finally, my constituent said to me that she believed that this candidate was preying on the emotions of elderly tenants and widows who were occupants of South Australian Housing Trust accommodation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Albert Park to resume his seat.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Albert Park has finished his question and it is now the Minister's turn to reply.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Yes, I certainly heard those misleading statements that were made, not only in relation to the seat of Albert Park but also Hayward, Henley Beach, and Adelaide. They came in fairly late in Adelaide because, until the last week of the campaign, Mr Wilson thought that he was going to win the seat—they used their dirty tricks later in the campaign. I am not in a position to pass judgment on the calibre of individual candidates—whether they made up untruths or whether they were carrying out official Party policy. However, when these sorts of accusations were brought to our attention we usually found that the Liberal candidates involved were of a pretty poor quality and were using scare tactics to try to overcome the gains that had been made by my colleagues on this side of the House who I am pleased to say are now sitting alongside me.

Before answering the specific question asked by the honourable member, I want to talk about the housing policy

that the Liberal Party put up in the campaign. It really shows the Party's completely abysmal ignorance of public and concessional housing. Members opposite had to write to Mrs Thatcher to send over two clowns, and then they based their campaign on the advice subsequently received. They found subsequent information disappointing and embarrassing. After the Leader of the Opposition had done his little act with all the tombstones, and after telling us about the great South Australia he would produce, he went into housing matters and within 25 minutes, by just scanning the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, we found that everything the Opposition was saying, everything that it was promised, was illegal.

Mr Olsen: Say that outside the House.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: It was illegal.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister will resume his seat. I call the House to order. I would remind members of the traditional standards of decorum that should be maintained in the Chamber and, regardless of the friendly disposition of the Chair towards all members, I intend to uphold those standards of decorum. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Thank you, Mr Speaker, for your protection. As I said, it took me only 25 minutes in scanning the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement to ascertain that fact. It is a rather historic document, signed by the Premier, Robert Hawke, and also by Mr Stewart West. I must say that the Liberal Party did have a copy of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. I arranged for a copy to be forwarded to the Opposition but, as I said yesterday, every time information was forwarded to the then Liberal Party spokesman on housing matters it was either a question of his not being interested or that he did not think it was important. The policy of privatisation, involving selling off two for the price of one (in fact, we call it the fire sale of the century) was the Liberal Party's answer to the growing need of disadvantaged people for housing in South Australia.

We indicated, using simple arithmetic, that such a policy would not only send the Housing Trust broke but also would mean that two would have to be sold off to build one. I contacted Mr Stewart West, the Federal Minister for Housing and Construction, who confirmed exactly what I had thought, namely, that the Liberal Party's proposal to privatise public sector housing was completely illegal. He said, 'Terry, to make things easier I will send over a complete package to explain what can and cannot be done within the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement.'

The package, of which I think I sent a copy to the member for Light, explained exactly what it could do. It said 'Facts and figures: A plain English guide. Questions and answers about the CSHA.' I wrote back to the Federal Minister and asked whether he could supply an abridged version for the Liberal Party in South Australia—one with pop-up pictures for two and three year olds, so that if the Liberal Party could not work out the print it could see in the pictures exactly what one could and could not do. What the Liberal Party attempted to do at the last election was a complete disaster and showed to the community that it was attempting to do something illegal.

It is interesting that in all areas made up predominantly of Housing Trust tenants the Labor Party majority increased. I am pleased to say that my majority in my electorate increased by something like 4 per cent or 5 per cent. Voters preferred me to the member for Light. Back to specifics: I heard the kind of proposals being put forward—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Yes, I did a lot of door knocking. They say that if I had spent another couple of

weeks in Hanson then Anne Pengelley would have won! The kind of cheap proposal touted by the candidates in Albert Park, Hayward, Henley Beach, and Adelaide is totally unacceptable to the Government. Why should people benefit with free rents after spending 30 years in public housing? If one looks at the simple arithmetic of it, if one starts giving a certain section of the community free accommodation it is not only inequitable but it stops one's capital works program.

This Government charges rents within a cost rent formula—and that is another thing the member for Hanson should brush up on; that might dictate the future questions in the House. Of course, any trust tenant over 75 years of age—and we have plenty of those—has a rent freeze, which is only fair. They have paid their rent and when they reach the age of 75 years we give a rent freeze and they live out the rest of their lives with some degree of security. This Liberal move was a blatant attempt to buy votes, like all the Party's policy on housing. The Opposition attempted to fool the disadvantaged and low income people and it fell flat on its face.

IRAC

Mr. S.J. BAKER: Because the Minister of Labour is in serious conflict with the Premier and his predecessor (Hon. Jack Wright), will he admit that he misled the House yesterday when giving his interpretation of his responsibilities under the IRAC legislation, or is the Government planning to change the role of IRAC? When he introduced the IRAC Bill on 30 March 1983 the former Minister (Hon. Jack Wright) said:

The Bill specifically requires that draft copies of all proposed legislation be placed before the council.

The Premier said much the same thing in the Government's industrial relations policy released during the election campaign (page 6):

The legislation requires the Government to refer any legislative proposal of industrial significance to the council.

The Premier also said that IRAC had proved to be an outstanding success. While both the Premier and the Hon. Jack Wright have said that the Government must place all legislation before IRAC, the Minister said in the House that whether or not the Government did so was 'entirely discretionary'. Either the Minister misled the House or the Government intends a new role for IRAC, and I ask him to say which it is.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am surprised that the honourable member has not gone over the personal explanation I made yesterday. The question of serious conflict with the Premier and the former Minister of Labour is nonsense. I have a very warm and close relationship with the Premier. It may even get warmer and closer as years go by. Certainly, as regards the former Minister of Labour—again, a man whom I deeply respect, have known and worked with for at least 20 years—I know that he has the same affection for me that I have for him. IRAC has been a great success and one of the great innovations of this Government. All members would, or ought to, remember that it was one of the principal platforms on which we went to the election in 1982.

That election, of course, was very successful. If members opposite think about it for a moment rather than shout, they would see that no Government can give away to a non-elected body its right to legislate. That is why the IRAC Act was specifically framed as 'should' rather than 'shall'.

There have been occasions over the past three years when it has been necessary to bring legislation into the House or indeed to change regulations that have not been before

IRAC for the prescribed period of time. I do not have the legislation in front of me but again, if honourable members look at the legislation, they will see that the IRAC Act says, from memory, that legislative proposals (not draft Bills but legislative proposals) should go before IRAC.

Workers compensation has, in one way or another, been before IRAC for about three years. Indeed, some of the members of IRAC were on the negotiating committee that came up with the white paper, which paper was put before IRAC I think in August of last year. The additional measures that were included in the workers compensation proposal now before the House were put before IRAC I believe in October. So, there is absolutely no question that the intent, spirit and letter of IRAC has been fulfilled in the workers compensation legislation.

I assure the House, as I have assured IRAC, that I personally am a great supporter of that body. I was in another place when the legislation went through the House. I can recall the spokesperson opposite for the Liberal Party saying that it was virtually worthless, that there was nothing left in the Bill before the House and that he could not see anything to oppose as there was nothing left in the Bill to oppose. I welcome the change of heart of the Liberal Party. Where it cast doubt as to the value of IRAC, it is now apparently the champion of IRAC. I welcome aboard members opposite on that measure.

HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

Mr PLUNKETT: Will the Minister of Transport advise whether any savings are available to parents who need to purchase a second vehicle for the carrying of a wheelchair for their handicapped child? Members opposite might be quiet now. The father of a handicapped child has written to me advising that he recently purchased a van-type vehicle in which his child's wheelchair can be transported. Are any discounts on registration or savings on stamp duty and sales tax available? The van is not used as a family car.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question.

Mr Gunn interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Members opposite seem to believe that questions asked by members on this side are all asked after the Minister has access to information, but I can assure honourable members that that is not the case, even though the answers given by Ministers are usually so much to the point and so accurate that one could forgive members opposite for believing that that was so. I believe it would be appropriate for me, rather than giving part of an answer, as this matter is so important, to obtain a full report on the position in relation to people who have to buy additional vehicles to carry wheelchairs and so on. I will do that and bring back a reply as soon as possible.

Mr KEVIN BARLOW

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Will the Premier say whether, in view of its involvement in the Kevin Barlow case, the South Australian Government will take action to determine the justification or otherwise for the statement made yesterday by radio commentator Derryn Hinch that Barlow has confessed his guilt? A report in the *Advertiser* on Monday revealed that in January the South Australian Government wrote to the Federal Attorney-General fully supporting the claims of Barlow's legal adviser, Mr Frank Galbally, of a miscarriage of justice. The letter stated that the South Australian Government sought to advance Galbally's objections with all the vigour at its disposal. However, yesterday

Mr Hinch claimed on television that Barlow had confessed his guilt to another person in Penang Prison since his appeal against his conviction for drug trafficking failed in December.

Hinch said that he had the utmost faith in the source of his information but that he would not reveal that source. As Hinch's claims directly conflict with the attitude of the South Australian Government as expressed about this case, does the Government intend to seek further information from Hinch to clarify the matter?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will refer this matter to the Attorney-General for a detailed response, but I would question the statement or the implication therein that we are taking some kind of active role in supporting Barlow other than in the extent of suggesting to the Federal Government that it should look seriously at any request for legal aid that has been discussed. That eventually becomes a legal matter. I will refer the question to the Attorney and ascertain the position.

LPG

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy indicate whether the local production of LPG at Port Bonython and also joint promotional activities by the Government and the LPG industry have had a measurable effect on the use of this fuel in South Australia?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I can give some information, and I thank the honourable member for his question. I also thank him for his courtesy in advising me yesterday of his interest in this matter. For that reason I am able, and I am very pleased, to have this first opportunity to provide information for the benefit of the member for Whyalla who, on today's effort, it seems will spend a fair amount of time on his feet answering questions rather than receiving information.

Automotive use of LPG in South Australia totalled almost 14 000 tonnes during the year 1984-85, an increase, important in relation to this question, of 24 per cent on the previous financial year. In the traditional areas of non-vehicle use, consumption rose to almost 30 000 tonnes, an increase of 18 per cent on the previous year. Exports of LPG to other States and overseas are also rising rapidly, and members who have taken the trouble to scan the annual report of the Department of Mines and Energy will have seen that present arrangements provide for the export of 500 000 tonnes a year over the next four years on a contractual basis already concluded with overseas interests.

The member for Gilles asked whether the efforts of the Joint Government Industry Committee had helped in this matter, as well as the fact that LPG is now available locally on the South Australian scene at Port Bonython. The answer, based on the figures that I have been given, is 'Yes'. A corollary of the question asked by the honourable member is why the Government should necessarily be involved in this area. The answer is simple: the Government has a great interest in industry costs and the use of LPG as an alternative fuel, especially by transport, as its current price level clearly is a factor that will assist in keeping down industry costs, because it will help keep down the cost of transport. That is one reason why the Government has been so keen, through me as Minister, to be involved in this area and to work with the industry group to promote the use of this fuel.

I pay a tribute to the industry groups concerned, which have put up both the money and the effort, as well as providing nice sounding words and phrases about the use of LPG. The industry has put up hard cash and the Government has reciprocated by making its contribution, too,

through the lines of my department to achieve the result that I can now report to the House. I think that it was late last year that our efforts were so successful in relation to fuelling for vehicle use that it appeared that there would be a shortage of pressure vessels used to provide the fuel reservoir in the vehicle installation. Happily, I can now say that that difficulty has been overcome. That was an improvement in the employment scene also that was a spin-off from the activities of the group concerned.

DUNCAN CASE REWARD

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Will the Minister of Emergency Services say whether, following the recent arrests in the Duncan case, the Government's reward offer of \$25 000 is still open, and has immunity from prosecution been granted following the new investigation of the case? I direct this question to the Minister because the Police Commissioner is the person responsible for advising the Government on this matter. On 13 August last year, the Government offered a reward of \$25 000 for the person giving information leading to the arrest of the principal offender or offenders. So that any potential informants or witnesses are aware of the present position, I ask whether the Government can, without prejudicing the imminent court hearing, clarify whether that reward offer is still open and whether immunity from prosecution has been granted following the Government's guarantee of such immunity, on certain conditions, which was also offered on 13 August 1985.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The honourable member is correct: the Government accepts advice from the Police Commissioner in these matters. Having accepted advice from the Commissioner as to a reward for information leading to a conviction, it would also obviously accept advice from the Commissioner as to the termination of that offer. As no such advice has come forward, officially the reward is still available. Certainly no information has been given to me as to whether immunity has been given to any individuals in relation to evidence that might have a bearing on the pending prosecution. I will check the matter with the Attorney-General and, if it seems relevant and reasonable that that information should be made available to the House without prejudice to the conduct of the case, I will make it available. If there are any problems in that respect, I shall be happy on a confidential basis to give the information to the honourable member.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: HOUSING DOCUMENT

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Earlier this afternoon, by way of answer to a question, the Minister of Housing and Construction indicated that he had delivered to me a copy of a document that had been provided by the Federal Minister (Mr West). I should like it to be understood that, whilst over the past three years I have received on numerous occasions courteous attention from officers of the Minister's department, as well as documents that had been directed by the Minister to my attention, at no time have I received from the Minister the document that he suggested had been made available to me.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1)

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to apply out of Consolidated Account the sum of \$475 000 000 for the Public Service of the State for the financial year ending 30 June 1987. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to grant supply for the early months of next financial year. As I explained when introducing the comparable legislation last year, it has been customary in this period of the year for Parliament to consider two Bills for the appropriation of moneys—one in respect of Supplementary Estimates for the current financial year and one to grant Supply for next year.

However, as was the case last year, appropriation authority already granted by Parliament in respect of 1985-86 seems adequate to meet the financial requirements of the Government through to the end of the financial year, barring a major unforeseen event. Although the Government will, of course, be monitoring the situation very closely, it is unlikely that Supplementary Estimates will prove to be necessary. With one-third of the financial year still to run, however, it would not be appropriate for me to seek to make precise forecasts of the final budget results for 1985-86. I can, however, advise the House of some of the factors which will influence actual outcomes this financial year as compared with the budget estimates.

Recurrent budget:

The Government budgeted for a balanced result on recurrent transactions in 1985-86. Present indications are that the actual outcome will be reasonably close to that budgeted for, or possibly a little better. On the receipts side, members will be aware that property values have plateaued and in some cases fallen slightly which, combined with a decline in the number of transactions, means that stamp duty collections are almost certain to be lower than estimated at budget time. On the other hand, payroll tax collections (as a result of a healthy increase in employment), interest on funds invested at Treasury and our financial assistance grant from the Commonwealth seem likely to exceed budget. The expected increase in payroll tax is due to a healthy increase in employment in the State. The expectation of an increased Commonwealth grant is due to a revision of the CPI factor in the formula. The net effect of these and other items will probably be a small improvement.

On the expenditure side, the Government is continuing its close monitoring and control procedures. There will inevitably be some variations, but generally departments are working well towards meeting budgetary targets.

A review of the cash needs of the State Transport Authority has revealed a budget saving in 1985-86, while the Government's decision to assist in holding down building society interest rates is expected to cost the budget approximately \$2.3 million in 1985-86. Some savings are occurring in the round sum provisions for wage and salary rate increases and other contingent items. The net effect is again presently expected to be some improvement.

Capital Budget:

Members are aware of the particular difficulties involved in making precise predictions about capital spending, as the amounts expended in a particular period can depend on variable factors such as the timing of payments to contractors, progress with construction projects which can be affected by the weather, planning processes, and so on. However, present indications are that outlays from the capital side of the budget will be somewhat above the budgeted level of \$489 million. This results mainly from three items not included in the budget, namely:

funds for the construction of a ship-lift at Port Adelaide which is associated with our bid for the submarine project, which has an expected requirement in 1985-86 of \$4.5 million; the need, under new Commonwealth-State arrangements for rural adjustment, for the State to provide capital funds previously provided by the Commonwealth (but with the Commonwealth still providing an interest rate subsidy); the amount involved in 1985-86 is \$5.7 million; and an estimated amount of \$6 million as low-interest loans to drought affected farmers.

These increases are expected to be partly offset by a reduction of \$5 million in the funds required by the Woods and Forests Department. This has been brought about by an expected improvement in profitability of the department together with some delays in implementing its works program. Some other relatively minor variations below budget are expected, by and large, to be offset by equally minor variations in the other direction.

Overall Budget Result:

In summary, and subject to the qualifications to which I have already referred, the Government expects the outcome on the Consolidated Account in 1985-86 to be satisfactory. It is far too early to make predictions about next financial year, except to say that firm control over expenditures, especially on the recurrent side, will continue to be a key feature of the Government's policy.

Turning now to the legislation before us, this Bill provides for the appropriation of \$475 million to enable the Public Service of the State to be carried on during the early part of 1986-87. In the absence of special arrangements in the form of the Supply Acts, there would be no parliamentary authority for appropriations required between the commencement of the new financial year and the date on which assent is given to the main Appropriation Bill. It is customary for the Government to present two Supply Bills each year, the first covering estimated expenditure during July and August and the second covering the remainder of the period prior to the Appropriation Bill's becoming law. I believe this Bill should suffice until the latter part of August when it will be necessary to introduce a second Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

Clause 3 provides for the issue and application of up to \$475 million.

Clause 4 imposes limitations on the issue and application of this amount.

Clause 5 provides the normal borrowing powers for the capital works program and for temporary purposes, if required.

Mr OLSEN secured the adjournment of the debate.

DAYLIGHT SAVING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Daylight Saving Act 1971. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation of the Bill inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The visit of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth and His Royal Highness Prince Philip and the staging of the Moomba Festival in March 1986 have prompted the Victorian Premier, Mr Cain, to seek an extension of the period of daylight saving for a further two weeks, until 16 March 1986. The

suggestion is seen as valuable to the arrangements for Jubilee 150 celebrations, the royal visit and some of the Festival of Arts activities in South Australia. The Premier of New South Wales has indicated his support for the proposal.

The Daylight Saving Act 1971-1972 does not contain any provision which would permit a variation in the period of daylight saving. Accordingly, a legislative amendment is necessary in order to accede to the Victorian Premier's suggestion. A lack of close coordination would lead to temporary border anomalies and cause airline and other services between major cities to be disrupted. In the 1982 referendum conducted on the subject approximately three-quarters of the population supported daylight saving. Acceptance of the proposal should receive early and wide publicity so as to provide the community with as substantial a period of notice as possible before implementation.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 amends section 2 of the principal Act by the insertion of a definition. 'Prescribed period' is defined in paragraph (a) as the period from 2 a.m. South Australian standard time in the last Sunday in October of each year to 2 a.m. South Australian standard time on the first Sunday in the following March, if no period is prescribed by regulation for the observance of South Australian summer time, and in paragraph (b) as the period so prescribed if a period is prescribed by regulation.

Clause 3 repeals sections 3 and 4 of the principal Act and substitutes sections 3, 3a and 4.

Section 3 provides in subsection (1) that South Australian summer time shall be an hour in advance of South Australian standard time.

Subsection (2) provides that, notwithstanding anything in the Standard Time Act 1898, South Australian summer time shall be observed throughout the State during the prescribed period.

Under section 3a the period for observance of South Australian summer time may be prescribed by regulation.

Subsection (1) of section 4 provides that a reference to time in any instrument, contract, stipulation or direction in relation to the prescribed period shall, unless the contrary intention is expressed, be taken to be a reference to South Australian summer time.

Under subsection (2) instrument is defined in section 4 to mean—

- (a) an Act or an instrument made in pursuance of statutory powers;
 - (b) a proclamation or order in Council;
 - (c) a judgment, order, judicial direction or process;
 - (d) an order, direction or notice given in pursuance of an executive or administrative authority;
- or
- (e) a deed contract or other instrument.

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

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 12 February. Page 121.)

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I support the motion. I extend my congratulations to the Premier on his return to office and to Cabinet Ministers who have been re-elected. I particularly extend my congratulations to the new Minister, the member for Unley, on his election to the Cabinet. The honourable members's election to that high office is particularly noteworthy, especially in view of the fact that the honourable member had one of the most marginal seats.

He should indeed be congratulated not only on his elevation to Cabinet but also because he has now taken his district out of the marginal category.

I also extend my congratulations to you, Mr Speaker, on reaching the highest office that Parliament can provide. I am sure that there is no need for me to give you a lecture, as in the short time that we have been sitting I have seen how you acquit yourself in this high office, and I feel sure that your impartiality will be apparent to everyone. So far you have done a great job.

I am most grateful to be able to return to the Government benches and of course to have been re-elected to the seat of Henley Beach. It is with some satisfaction that I have seen this seat elevated from the most marginal seat at the 1982 elections to a situation where there are eight other seats on this side of the House more marginal than mine. The percentage swing has gone from minus 1.1 per cent to 7.4 per cent on a two Party preferred basis during this period.

I believe that this is an opportunity that I must take to thank the people in my electorate who were able to assist me in my re-election and also the Bannon Government. To those people who sacrificed both time and money in achieving that objective, I am most grateful. It is always interesting to note that the Australian Labor Party is able to muster a large number of volunteers at any time, in sharp contrast to other Parties which pay for their helpers. The Australian Labor Party is able to rely on the sacrifice of its members and helpers.

During my last Address in Reply speech I stated to the House that I thought that the privatisation plans of the Liberal Party would be its Achilles heel. I stressed the point of view that I hoped that those privatisation plans would be exposed, and this certainly proved to be the case. The South Australian people were not prepared to accept the privatisation proposals put forward by the Liberal Party and I believe that the most telling factor in the resounding win of the Bannon Labor Government was this Liberal proposal.

The Liberal Party's retreat from the middle ground and the swing to the right has been emphasised through its privatisation policies, and in South Australia has left it in a most depleted situation. We have seen, from the reports and surveys issued both before and after the State election, the Liberal Party deserted by young people in South Australia. One only has to look at the Liberal Party policy on youth employment to see the reason. The end result of that policy had the objective of cutting youth wages and could simply be called grossly unfair. The vast majority of youth wages are on a graduated scale, in any event. Even though the Liberal Party knows that this situation does prevail, it keeps suggesting that youth wages are preventing the increase of employment throughout industry.

I have had the rare opportunity of reading Liberal Party policy, and the proposition outlined regarding youth policy stated:

The proposition that an across-the-board cut in youth wages would solve employment is rejected.

The end result of Liberal Party policy as stated would in fact have the effect of cutting youth wages. The proposals submitted in their proposition, that they also wanted to amend youth wages by submitting to the Industrial Commission that the commission recognise add-on costs of training and supervision, would have that effect. One of the key proposals of the Liberal Party's policy was the deregulation of the labour market. The proposed and alleged freedom to opt out, that is, to make an agreement with an employer to pay less than that required for a fair day's wage, was part and parcel of the deregulation proposal.

That proposal was the most dangerous attack on the basic award rates and employment conditions for workers that has ever occurred. There is no provision for flexibility or equality in this proposal for negotiations. There was no freedom for a young unemployed person to allow for bargaining over conditions of employment with a particularly powerful employer. The question which I have posed in the past in relation to this proposition, and which has yet to be answered, was 'How does one provide protection against exploitation in any situation with this proposition?'

Mr Lewis: Ask George Apap.

Mr FERGUSON: The member for Murray Mallee keeps coming in with inane and stupid interjections. With this deregulation proposition, on the one hand we have these people who are seeking employment in a particularly vulnerable area: for example, how does a 16 year old boy or girl seek reasonable rates of remuneration when being employed at, say, the local delicatessen, grocer or butcher shop, and so on, without being able to have recourse eventually to wages set by the Industrial Commission? How does a 15, 16 or 17 year old gain the necessary skills involved in bargaining for a wage in a situation like that? The present industrial situation provides for a basic wage, minimum rates and minimum standards of conditions, which excludes the possibility of exploitation. In this situation an employer is all powerful. He has the right to hire and fire; he has the right to demote and promote; and he has a large influence over the extent of the wage rate beyond the minimum rate.

Protection in this area at present is minimal, and yet the Liberal Party proposed to take away these protections. The proposals of the Liberal Party related not only to a situation like this but were to operate across the board so far as youth wages were concerned. This deregulation was to apply to the transnationals, the multinationals and the large national companies with all their expertise and help in a bargaining situation against a young person who had just left school, a person with no negotiating skills, who would be left in a situation of a completely unequal contest. It is no wonder that the youth vote left the Liberal Party. The Business Council of Australia, supporters of the Liberal Party, those people who provide the Liberal Party with their money to run its election campaigns, even told the Federal Leader of the Opposition how ridiculous the proposition was.

In relation to the recent State election, I have already, and quite rightly, thanked my own people who assisted me. However, there are a few other people whom I ought to thank. Not the least of these are the Opposition interjectors. Many of their interjections are recorded in *Hansard*. I refer particularly to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who informed me continually during the three years of the previous Administration that I was a oncer in Henley Beach and that I would never return to this House. I explained to the Deputy Leader that, when I had the opportunity to do so I would publicly thank him for the assistance that he gave in helping return me to the seat of Henley Beach. It is a great pity that the Deputy Leader is not in the House to hear my public thanks. But when he reads it in *Hansard* no doubt he will recall my saying that at the appropriate time I would thank him for his assistance in returning me to the House.

Of course, it is of great satisfaction to me to be standing here addressing the House on this occasion. Remarks made by members opposite included a comment that I would be run over by a certain double decker bus. These only increased my resolve to return to this House, and I have been able to do that, with a substantially increased majority. I set out to achieve that which is not always achieved but often spoken about in this House. I visited every house in my electorate. This objective was completed just prior to the State election campaign, and I had the satisfaction of com-

pleting the task of knocking on doors and visiting 10 264 homes, flats and dwellings in my electorate. The task of doorknocking is not an easy one. There are problems with physical effort, and it also produces quite a deal of work for the electorate office.

On 200 occasions I took the opportunity of going out to visit houses in my electorate, averaging just over 51 houses per visit. When the going was tough, the feet were aching, and the task looked daunting I remembered the interjections across the House and they helped sustain me in completing my objective. Therefore, I say to members opposite, that, to some extent, I am grateful for the remarks that were thrown my way, which spurred me on to greater efforts in my electorate. I even remember the Hon. Dean Brown taking the opportunity to walk across the House to tell me that he would never see me in the House again—that was just prior to the election.

Mr Hamilton: He was right.

Mr FERGUSON: As my colleague the member for Albert Park says, he was quite right: I am in the House and he is not. I intend to continue to maintain an interest in tourism development for the western seaside area during the Government's next term in office. Members might be aware that, through an initiative of mine, a seminar was conducted in the Henley and Grange council chamber. The shadow Minister of Tourism attended, and I was very pleased to see her in my electorate at that time advancing the cause of tourism. The member for Hanson also attended the seminar, the object of which was to increase as much as possible activity in the tourism area. Tourism activity can provide some employment for those who have lost their jobs through the decline in manufacturing industry. Unfortunately, not a lot of people realise the implications and advantages of increased activity in this sphere.

It is with great pleasure that I congratulate the Henley and Grange council on its activities to increase the number of day visitors to Henley Beach. The increase in the number of day visitors and consequential increase in economic activity can do nothing but be of assistance to the district in the long term. Several good things have happened as a result of that initial seminar conducted by the Department of Tourism. I must extend my thanks to Mr Graham Inns and his people who had the foresight to agree to look at tourism aspects and to assist the tourism industry in the area. Two committees were formed as a result of that exercise. One is related to Henley Beach itself and the other group was called 'Grange Promotions'. These bodies were formed to provide for whatever increase in tourism can be made available through promotion in the Grange area. I am very happy to say that as a direct result of the formation of this committee, under the sponsorship of the *Advertiser* and Peters Ice Cream we saw the great Australian sandcastle competition held in the Grange area. It was heartening to see both the publicity generated in relation to the Grange area and the number of people who attended the occasion. I want to extend my congratulations to the Chairman of that committee, Mr Roy Coombe, on his efforts in relation to that function.

The people associated with the project, and in particular the weight given to it by the Henley and Grange council, ensured that it was certainly worthwhile. The local traders in the area must have been impressed by the increase in numbers of people attending, while the function created problems in relation to car parking spaces. I hope that Grange Promotions will continue its good work so that we may see four or five major functions per season on the Grange beach area with the consequential increase in numbers of day visitors and the financial reward that that brings.

Of course, this is not the end of what is happening in the area so far as the Henley and Grange council is concerned.

Through January and February it is conducting a successful program of entertainment on Sunday afternoons in Henley Square. Since that square has been revamped (and this was done with the assistance of the Coastal Protection Board) it is now starting to fulfil its potential, particularly when entertainment is provided as it has been by the council on Sunday afternoons. I believe that other people are now starting to copy the program conducted by the Henley council, and this is the sincerest form of flattery. This sort of entertainment will probably go to other areas. All this activity is of assistance to the restaurants, the hotels and other shops in the vicinity, and I hope that it continues and goes from strength to strength.

The Jubilee 150 Committee, which is strongly supported by the Henley and Grange council, has put forward a program that will also assist day visitors and bring them back to this very popular and clean beach, which is close to the city. There is no reason why day visitors should not return to Henley Beach. We are in a fortunate position in Adelaide in having a clean and relatively unpolluted beach near the centre of the city. Some of the larger cities, namely Melbourne and Sydney, suffer pollution because wharves and sea terminals mix with nearby beaches and make it impossible for them to be enjoyed by seaside visitors. Adelaide has nearby beaches which are clean and quiet for a family-type situation, where people can visit for safe swimming.

There is no reason why the tourism potential in this area should not continue to expand. I am a strong supporter of the tourism development strategy plan that is currently being undertaken by the Western Metropolitan Regional Organisation. It is hoped that this report will be completed soon. Arising from the report I hope that we will see substantial gains and development that will assist economic activity in this area. I have been in the privileged position of being able to see some of the draft plans, although this study has not yet been completed. I visualise that there will emerge some recommendations that will be of benefit to the whole western area. One disappointment is that local traders have not put their shoulders to the wheel, so to speak. I hope that during the next four years we will see development so that local traders will assist in promoting both tourism and their own interest in the area.

During the past few days my attention has been drawn to a series of protest meetings that have been held in various parts of the State, particularly in the western area, relating to alleged cutbacks in child-care services. I understand that these cutbacks will include increasing fees for child-care services and involve the reduction of capital grants for equipment. I have been given to understand that the Federal Government intends to cut back the budget on child-care by approximately \$10 million this financial year. I am sympathetic to the people who are protesting and I believe that it is any person's right, be it in the industrial or in any other field, to strive continuously for better conditions and improvements. However, I am envious of those areas that have been able to obtain a Commonwealth funded child-care centre. I understand that a protest was recently held about the child-care centre at Port Adelaide. I could not help but feel envious of the fact that, although capital funding for equipment has been cut back and fees were likely to be increased because of new rules introduced by the Commonwealth, at least that area has a child-care centre.

In the electorate of Henley Beach there is dire need for a child-care centre. There is neither a commercial nor a publicly funded child-care centre in operation, and the need is great. Because of the obvious need applying there, I have been unable to fathom why an area as large as the electorate of Henley Beach should have found itself in this situation. I think that there are several reasons for this. One is that the electorate contains a small council—the Henley and

Grange council—and a small portion which is on the outer reaches of the Woodville council.

In addition, over the past decade there has been rapid growth in the area and land once used for horticultural purposes (for growing tomatoes and similar vegetable crops) has been carved up into new housing estates. Therefore, there has been a rapid increase in a population that has no homogeneous base. Many migrant and older Australian families have no real community centre. That is probably another reason why to this point in time there has been no movement to do something positive about child-care.

The Henley and Grange council over the past 2½ years has formed a committee that has striven to do something to overcome this problem. Various organisations in the electorate have approached me, as their representative, to see what I can do. The three kindergartens in the electorate have all contacted me expressing grave concern that there is no child-care centre. From time to time mothers have approached me with problems in finding suitable child-care, either as a respite to have children looked after in the case of illness, for short periods of annual leave, trips away and other problems of a short term nature. There is a great need especially for casual child-care services in the electorate.

The success of a child-care centre in the nearby electorate of Albert Park, in the suburb of Seaton, is undoubtedly a pointer to what would happen if child-care was established in my electorate. I congratulate the member for Albert Park on the way in which he has been able to gain child-care services for the people of his electorate.

Mr Hamilton: They are not without problems, though.

Mr FERGUSON: I know that the member for Albert Park says that, but it is better to have a child-care centre with problems than to have no child-care centre at all. I have tried over several years to ascertain what I can do as a member to promote the introduction of child-care in the area.

Mr Lewis: Get rid of the red tape.

Mr FERGUSON: I do not disagree with the interjection by the member for Murray Mallee regarding the amount of red tape in relation to Commonwealth State relations involving child-care. I will have something further to say on that in due course. I have approached the Minister from time to time, and I have also approached the Commonwealth representatives, both political and public service, in relation to the matter. Unfortunately, there are no set criteria for the introduction and establishment of child-care, and there is a vague concept (and I use that word advisedly) so far as the introduction in the form of need. Now, who determines that need? Who defines what need is and what steps are taken in order to determine where child-care centres ought to be established? It is very difficult to find out. In a way, I was glad to see the old formula of a submission based proposition going to the Federal Minister. I was glad to see that eliminated. The replacement of establishment of child-care centres on a needs basis is very vague indeed. The criteria have obviously mitigated against the establishment of a child-care centre within my electorate.

The statistics of the local government area would lead one to believe that a child-care centre ought to be established within this area and close to Henley Beach. Local government figures have been passed on to me, and the latest local government figures that I have received indicate that the number of children from the age of 0 to four years old in Henley and Grange rank third on the list of local government areas. Munno Para heads the list with 2 937 children; Port Lincoln comes next with 781; and Henley and Grange follows with 743. Following that, Payneham is next on the list with 683 children.

Since the establishment of these figures, further development has taken place within my area. New housing trust

areas have opened up along Frederick Road and Trimmer Parade, and I feel sure that with the influx of children (if we can take the Grange school as an example), the increase in the number of children attending would lead one to believe that there has been a substantial increase in the number of children from 0 to four years old who would be seeking child-care in one form or another. There would be a substantial increase in these numbers.

The primary difficulty is that the child-care needs in the Henley and Grange area vary, from my observations, from those in other areas. We badly need a centre that would provide occasional care for approximately 25 to 30 children on a rotating basis. I understand from the information that I can glean that the number of children needed to occupy a child-care centre on a regular basis is 40 before a child-care centre would be established. Therefore, on a rotating basis, I believe that that figure would be exceeded within my electorate. Development in my electorate is continuing, with further proposed subdivisions. The Housing Trust has other areas at which it is looking, and I would say that by the end of this parliamentary term the influx and the further establishment of homes in this area will mean that these figures will increase yet again.

The number of working mothers in the coastal areas, on a percentage basis, is not as high as the number of working mothers in the nearby metropolitan areas. This does not, however, reduce the need for a child-care centre within the Henley and Grange area. Many young mothers, for example, would like to continue their studies with the Port Adelaide Community College annexe at Jetty Street, Grange, and, unfortunately, because of the lack of child-care facilities, this objective is not available to them. It is highly desirable that child-care provisions be available for the mothers in the area in order to provide the opportunities that young mothers would require to continue with their studies. The current downturn in the employment situation which has led to unemployment for working mothers who, under normal circumstances, would be working is another factor which relates to the downturn in the number of working mothers in this area, mitigating against an increase in child-care.

One of the disadvantages of being in a seaside electorate (which otherwise has advantages for constituents) is that, so far as statistics are concerned, community welfare services are hardly ever placed in coastal areas. The coastal area, of course, has the problem of the sea on one side, and the nearby inner city areas have the advantage of being landlocked and are therefore able to provide better statistics for a base in order to provide arguments regarding facilities. I must, however, express my satisfaction at the increase in social welfare grants, both to the Henley HUG organisation and to the Women's Information Service at Henley Beach, and I would hope that in no small way have I been able to contribute to the increase in funding for these particularly worthwhile organisations. But, notwithstanding that, when one looks at the sort of statistics that can be produced in the geographical situation that Henley and Grange is placed in, one sees that the difficulties arise in convincing people, especially as far away as Canberra, that there ought to be child-care facilities in my area.

The number of children in Henley and Grange, according to the Australian statistical data for 1981, was 743 from the 0 to four year old age group and 891 from the five to nine year group. I am sure that these figures have increased substantially, and as soon as the next statistic figures are available I am sure that we will be able to produce some more impressive figures. For 1981, family heads with dependants equalled 287 families, which is 4.78 per cent of all families. This is an increase on the 1976 family heads with dependants, which represented 3.9 per cent of all families.

Quite apart from the informal care network family day care co-ordinated by the Department of Community Welfare, no other child-care services are operating in Henley and Grange. At present there are 11 mothers caring for other women's children in their own homes under this scheme. This provides placement for only 35 children and this was at August 1984. However, the scheme cannot meet the demand as additional mothers requiring care for their children at present are refused and insufficient places are available. Little capacity exists for this scheme to expand as only one coordinator is responsible not only for Henley and Grange but also for the Thebarton and West Torrens area. I am an executive member of the Grange CYSS organisations. I was formerly president of that organisation and I have been a member of the executive for approximately five years.

I know that from time to time there are inquiries from people who want to join this scheme but who are unable to do so because no child-care facilities are available. It is a great pity not only that young mothers are being penalised as far as child-care facilities are concerned but also that they cannot use some of the money that has been set aside to assist them because they are young unemployed. It is bad enough that they suffer the handicap of being young unemployed with insufficient skills, not being able to find a job, but in addition the money that has been put aside by the Commonwealth Government to assist participants to gain sufficient skills so that they can obtain employment is not available to young mothers because of the lack of child-care facilities.

I am very proud and I feel a sense of satisfaction that it was a Federal Labor Government that increased child-care facilities substantially. The previous Federal Liberal Administration refused to tackle this problem at all, and the amount of money that has been injected by the Federal Labor Government into this area is to its very great credit. It is somewhat frustrating to me, being a member in a coastal area where the need is great, to have to watch with some envy the establishment of facilities in other areas and finding myself in the situation where I continually have to plead for further child-care facilities within my district.

I refer to correspondence that I have received from a mother in my district. This letter tells the story. Addressed to me as the local member, the letter states:

Dear Sir,

I am writing to bring to your attention recent difficulties I have experienced in obtaining quality child-care in your electorate, and, having read of your previous efforts to draw the Government's attention to this serious problem, hope that you will continue to work towards this end on our behalf.

During October 1985 it became necessary to make new child-care arrangements for the coming year for our young daughter, so we began then to investigate the various facilities in our area. We soon discovered that our choices were very limited and the type of care given not entirely suited to our particular requirements. As we are both professional people who have decided to continue our separate careers, we are concerned that the child-care we employ be of the highest possible standard and so we are quite willing to pay for this privilege. Yet it would seem, particularly in the western suburbs, that the demand for this service far outweighs the supply.

As our child is now three years old, we felt that she was ready to cope well with a creche situation, and so we began the rounds of the three available to us. One was already fully booked with a lengthy waiting list; another upon inspection proved to be too large and not suitable for our child; the third we visited we were very impressed with, and it appeared our daughter would settle well there.

However, after some initial confusion about numbers, we were eventually told that we would be placed on a waiting list. Despite the fact that our application was high on the waiting list, it was no guarantee that our daughter would have a place there in 1986; this proved later to be true.

And so we began to investigate the arrangements provided by the Family Day Care Service. By this time, however, we were in November/December 1985, trying to finalise an arrangement for

February 1986. The staff in the offices we contacted, although exceptionally sympathetic, were not in a position to help us, because our need was not immediate. In other words, they would not be able to work on our particular arrangements until about a fortnight ahead of the time that the child-care was actually necessary and, therefore, we could not make any suitable arrangements ahead of Christmas and holidays. In any case, both offices (Woodville and Thebarton) had waiting lists of up to 14 placements at the time I rang.

I wish to bring particularly to your attention the unnecessary worry and concern that this sort of over-burdening of child-care facilities places on parents. The whole process of arranging suitable quality care is fraught with anxiety and frustration, because it is impossible to plan ahead with any certainty or, in many circumstances, take advantage of the child care of your immediate choice.

In my professional capacity I have the opportunity to speak to many parents who are or have been interested in arranging child-care. It would seem that our case is not an isolated one, and, judging by the waiting lists and how slowly they are upgraded, anyone anticipating a place for their child in a child-care centre is forced to make long term alternative arrangements.

We have been fortunate to find a suitable place for our child, but I might add only two weeks before I began work again in February 1986. All these uncertainties of child-care have forced my husband and I to re-organise our working hours, and as a consequence we have decided to both remain at home one day a week so that we need child-care arrangements for only three days in the middle of the week.

We are fortunate that economically we can bear this loss in salary for a year or so and that our employers are compassionate and understanding people who have allowed us these adjustments in working hours. I cannot but feel great sympathy and concern for parents, and their children, who cannot arrange similar readjustments and are forced to place their children in care that may be suitable but not entirely satisfactory.

I hope that you are able through your representations to improve the availability of quality child-care facilities in this area as I am sure the need is very great. Parents cannot be expected to operate as efficient, happy members of the workforce if they cannot leave their children in the best care available.

A signature is appended to the bottom of the letter. That correspondence is from a professional person who, of course, has the ability to express herself on paper, but that does not apply to a lot of the people who are seeking child-care in my district. The problem is, of course, that statistics reveal that the people in my district receive an average wage, and thus it is not perceived as an area of need. This is very unfair on those poor and poverty stricken people who live next door to people in better circumstances. People are being penalised because they are living in an area in which some people receive higher wages, although others receive lower wages. Therefore, the people far away in Canberra cannot see the necessity for the establishment of child-care centres in my district.

I believe that I have been elected to represent the people of Henley Beach and, if a facility is lacking, it is my duty to make that fact known to the Parliament at every opportunity, and I make no apology for doing so. I believe that the time has come for further action. I would say that there has been a slight difficulty in that the Minister of Community Welfare was responsible for this area but the matter was handed to the Minister of Education. I am not critical of that.

Now, however, we have seen a change back to the original Minister. I have made vigorous representations to both Ministers. I imagine that there has been a little difficulty as a result of the portfolio moving around, and the position has been slightly unsettled. However, I intend to continue to make vigorous representations until a child-care centre has been established in my area.

I have yet to hear arguments why the child-care centre ought not be established in the Henley Beach District. Indeed, I should be interested to hear arguments either from the public or from the Minister, or from anyone else, as to why a child-care centre should not be established within my district. That would make my task a little easier, because

at least it would give me a basis on which I could try to refute any contrary arguments put up.

No contrary arguments have been advanced from any person, and I shall be interested to find out whether anyone can put a contrary argument and say why a child-care centre should not be established within my district. Unfortunately, it is like trying to wrestle with a blancmange: there is nothing substantial in the arguments that have been put as to why a child-care centre should not be established. Everyone is being sympathetic, including federal public servants and the federal Minister. I had the opportunity to approach the federal Minister on this subject and I may have taken too much of his time because I dominated a delegation from several areas. However, I believe that I must use every weapon available to me and take every opportunity to advance this matter.

Mr Oswald interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: The honourable member who is interjecting and his colleagues have nothing to be proud of in the matter of child care. While we had a Liberal Administration, we saw no progress in child care. In fact, I remember having to run around my district from kindergarten to kindergarten and from meeting to meeting. As a parliamentary candidate at that time, I attended protest meetings of people in the kindergarten area when the then Liberal Government was determining to raise child-care fees. Not only did we not have any child care: there was absolute inertia on the part of the federal Liberal Government. I should be interested to hear from an Opposition member how much money the Fraser Government was willing to give the States for the provision of child care. One would need the biggest magnifying glass ever produced to see that amount, because the Fraser Government would not spend even a dollar toward taking over this vital facility.

Mr Oswald interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: If the honourable member had been listening instead of going to sleep, he would have heard what I said earlier. I am proud of child care as a general proposition in South Australia. More child-care centres have been established in this State over the past three years than in the preceding 20 years. That improvement has resulted from a change in the Administration in Canberra. However, to my chagrin I have not seen even one child-care centre established in Henley Beach, even though the area richly deserves one. In conclusion, it is with pride that I support the motion.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): First, Mr Speaker, let me congratulate you on your elevation to the highest office in this House. I can understand how proud your family must feel on your attaining this high office. Moreover, I know that you will fulfil the functions of your office with dignity, fairness and, no doubt, the occasional touch of humour to which we have been accustomed from you.

To my colleague the member for Henley Beach, who protects my southern flank, I offer my heartiest congratulation on his appointment as Chairman of Committees. Over the past three years, he has demonstrated to those who have served with him his tremendous capacity in all forums of the Party and his fairness to all concerned. Clearly, his elevation to his new position has resulted not only from his ability to serve this Parliament but also from his dedication to the Labor Party in which he has filled every position except that of State Secretary. He has also rendered long service and derived much experience in the trade union movement, especially in his union (the Printing and Kindred Industries Union). Such a record of service has fitted him for his responsible position in this House.

I also offer my congratulations to the new member for Price on his election to this Parliament. I expect that he

will have a long parliamentary career because, like other Labor members, he has a desire to work and look after his constituents, which augurs well for the western suburbs of Adelaide. That area will be serviced by a Labor team which is prepared to work for and which has a deep knowledge and understanding of the constituents they represent. Having the member for Price on my northern flank affords me a degree of protection. I did not experience complete protection in this way when I first came into Parliament, and it is nice to know that one can work with adjacent members who have a Labor philosophy and believe in looking after their constituents.

The new members for Adelaide, Briggs, Fisher, Newland, Bright, and Whyalla have all shown that the future of the Labor Government and of the Party itself is in the hands of capable, energetic and understanding men and women. Indeed, South Australia can look forward to at least another 12 years of Bannon Labor Government. When mentioning that Government, one must give credit to the Premier for his leadership, especially during the first years of his Government. Times were difficult then and we were told that they would be tough, but the Premier showed the way and, despite the forecasts of some doubting Thomases, we came through, and full credit must be given not only to the Premier but also to the Cabinet that has served so well since 1982. Speaking of Cabinet Ministers, I congratulate the continuing Ministers on their re-election and the member for Unley on his election as a Cabinet Minister.

Before addressing the motion before the Chair, I wish to comment on the so-called contributions of members opposite in this debate yesterday. Despite the gibes by the member for Kavel regarding my so-called relegation to the backbenches, let me say a number of things. First, the member for Kavel will never again in his parliamentary career sit on this side of the House: indeed, it is his swan song. I believe that his contribution during the past three years contributed to the lack of community support for the Liberal Party. On a number of occasions (and I call a spade a spade), the Leader of the Opposition gave us a little bit of a roughing up, but then we had the foolish contributions, to which we became accustomed, by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition who, rather than attacking the philosophies and policies of the Labor Party, let the side down by making personal attacks on members.

The Hon. J.W. Slater interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: As my colleague was about to say, he has not learnt from that demise that he brought about for his own Party. Very early in public life I learnt that, when one starts to abuse one's opponents or tries to bring them down, it does not pay off. I think that the trade union movement is a rather tough occupation, or at least I found it so when I stood for office, but I once criticised an opponent. My colleagues would know of Nick Alexandrides, who taught me a hell of a lot, and I believe that my position today is due to his guidance. He told me never to attack an opponent but, rather, to go out with policies, sell them to the community and justify what you are doing, and not to worry about those knockers who are around you. That was good advice and I will never forget him, not only because of his wisdom but also for his friendship, which unfortunately was short circuited because of his death.

The so-called Olsen-Goldsworthy team is a combination of young and old, the sort of combination where one normally expects a degree of wisdom to be imparted to the younger person, but in the case of members opposite I do not believe that to have been the situation. Unfortunately, they have no-one on their side with sufficient ability, so over at least the next four years members opposite are literally stuck with the team that led them to their worst defeat.

Before turning to the issues at hand, I want to place on record my appreciation to the electors of Albert Park for re-electing me, and my appreciation of the tremendous support received from those hundreds of people who have assisted me, not only during the last election but indeed over the past seven years. Rather than assisting Kevin Hamilton, they assisted the Labor Party to retain the seat of Albert Park. The local branch of the Labor Party in Albert Park may not have a great deal of money, but what we do have is people who are prepared to go out and work hard in order to assist the movement in that electorate. They consist of people from all walks of life, including the western part of my electorate in the West Lakes area. For many years the Liberal Party thought that that was its domain: it took them for granted, but paid the penalty at the ballot box. Despite the redistribution of electoral boundaries, the figures resulting from the last election are interesting. I seek leave to insert in *Hansard* a statistical table of information relative to this matter.

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

Mr HAMILTON: Sir, I would not lie to you.

Leave granted.

ALBERT PARK			
Enrolment		20 094	
Voted		18 920	
Formal		18 335	
Informal		585	
First preference votes			
Candidate	Party	N	%
Malone, J.L.	AD	795	4.3
Hamilton, K.C. (SM)	ALP	11 015	60.1
MacKenzie, B.	LIB.	6 525	35.6
Two-Party votes		N	%
	ALP	11 530	62.9
	LIB.	6 805	37.1
Shift from 1982			
ALP (first pref.)		-0.9%	
(two Party)		-1.1%	
LIB. (first pref.)		+1.6%	
(two Party)		+1.1%	
Swing to Lose (first pref.)		10.2%	
	(two Party)	13.0%	

Mr HAMILTON: Turning now to some of the issues that were canvassed during the last State election, particularly in the seat of Albert Park—

The Hon. J.W. Slater interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Yes, as my colleague constantly reminds me, the achievements in that district over the past six years, and especially in the past three years, have been somewhat remarkable, particularly with the assistance from my parliamentary colleagues and many other people in the community. I am well aware that people sometimes forget, so I thought that it was incumbent upon me, leading up to the last State election, to remind my constituents what had taken place in the Albert Park electorate. Of course, the very controversial issue of the lighting at Football Park, which dragged on for many years, was finally resolved.

On the question of law and order, the Liberal Party had a great deal to say in the 1979 State election. I commented in this Parliament that some of the advertisements were lower than shark's droppings and were on the bottom of the ocean. Experience of those three years spurred me to question the Liberal Tonkin Government about what it was doing about law and order. That Government was found to be deficient in its policies on law and order in many areas. Being cognisant of what I would call its very low attempts at politicising this area, I decided that I would go out to the community and find out the problems people had.

Indeed, since 1979 four public meetings have been held dealing with the question of crime and vandalism in my electorate. In 1983—and this is on record—in this Parliament I urged the State Government to introduce the Neighbourhood Watch Scheme. I initiated that scheme, having presented to the State Parliament a petition of 1 400 signatures asking not only for the Neighbourhood Watch Scheme in my electorate: at those public meetings I also pressed for stronger council by-laws to crack down on abuse, vandalism and indeed disruption to the local community, and that action has been well received.

I initiated that scheme, having presented to the State Parliament a petition of 1 400 signatures asking not only for the Neighbourhood Watch Scheme in my electorate: at those public meetings I also pressed for stronger council by-laws to crack down on abuse, vandalism and indeed disruption to the local community, and that action has been well received.

In terms of the elderly, I campaigned for and achieved greater access to public beaches for our aged and disabled. I am proud to say that I was involved in that area, too. Since 1983, I have actively promoted the need for a granny flat scheme in this State. On a number of occasions I have related to this Parliament the fact that I have been to Victoria and seen the scheme operating in that State. Unfortunately, it has not gained the acceptance that I had hoped, but that will not deter me. I believe that a number of councils in South Australia still strongly oppose the introduction of the granny flat scheme, but I believe that those problems can be worked through.

In terms of small business, like my colleague the member for Henley Beach, I have made it my business to go around my electorate to speak to small business people, to disseminate information and to tell them where they can obtain assistance, and the like, and that has been well received. On one memorable occasion, I can recall meeting you, Mr Speaker, on our common boundary, with you on one side of the road and me on the other, and we put this information out to the small business people within our respective electorates.

I will come back to the matter of tourism later. However, in relation to traffic control, a tremendous amount has been done in the Albert Park area and I list the following: traffic lights at the Frederick Road and Old Port Road intersection; the lights at the Trimmer Parade and Frederick Street intersection; the turn right indicators at the Trimmer Parade and Tapleys Hill Road intersection; the pedestrian lights opposite the Albert Park railway station; the pedestrian lights on Tapleys Hill Road in the Royal Park area; and our expressed opposition to the installation of a median strip on Tapleys Hill Road.

The question of the median strip on Findon Road has yet to be resolved. This is a matter of concern also to the member for Spence and you, Mr Deputy Speaker, as that road borders the electorates of Spence and Henley Beach as well as mine. I have put to the Minister that I believe that before any concrete median strip is installed by the Highways Department sandbags should first be placed on a trial basis where it is proposed to install the median strip to ascertain the reaction of the people in the area.

I have actively supported the need for tourism promotion in the western suburbs. As you, Sir, are well aware, the western suburbs have much to offer in terms of tourism. Captain Sturt's cottage is in the electorate of Henley Beach, and then one can work one's way down to Football Park. The South Australian Football League has told me that in excess of 12 000 people a year visit Football Park just to see what that stadium contains in the way of facilities, and I was somewhat surprised by that. The development around West Lakes has a lot to offer tourists from not only the country but also interstate and overseas.

The South Australian Film Corporation has a lot to offer, and those who have visited the Hendon studios would be well aware of the facilities supporting the sound stages for the film *Playing Beatie Bow*. I highly recommend this film to those members who have not already seen it. The set is tremendous, and I believe that that sort of set should be allowed to stand to promote the efforts of the South Australian Film Corporation.

Since 1979 I have campaigned for a hydrotherapy pool to be installed at Royal Park. A commitment was given by

the present Minister of Health, Dr John Cornwall, when we were in Opposition. He honoured that undertaking when the Labor Government was elected to office, and the hydrotherapy pool became a reality. I delight in repeating, time and time again in this Parliament, comments that were made by former Premier Tonkin on 4 October 1979. I think the people of South Australia should appreciate what has been achieved despite utterances of members of the former Government in relation to helping people in the work force and particularly the disabled.

At the opening of the hydrotherapy pool former Premier Tonkin said, after being asked to pay or 'hit the kick' for \$300 000 for that pool, 'I have learnt three new words since becoming Premier: the first two are "How much" and the third is "No".' I constantly reminded the former member for Davenport of the statement made by the then Premier. However, nothing was done until the present Government came to office and put its money where its mouth was. That pool is now there to assist those people in the community less fortunate than ourselves.

In terms of recreation and sport, I spent hours upon hours going to the then Minister of Recreation and Sport concerning money for the development of the Hawkesbury Reserve. I was told, 'Yes, Kevin, no problems, we will fix it up.' However, what was done? 'Sweet FA, mate' I think is the expression that is used out in the community—'Sweet Fanny Adams' I think is the expression for those on the other side who are starting to get excited. When the present Government came to office I arranged a meeting with the Minister of Local Government (Hon. Terry Hemmings). We went to the West Lakes Community Club. The management was very hostile towards the Labor Government. We sat down with the Minister and his adviser. We learnt that a lot of utterances had been made by the Tonkin Government about money that would be allocated. We then learnt that not a red cent had been allocated. The Minister then said that he, in conjunction with his colleague the Hon. Jack Slater, would provide \$10 000 for a needs study, and that was undertaken. Subsequently, it was proven that there was a need for the facility and as a consequence \$225 000 was allocated by the present Government for the Hawkesbury Reserve land acquisition. Some people, not of our political persuasion, believe it was only a paper transfer. I think they will be very enlightened upon looking at the documentation. On the eve of the last State election another \$102 000 went towards the needs of that project, which will cater not only for the people of West Lakes, West Lakes Shore, Semaphore Park, Royal Park, and Seaton but many others outside those suburbs.

In relation to the upgrading of the Port Adelaide sewage treatment works, I pay a tribute to the previous Minister responsible for this matter because money was spent there. Some people got a bit uptight on the occasion when I went down there and wandered into the works—God knows why, because it is literally a stinking place. Some \$2.5 million has been spent on the upgrading of the Port Adelaide sewage treatment works. Unfortunately, the smells still seem to creep out of the brickwork or the woodwork, or whatever. Nonetheless, there has been a significant reduction in the number of complaints from people living in that area.

In terms of public transport, considerable progress has been made since 1979. I must say that some of those 1979 initiatives were the result of the previous Labor Government. There is no question of that, but in this regard full credit must be given to Geoff Virgo, a former Minister of Transport. The easement to the West Lakes Boulevard extension to Clark Terrace is still subject to negotiations, and in the next couple of weeks a deputation will meet with the Minister of Transport to try to resolve the problems

pertaining to a section of playing area which residents feel should not be touched by this new extension.

In terms of other transport needs I refer to the perennial problem of the need for a service along Tapleys Hill Road to Glenelg. This I believe is very important. The introduction of such a service would overcome criticism levelled at the State Transport Authority for not providing an extended service. In your electorate, Sir, a service is provided along Tapleys Hill Road through to the Target shopping centre at Fulham. However, I would like to see a full service along Tapleys Hill Road from Port Road through to Glenelg. I think that would overcome many of the complaints that have been directed to my office and, indeed, to the Henley Beach electorate office. Sir.

I commend the Housing Trust for the magnificent job it has done, although it has thousands of people still on the waiting list. Without the moneys allocated by this Government it would not have been able to provide as much accommodation as it has. Many Housing Trust units are extremely well sited, particularly in the Semaphore Park area, where two storey houses are built on the waterway, on prime real estate, yet the Housing Trust has developed this land for people looking for public housing. In the West Lakes area the Housing Trust has developed units, and this provides a proper mix in the local community.

The past three years has seen a considerable improvement in the electorate of Albert Park, and I commend the Government for that. Without the assistance of the Ministers and the leadership shown there is no doubt that my constituents would not be benefiting from the tremendous achievements of this Government.

As mentioned in the Governor's speech, adoption reforms have to be tackled. I noted with interest the question asked by my colleague today about the panel to recommend reforms to South Australian adoption laws. I understand that enabling legislation will be introduced in the Upper House.

An article in the *Advertiser* on 5 February headed 'I thought adoption was right' outlined the case of a mother who is a resident of the West Lakes area and who, 23 years ago, gave up a baby for adoption at birth. I do not intend to canvass all these matters concerning adoption, as I think they are known to most people with an interest in this area. I feel very strongly for the people involved. In fact, on a number of occasions I have written to the responsible Minister. Women have contacted me, in writing and at my office, particularly concerning the blood group of their children and other problems that they perceive their children could grow up with. I know that this is a sensitive area, but I feel that the Government has the compassion to address this matter in the next four years.

Another matter in which I have taken an interest over the years, and which is in the process of being tackled, relates to the needs of the disabled. While in Western Australia—a place I find fascinating in more ways than one—I contacted the Green and Gold Taxi Service, in Perth, as a result of seeing in the streets a Holden vehicle known as an 'MPT' (multi purpose taxi). The Minister of Transport in Western Australia allowed me the opportunity to inspect this multi purpose taxi. It is a 1982 Holden Shuttle, with a five speed manual column shift. It has a capacity for five regular passengers and one wheelchair, or two regular passengers and two wheelchairs. The vehicle has wheelchair access and air-conditioning. More importantly, the information I have details the faults detected during the operation of this vehicle. It states that the rear hatch entrance is too low for many passengers when seated in wheelchairs and talks about the way that could be remedied. It details that the additional weight of the electric winch platform, the hydraulics, and the frame have very quickly worn out the rear shock absorbers; that the ride for the passenger on

conventional shock absorbers leaves something to be desired, and there is room for improvement in this area.

The information talks about seat belts for the rear bench seats, some of which are quite unsafe, in addition to being an annoyance, as every time a seat is folded down one has to unthread the belt and rethread it. The front passenger seat is very high off the ground and it is very difficult for passengers, especially women, to get into the vehicle. Drivers would prefer the vehicle transmission to be automatic rather than manual. The situation regarding availability of parts for the vehicle is difficult.

The report indicates that the floor coverings should have been of rubberised material rather than carpet, which wrinkles and catches on the wheelchairs. While the Government is addressing this problem, I hope that it is aware of the report commissioned by the Western Australian Government on the transport needs of severely disabled persons. I will make this information available to any member of the House who is interested in reading it. It is very important to assist those in the community who are less fortunate than ourselves.

Other matters of concern to me are problems associated with education. I applaud the Minister's statement that he will provide a telephone hotline to seek the views of parents on education. I understand, from a press article, that this telephone hotline will become operational in April this year and will be open to seek the views of parents, students and others in the community about the way to upgrade excellence, equality and efficiency in schools, the three Es.

A number of schools have a pilot scheme for students to play a greater part in making decisions affecting those schools, in seminars, and for changes to the role and functions of school councils. I hope that the Government gives serious consideration to altering the Education Act so that members of Parliament have the same opportunity for representation on school councils as applies to high schools. I hope the Minister will consider this at a later date.

An ongoing problem is the education of the deaf. The previous Minister is aware of the problems of deaf people. The Woodville Speech and Hearing Centre in my electorate has some problems. Mrs Lillecrapp, who I understand is a constituent of the member for Kavel, has approached me on many occasions about the need of not only the deaf but also in her fight to find adequate education for her profoundly deaf son Brenton. The problem is to provide adequate training for teachers of these children, and I intend to pursue this matter over the years.

Another matter that is outstanding in my electorate is the question of a CEP project. I urged the Hendon Primary School to involve itself in it, but to date the money for that scheme has not been provided. It is frustrating in many ways, when one looks at such a disadvantaged school, particularly when its children come from the poorest part of my electorate, to find that they are missing out on Community Employment Program money, whereas other schools in my electorate not only have had one bite but also look like getting a second bite at the cherry.

Understandably the \$2 000 that the school council and parents of the children have raised for the consultant's fee in this area is perhaps considered by some not to have been wisely spent. I believe that it has been wisely spent, and I would hope that the money that they are seeking is found in the very near future. Most certainly the Minister is aware of my concerns in this area, my having written to him just prior to Christmas last year. So, I am looking forward hopefully to a favourable response on that project.

I know of your concern, Mr Deputy Speaker, for child-care which was amply demonstrated in your contribution. I have received today correspondence from the co-ordinator of the Seaton Community Child-care Centre which was

opened late last year by the then Minister of Education, Lynn Arnold. It was certainly needed in that area as you, Sir, are well aware. In writing to me today, Mrs Jan Washington (the co-ordinator) states:

Dear Kevin,

I am writing to ask you for your advice and assistance with our present financial crisis. As you know, we are a new State and federally subsidised child-care centre, having opened on 30 September 1985. On the advice of the Department of Community Services field officer we are presently negotiating an overdraft with the Commonwealth Bank to cover our present payroll. Why should a federally subsidised child-care centre be asking for a huge overdraft to cover wages within four months of opening? I find it impossible to understand how we are expected to staff, equip and maintain our centre on an inadequate federal subsidy.

The list of expenditure, and so on, is contained in the attached correspondence. I have spoken to the Minister on this matter, and I hope that ways and means can be found to address the problem, because the demands in that area are enormous, as you, Sir, are well aware. I am also informed that the demand far exceeds the capacity, so the lack of places for those children in that area is a real problem.

Another long outstanding matter is the redevelopment of the Seaton High School library centre. The issue goes back over 10 years, and I can understand the frustration, and, indeed, what I have perceived on a number of occasions to be the hostility, of some of the parents whose children attend that school. I know that some achievements have been made since I have been a member, but certainly that does not satisfy the needs of the school council. Indeed, during discussions with the Principal and Chairman of that school council only last week I was again told that the school council intends to pursue the matter until it is satisfactorily resolved.

I also point out to the House that the question of the sale of some land in Russ Avenue in an endeavour to gain money for the redevelopment of the resource centre and library has been put to the Treasurer, I understand through the Minister. I hope that if the land is to be sold the money will be used for this redevelopment. The school has been quite fierce in its approach to this matter over the years. The chairperson of the committee, having been on that committee for some six years, has said that she does not intend to relent on the matter until that has been achieved.

I now refer to the West Lakes High School and the question of the sale of the Spring Street annexe, which is surplus and an outstanding matter for that school. I wrote to the Minister on 18 December, but I will not go through the details. I referred to the concerns of the school, to what is to happen regarding the sale of the annexe and to how the proceeds will be distributed. It is the view of this school that these moneys could be utilised on—or at least a fair proportion of moneys could be allocated to—the adjacent aquatic centre, which is close to the school. I support that notion and believe that the waterway in and around West Lakes, on which I have had a lot to say during my term in Parliament, is certainly a facility that should be utilised. Facilities should be provided in terms of bricks and mortar for people who wish to use the waterway. It is not, as some people suggest, a facility for the elite in the community who can buy canoes and other vessels to sail on the waterway. I understand that this annexe is worth approximately \$100 000 and, if it was sold, some of that money should be contributed towards that building.

I refer also to the question of promotion of tourism in South Australia. The West Lakes waterway is a unique development and, as I have mentioned many times in this place, it attracts an unruly element who seemingly have no concern for residents or other users of the waterway. As I have stated over six years, I have had four public meetings relating to crime and vandalism within the Albert Park

electorate and, more specifically, in and around the West Lakes and Semaphore Park areas in my electorate. During that time I have had numerous discussions with the local constabulary. With the strategic plan that has been introduced throughout South Australia and the various regions, I had the opportunity to speak with Inspector Peter Marshman from the Henley Beach area about this problem. For my next newsletter, I asked for some statements from the inspector which I could convey to my constituents. He said:

I share the obvious concern being felt by residents of the West Lakes area about the problems they are experiencing with vandalism and the like. To be able to best deal with this, the police need as much information as possible.

I would be grateful if those who are affected could write to me at the Henley Beach Police Station, 196 Military Road, Henley Beach, detailing specific incidents and the area and time at which they are occurring. Plans are currently being formulated to deal with the matter, not on a short-term basis but hopefully on a longer term perspective as well. The more knowledge I can gain relative to the extent of the problem, the more effectively we can plan together to combat it.

I certainly support that view, and over the years I have encouraged my constituents to contact the police and to advise me of the problems. While that makes additional work for me, I applaud their efforts in letting me know, because at least I can speak with authority when I go to the police and try to address the problems of vandalism in the area. Once again, like many of my colleagues in this place, I appeal to the Minister who is present in the House for the establishment of a Neighbourhood Watch scheme in my district. I believe that the West Lakes Shore and Semaphore Park area is ideally situated to encompass this type of project.

From speaking to my constituents in those districts, I believe that such a scheme has great public support, as was amply demonstrated in May last year when in excess of 250 people turned up at the West Lakes Football Club to hear what the police had to say about the problem of crime and vandalism in the area.

I refer now to the West Lakes waterway. As many of my ministerial colleagues would know, I have expressed concern about the quality of the water in specific regions of that waterway, particularly around the inlets from the Port River drain and the southern end of the waterway. After discussions with the Minister of Marine going back to last year, I do not believe that this matter has been resolved satisfactorily.

However, I was somewhat surprised, I must confess, to read in *West Lakes Real Estate*, edition No. 19, that was published last year, about the quality of the water and the advice given to people regarding where they should or should not swim. This matter has concerned me for some time. When I last went to Western Australia, I had discussions with people from the EPI, and I ascertained that there are areas that I can pursue. I intend to do that. I will certainly raise the matter with the Minister for Environment and Planning in an attempt to follow up the report of the Western Australian working group, which was commissioned in April 1981 and which provides a guideline for South Australia. I say that because of the statement in the Governor's speech on Tuesday. There is much more that I would like to say on this topic, so I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: COORONG CARAVAN PARK

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Labour): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: During Question Time today information was given to the House relating to an employee of the Coorong Caravan Park. In order to assist the House, I have obtained further information to the reply that I gave during Question Time.

Graham Hay was Manager/Caretaker of the Coorong Caravan Park from July 1984 to 13 January 1986. He was dismissed on that day for:

- (1) Alleged drunkenness.
- (2) Alleged misappropriation of moneys (\$3 000)—recently discovered.
- (3) Failure to carry out duties in a proper manner.
- (4) Failing to bank all moneys received.

A letter setting out complaints was given to him on 22 October 1985. A warning was given on 31 October 1985 advising that he would be replaced unless all proper directions relating to finance and other matters were followed. This did not occur. The question of misappropriation of moneys has been reported to the police for investigation on 10 February 1986 and 13 February 1986.

As a consequence of (1), (2), (3) and (4) above, he was dismissed on 13 January 1986. Mr Hay has taken a reinstatement claim in the Industrial Court, and his case is to be heard on 14 February 1986, but it appears that it will go to arbitration. This information was supplied by his former employer, the Stormen and Packers Union.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move: That the House do now adjourn.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I wish to bring to the attention of the House two or three matters, one of which I referred to last evening in the Address in Reply debate, that is, the insensitivity in relation to the interpretations of various Government departments, both State and Federal. In particular, I referred to the difficulty that has beset people who live in the Adelaide metropolitan area and who are referred by the medical profession to specialist units in other States.

Very briefly, transportation and accommodation are provided for people who are termed 'isolated people', but that interpretation involves only those who live outside the metropolitan area. However, some clinics situated in various capital cities around Australia are looked upon as specific clinics. For example, the melanoma cancer clinic is based in Sydney and the craneomaxilla facial unit is based here in South Australia. Because of the narrowness of interpretations at present, people who live in the metropolitan area of other capital cities and who are referred to Adelaide are not treated as isolated patients, when in all true regards, I suggest, a person from, say, Brisbane is isolated from Adelaide, as a person from Adelaide is isolated from Sydney, Brisbane, Perth, and so on.

I suggest that the true interpretation and one that I hope will be forthcoming when this matter is drawn to the attention of the Hon. Neal Blewett, the Federal Minister for Health, is that the capital cities should be taken as being isolated one from the other. If a resident of South Australia is directed to New South Wales, regardless of where he lives in South Australia, he would be a beneficiary of the isolated persons assistance scheme. Even officers within the system recognise the inequity of the function that they must fulfil, yet they have been unable to obtain from the higher powers the necessary direction that would allow proper assistance to be given to people who need help.

In this respect, I predict that it will not be long before new members in this House find the bureaucracy and the

interpretation imposed by some departments and certain officers, albeit not all officers, galling to them. It behoves members on both sides to put into the system, either by way of grievance as I am doing now or by direct approach to a State or Federal Minister as the case may be, examples of services that are not being adequately delivered to the whole community, resulting in unnecessary discrimination against some people in the community. It is only by members of Parliament exercising their right of free speech and drawing attention to these matters that an argument with a computer or a bureaucrat will finally bear fruit. I look forward to action being taken soon that will bear fruit in the form of assistance for people under the isolated persons assistance scheme.

I intended to speak at length this evening on meat hygiene and the position of country operators who have registered slaughterhouses. With the passage of the meat hygiene legislation it became necessary for people to register their premises as country slaughterhouses or to seek to upgrade to abattoirs. This resulted in an increased capital outlay to put the works in an acceptable state as an abattoir and also required that an inspector be employed on site to undertake inspections that are part of an abattoir operation as opposed to a country slaughterhouse operation.

However, after a brief discussion with the Minister of Agriculture earlier this afternoon (and I compliment him on the speed with which he has acted), the problem to which I intended to refer has dissipated: the meat operator who was in some difficulty will meet with the Minister, an officer of the Meat Hygiene Division and me to see whether we cannot resolve a matter that has been proceeding for 3½ years and has caused major concern to one of my former constituents who is now a constituent of the Leader of the Opposition as a result of the change in boundaries at the recent election.

I trust that the assistance previously given by the Hon. Frank Blevins, when Minister of Agriculture, and the subsequent approach suggested by the present Minister of Agriculture will result in certain untenable circumstances being sorted out and that the benefit will result not only to the operator to whom I refer but also to the shops that rely on him for their meat and, through those shops, to the customers of those outlets. My former constituent is most anxious to fulfil his obligation to the authority. He has been working closely and diligently with officers of the authority now for some months, yet the top level of the authority has seen fit not to accept that he is purposeful in his attitude towards upgrading. I hope that that matter can be sorted out.

I now draw attention to the governmental system that fails to take account of the silly season, that period between about mid-December and the end of January, when many people, including professionals, take their holidays. Recently, I approached the Deputy Premier about a person who had been offered a contract price for the subdivision of a property. This amounted to a five-figure sum as regards expenditure to the E&WS Department to make available the necessary certificate to enable the subdivision to proceed. My client was placed in an invidious position because the firm of solicitors with which he had been dealing closed shop for some time and his personal solicitor was on a four-week extended holiday at the time. The 60 days available to him to close the transaction was therefore too short a time as a result of these contingencies.

Although it was not possible under the Act, I thank the Minister for extending by seven days the period during which the person had the responsibility of submitting the cash. The transaction has now been satisfactorily finalised, and I believe that justice has been done. I raise the matter only because I feel that there is an urgent need, by way of

regulation, Ministerial direction or, if necessary, legislative change, to insert an extended period of time where there are extenuating circumstances concerning access to offices, Government officers or the like. Certainly, with the governmental system closing down between Christmas Eve and the day after New Year, the situation to which I have referred arises.

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

Ms LENEHAN (Mawson): In taking part in this adjournment debate, I wish to refer to the new members of the House. I had intended to refer in detail in the Address in Reply debate to the calibre and quality of the new members on this side, and now I am pleased to do so. In this respect, I do not wish to reflect on the Opposition, but I do not know the newly elected gentlemen on the Opposition side. However, I know the new Labor members very well. Over the past two or three days we have had the pleasure and privilege of listening to the maiden speeches of the six new Labor members, and I believe that that number must surely constitute some sort of record.

I was delighted that the member for Newland was chosen to move the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I congratulate her on her maiden speech. In a strange and in some ways intimidating environment it is not easy to be, as is often said, the first cab off the rank. I remember very well my own maiden speech and how nervous I was on that occasion. However, if the member for Newland was nervous she did not show it. She gave us a perceptive look at her district, and I congratulate her on her successful efforts to be elected as member for that district. Indeed, no member deserves to be here more than does the member for Newland.

The next member to whom I wish to refer is the member for Briggs, who seconded the motion. I will again be referring to the member for Briggs later, because I think it is very important to look at the way that the Opposition has managed to cope with what the member for Briggs had to say.

Of course, the member for Adelaide is no stranger to this House, because in the past three years he has worked tirelessly as Personal Assistant to the Attorney-General. I congratulate him on his maiden speech. Once again, I believe that it showed a perception and understanding of the issues involved in his electorate and the way in which he has sensitively and caringly gone about winning that seat not just over the past three years but in fact over the past six years. It shows that a willingness to work tirelessly over that period has paid off.

The next member to make his maiden speech was the member for Fisher. Of course, I congratulate the member for Fisher with a great deal of affection and I guess a great deal of delight because, as this House knows, in the previous election he was my campaign director. I would like to be able to say that in terms of how to win campaigns I taught him a few tricks, but that does not in any way detract from his hard work, ability and belief that he would win Fisher from the day that he was preselected. I am delighted that that belief came to fruition.

The member for Price was the next member to make a maiden speech, and I congratulate him. Of course, although Price is not by any stretch of the imagination a marginal seat, it has very special problems. I believe it was very important for the honourable member to point out those problems and the kind of solutions that should be applied to his electorate and the direction he plans to take in this Parliament.

The last member to speak in the Address in Reply was the member for Bright. I think we would all have to say

that the slogan, 'A bright young man for Bright' certainly paid off and his electorate recognised his sensitivity, honesty and compassion by voting for him. I believe that he exhibits (and I know him very well) a degree of integrity and honesty that I am delighted he was prepared to carry with him into this Parliament. I believe that we will all be richer for having worked with and known the member for Bright.

Returning to the member for Briggs, as a relatively new member it disturbed me to observe that, whilst we have conventions in this Parliament that new members and their maiden speeches are heard in silence, it was my understanding that we also had a convention where new members were accorded the courtesy of having their speeches referred to in complimentary terms only or, if people did not want to be complimentary, not referred to at all. However, I was absolutely amazed to hear the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, in his Address in Reply speech, not only attack the principles and the philosophies for which the member stands—and that is what we are here for: we have different philosophies and principles and that is the role of the Opposition—but also personally attack the member for Briggs. That makes me feel very sad and angry, because it detracts from the quality of any kind of standard in parliamentary debate.

The Deputy Leader attacked him with the sort of slander that would be actionable outside Parliament. I raise this because no, we do not have narrow shoulders; we have very broad shoulders, and we certainly have the numbers in respect of this Parliament, but I cannot help thinking that the Deputy Leader sees the member for Briggs as fulfilling his role as the Press Secretary to the Premier so effectively and efficiently, and having had such a key and major role in the winning of the last State election that he feels very aggrieved. He does not like that, and we all know how the Deputy Leader responds when he does not like things—he resorts to personal slander and personal attack.

What has happened? The member for Briggs has taken his position in this Parliament and has continued to exhibit the same degree of effectiveness and professionalism that he took to his last job, and the Deputy Leader does not like it. He sees the six new backbenchers as a threat. He sees the quality, calibre, professionalism and, most importantly, the commitment (and I think that is an important word) and dedication of the new backbench members as a threat. Having members on this side of the House who are prepared to put the research and their own souls, if you like, into their maiden speeches will make the job of the Opposition 10 times harder, and it does not like that, to the extent that it was prepared to break and flout an unwritten convention. I acknowledge that it is an unwritten convention but, after asking members who have been in this House for a longer time than I, I understand that it has been a convention where you do not personally attack a new member in respect of his maiden speech. If that is how the Opposition wants to play it, that is the way they will play it, and so be it.

The Hon. R.K. Abbott interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: My colleague points out that they do not know how to behave properly. If that is the way they want to conduct themselves, let them, because it is the bleating of desperate people. They have no policies or program and they have no hope for the future. The people of South Australia unequivocally rejected the Liberal Party's negativism and personal slander. I do not have to look any further than myself for an example. The member for Morphett knows what I am talking about. The Opposition had to resort to a personal attack on my family, and myself. I will be talking about what happened to my vote in my Address in Reply: it went up by one of the biggest margins of any electorate in this State. My electorate showed in their vote how they felt about that personal attack.

I think it would behove the Opposition to have a look at the sorts of things that this Government did. We stood up positively and did not personally attack members and their families. We stood up on issues and policies and we won fairly and cleanly. That is what the people of South Australia want. I am proud that I am a member of this Government, that the six new members who have joined me as Government backbenchers have carried on that tradition of not personally attacking members of the Opposition, and that they have stood up on policy. I congratulate them.

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

Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide): Rather than beginning this address by misquoting Abraham Lincoln, I might in fact begin by quoting him correctly. Before doing so, might I indicate that misquoting Abraham Lincoln seems to have become a characteristic of members opposite. In the past 24 hours, since he was last misquoted, I have gone through some documents and I find that, at least as far as I was able to go, the trend started in 1979, before the election, when there was an advertisement in the *Sunday Mail* which contained an entire misquote and misappropriation of some words of an otherwise unknown person into the mouth of Abraham Lincoln. It carried on in 1980, when the current Leader of the Opposition was a member of the backbench and writing in the *News*.

It then carried on in 1982, in the maiden speech that was given by the member for Goyder, and still has not stopped, because yesterday, as I think the member for Briggs pointed out, the member for Goyder again misquoted the same Abraham Lincoln comment.

Let me start by quoting him correctly—and I will use this as the theme for the few minutes that I have available to me this evening, the theme of unemployment and job creation schemes. Abraham Lincoln said:

The monetary needs of increasing numbers of people advancing towards higher standards of living can and should be met by the Government.

I want to look particularly at unemployment schemes and job creation schemes, because unemployment is a social evil: it is not just an indicator of poor economic performance.

It is a social evil, because unemployed people are in fact not statistics. Therefore, the situation is that the solution must be based on getting people into work rather than simply reducing the statistics. Unemployment is affecting a large number of people in our community. Yesterday I spoke about the housing difficulties that young people find themselves in. In addition to housing difficulties they also have employment difficulties, and there are enormous costs and casualties in relation to being unemployed and without work, because for many people work provides the pattern in which their lives are lived. When that pattern is thrown out or never established, and when the responsibility that goes with that is never provided to young people, they have no way of becoming part of the social environment in which we live.

What happens is that, as a result of having no work, young people particularly lose faith in the society and government which is supposed to provide for them. They do not develop work habits, which mitigates future employment opportunities. Their self-esteem is damaged, family tensions begin to increase, and young people start to get into trouble with the law. It is for those reasons that job creation schemes are so important. Those sentiments in relation to consequences of unemployment are not simply recognised by members on this side of the House but by those on both sides. I refer to the Liberal Party's policy statement, issued by the Leader of the Opposition, in which

the Liberal Party acknowledged that research has shown that the least skilled, especially the early school leavers, of our youth become the prime target for unemployment. It is that group which is least likely to participate in further education. The document states:

Ultimately, the only solution to unemployment is to increase the number of jobs that are available in the community.

However, the document also indicates:

The Community Employment Program has consumed millions of dollars of taxpayers' money with very little tangible benefit to the unemployed.

The Department of Industrial Relations has just issued a Community Employment Program assessment at the conclusion of the second year of operation of that program. I suggest that this makes very good reading for those people interested in the Community Employment Programs. These programs are providing a start for young people as well as opportunities to get back into the work force for those older people who have been thrown out of it, and thus is providing a major social need. This document, which has just been issued, indicates that the Community Employment Program is the largest and most ambitious program of its type ever undertaken by a Government in Australia. It is being directed specifically at people who have been out of work for some time. The achievements of the program, until June 1985, were as follows: a total of 78 595 jobs had been approved; and 75 519 unemployed persons had been placed on CEP projects.

Mr Ingerson: What is the long term projection?

Mr DUGAN: Would you rather those people be out of work? The placement of unemployed people from the program set targets which are accountable for 83 per cent of all the placements that have been made in the workplace to 30 June last year. Sixty per cent of all people placed have been long term unemployed persons who would not otherwise have gained employment. The problem being addressed by the CEP program concerned the increasing number of people out of work or unable to get into the work force as a result of the sluggish growth in the 1970s and early 1980s. As unemployment rose during that time so did the average period for which a person was out of work. In 1970 the average length of a spell of unemployment was less than

two months, whereas in 1983 it was 10 months. It was against that sort of background that the program was conceived. It has provided, at least for the 80 000 or so young people and others who have been involved, an opportunity to get into the work force.

I refer honourable members to two tables in this document, one of which provides a summary of the outcome of the employment programs to the actual participants. Of those 80 000 people placed on the program, an average of about 40 per cent to 50 per cent of people have now been able to take up full time work, because they were provided in that short term period with the skills and work experience necessary to get into the work force in the first place. Without that experience they simply would not have got in there. Other benefits that flow from programs such as the Community Employment Program relate to community spin-offs. Again, I refer honourable members to a table relating to the project, which indicates that there has been a significant improvement in the areas of community health and welfare, and child-care and age facilities available to our community as a result of people who otherwise would have been out of work being able to participate in the work force.

A major commitment was given by the Government to youth unemployment and training before the last election. I hope that this will continue to provide an opportunity for young people in South Australia. I conclude by referring to an address which was given by the Minister of Youth Affairs (Hon. Barbara Wiese). In commenting on the policy of the Liberal Party, she said:

To reduce the wages of young people further would simply economically disadvantage them and would not lead to any increase in employment.

That is the option that members opposite think would get young people into the work force. The Minister of Youth Affairs concluded by saying that she thought it was:

... incumbent on the Liberal Party to seriously and rationally consider the problem besetting young people and to take notice of the evidence and not simply to follow their obsessions.

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

Motion carried.

At 5.28 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 18 February at 2 p.m.