

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 21 July 1981

The SPEAKER (Hon. B. C. Eastick) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITION: MURRELL ROAD

A petition signed by 417 electors of Playford praying that the House urge the Minister of Transport to urgently take steps to provide for the safe local use of Murrell Road, Para Hills, was presented by Mr McRae.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: BEVERAGE CONTAINER ACT

Petitions signed by 488 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to restore the Beverage Container Act to provide that PET bottles be subject to a deposit were presented by the Hon. Jennifer Adamson and Messrs Evans, Olsen, Peterson and Plunkett.

Petitions received.

PETITION: CRIME

A petition signed by 161 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to increase the severity of penalties for serious crimes, especially rape, and grant the Police Department more power to act in such cases was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

PETITION: MURDER CASE

A petition signed by 23 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to release the Woodville Park woman who has been convicted of murder by granting Executive clemency or bail and that the legal matter of provocation be reviewed was presented by Mr Trainer.

Petition received.

PETITION: HOME LOAN INTEREST RATES

A petition signed by 199 residents of South Australia praying that the State Government urge the Federal Government to reduce home loan interest rates; ensure that home buyers with existing loans are not bankrupted or evicted as a result of increased interest rates; provide increased welfare housing and develop a loan programme to allow prospective home builders to obtain adequate finance was presented by Mr O'Neill.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the written answers to questions, as detailed in the schedule I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos. 4 and 17.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: MURDER CASE

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I seek leave to make a statement and, in so doing, I seek your

guidance in this matter, Sir. I understand now that an appeal has been lodged in the case of the woman who was convicted of murder recently, and I seek your guidance, Mr Speaker, as to how much ground, if any, can therefore be covered in a statement on the matter.

The SPEAKER: In reply to the honourable Premier I very quickly refer honourable members to the fact that this House, by precedent over a long period, has had a somewhat different *sub judice* rule from that of another place. It has been this House's opinion, as expressed by rulings from the Chair, and testing of those rulings, that *sub judice* matters must be given a very close scrutiny. I am advised that, as the appeal has been lodged, the position is not as simple as it might otherwise have been, had the decision been given by the court last week, there being public discussion that an appeal might be lodged, but no appeal having been lodged.

That appeal has now been lodged. *Erskine May* states that real and substantial danger of prejudice to the trial of the case must be the consideration upon which the House rests its view. I ask the honourable Premier, therefore, to limit any statement that he does make to facts which are not directly associated with the case and the decision which has been reached previously by the court.

Mr BANNON: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: I will hear the honourable Leader of the Opposition before asking whether the Premier has leave.

Mr BANNON: My question does bear on the statement about to be made by the Premier. I ask whether you could clarify the situation that you have just enunciated with reference to the fact that an appeal may well direct that a retrial be held, in which case the whole matter goes once again before a jury for all substantive matters of fact to be canvassed. Does that have any bearing on what the Premier may or may not say in his statement?

The SPEAKER: I am appreciative of that view and I know that the honourable Premier will take due cognisance of it. A similar situation came before the House of Assembly in connection with the Estimates Committees last year when a course of action was taken which was consistent with the precedent of this House but about which there was quite a degree of public and Parliamentary comment at the time. I indicated then that, until the House had addressed itself to a substantive motion on the matter which sought to clarify the views of the House in relation to *sub judice* matters, the previous precedent of the House would be maintained. I am certain that the honourable Premier is fully aware of that situation and it may be that on reflection he finds that the leave he is now seeking would not permit him to make a statement to this House. I will listen closely to any comment that the Premier wishes to make to if leave is granted. Is leave granted?

Mr Bannon: Yes.

The SPEAKER: Leave is granted.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: When was the appeal lodged?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I cannot answer that question because, as I understand it—

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: On a point of order, Sir. This is fairly difficult, but I can only quote what I heard on the radio. I am not in any position to make a statement on the veracity of what I heard at 12.15 today, but the matter is foremost in the mind of the public at the moment. The report stated that an appeal would be lodged later this afternoon. In your ruling earlier, Sir, you referred to the question of *sub judice* in relation to whether or not an appeal had actually been lodged. I seek your clarification on whether any specific advice is available as to whether an appeal has actually been lodged.

The SPEAKER: I thank the honourable member for the question. An appeal was actually lodged with the Supreme

Court at 1.35 p.m. today, and that has been established. I make the point to the House that it could be that a statement being made by the honourable Premier relates to assertions which have been made relative to either the Police Department or the Community Welfare Department and has no direct bearing on the matter which will go before a judge and jury. It is on that basis that, leave having been granted by the House, I call the honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I thank members of the Opposition for their understanding in this matter. As they will appreciate, I was only just advised myself of the appeal and for that reason I will not follow the usual custom and circulate copies of the Ministerial statement that I would otherwise have circulated. I am quite certain honourable members would understand the reason why. There has been considerable public and media comment generated since Friday on the subject of the woman who has been convicted of murdering her husband with an axe and her sentence of life imprisonment.

It has created a highly charged atmosphere in which a number of matters either have not been known, have not been disclosed or have been overlooked. I believe that, now the question has been referred to appeal, it would not be appropriate for me to canvass some of the matters that otherwise were covered in this statement; nevertheless, I am prepared to move into some fairly general statements and I ask the indulgence of the House for a little time to pick out the important ones.

There is a good deal of misunderstanding as to what a Government is or is not able to do in these sorts of circumstances. The mandatory punishment provided by the law for the crime of murder is a sentence of life imprisonment. The court has no alternative, but there are a number of courses of action available to a person convicted of a crime. The normal course would be for an accused person through lawyers to appeal to the Court of Criminal Appeal, which comprises three judges from the South Australian Supreme Court. Such an appeal would be made by the defendant where she had any complaint with the conduct of the trial. In fact, that would be the basis for the appeal now, and I will not in any way canvass the arguments that may or may not be put up in this instance.

The Court of Criminal Appeal can do one of two things. It can dismiss the appeal (thus upholding the conviction), it can allow the appeal and substitute a conviction for manslaughter in appropriate cases (in which case the maximum penalty is life imprisonment) or it could quash the conviction and order a retrial. The merits of any appeal and the course to be followed, I emphasise, are matters for the court to decide. It would be quite inappropriate, whether or not the matter is *sub judice*, for me to comment or speculate on what the court might do. If an appeal to the Court of Criminal Appeal is unsuccessful, the defendant can take the case to the High Court or the Privy Council and, if this is unsuccessful, there are two courses open.

The most usual course would be for the defendant to apply to the Parole Board for parole. In considering the question of parole, the Parole Board takes into account all the facts, even relevant facts which may not have been admissible as evidence at the trial as well as matters such as the record and background of the woman or person concerned. The alternative is a most unusual course—the Governor in Council would grant a pardon. The pardon would wipe out the conviction, providing a complete exoneration from the consequences of the crime. Obviously, it is a matter that would have to be considered very carefully indeed and a matter that would place a great responsibility on the Council.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: There is a third course, of course. The Governor in Council could simply release her.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: That is not the advice that has been given by Crown Law. A pardon in any form should be considered in any case only where appeals have been exhausted and no other remedy exists to right an injustice or a miscarriage of justice. The preferred course, even in the most exceptional cases, is to require the pursuit of remedies through the appeals procedures. It should be recognised that these procedures have been developed over a long time, are well tried and proven, and are directed specifically to ensure that convicted persons have every opportunity to establish and protect their rights.

The question of bail has been raised. In the period pending an appeal, any defendant can apply for bail. It is most uncommon for persons who have been convicted of murder to be granted bail, but it is possible for the Attorney-General to instruct the Crown not to oppose a bail application when it is made. The question of bail remains firmly in the hands of the defence lawyers and in their application. The person involved in the current dispute is currently in the Women's Rehabilitation Centre at Northfield. She is comfortable and is being given support with compassion by the authorities, the prison chaplain and others. She is in a single unit and is being well cared for with reasonable access to family and friends. Since Friday, she has been able to receive visitors. I and the Government share the public's strong sympathy for the personal circumstances of this particular case. The ordeal that has been covered has focused attention on women and children in situations of domestic violence.

It is in this context that the Government has been working on ways of dealing with such problems and giving support to women and children involved in such situations. A committee to examine domestic violence, chaired by the Women's Adviser to the Premier, Mrs Rosemary Wighton, and responsible to me, is almost ready to report to me on that subject with recommendations as to how to deal with it and provide further support for persons in these situations.

Officers are examining the ways by which peace complaint procedures may be significantly strengthened to effectively protect persons under threat of violence or intimidation. Generally, the peace complaint procedure has been quite inadequate. In the near future, I expect the Attorney-General to be able to make recommendations to Cabinet for changes to the law in this respect.

Recently, I convened a conference with the Attorney-General and the Chief Secretary and various involved persons to identify matters relating to rape and violence upon which the Government should take action. That conference identified a number of areas principally affecting the victims, predominantly women, where action possibly should be taken. These are being actively examined.

A few significant actions are already under way within the Government. They are all matters which I perceive to be directly or indirectly of concern to many people responding publicly to the circumstances of the woman recently convicted of murder.

I turn now to several matters raised publicly upon which reluctantly I must comment. I ask, Sir, that you give me guidance if necessary. They relate to the involvement of the authorities in 1975 and of the police on the day before the murder which was the subject of the trial. There is no evidence to suggest that inquiries were not made adequately as a result of complaints by the two runaway daughters in 1975. The information is that those two daughters were given every support by the Department for Community Welfare, whilst the other members of the family refused help and support. It is important to note that, when interviewed by police in 1975, other members of the family,

including the person concerned, had denied the allegations of sexual abuse made by the two daughters. It is clear that not since 1975-76 and up until the murder had any member of the family sought the assistance of any of the authorities to deal with family problems.

Information from the police is even more perplexing. Extensive inquiries were made by the police at the time, as a result of the allegations by two daughters of the deceased. The material which led to the conclusion by the police and the Crown Prosecutor at the time that there was insufficient evidence on which to lay a charge of incest is best summarised by reference to a paragraph in the police report, in May 1976, as follows:

Despite the additional inquiries we still have the same situation (two daughters) telling a story about the wrongdoings of their father with them, and the other members of the family, including two girls with whom he is alleged to have committed the same acts, saying that their father is a good man, and has never touched them. Despite quite rigorous questioning, neither [the wife] or the other children could be swayed from the stories they had told about their family leader.

I do not think it appropriate that I go further. There are other matters which I think could properly be considered by the Court of Appeal, and I do not wish to say anything that could in any way prejudice that proper course of action. I think everyone would agree that this is a sad and complex case; inevitably, one must feel sympathy for any person in circumstances involving family disturbance of this kind. The vital issues to which I have referred and which are the subject of investigation by my department and the Attorney-General are ones that undoubtedly will be canvassed and hopefully discussed and debated in this House in the weeks or months to come, if in fact we take the legislative action which might be necessary. I believe that it is to the benefit of every member of society if issues such as these can be periodically raised for examination, and changes made in the law if a careful examination indicates the need for such a change. It is a matter of regret that such an investigation occurs only after a tragedy of this kind.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Education (The Hon. H. Allison)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. South Australian Teacher Housing Authority—Report, 1979-80.

By the Minister of Agriculture (The Hon. W. E. Chapman)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Metropolitan Milk Supply Act, 1946-1980—Regulations—Milk Prices.

By the Minister of Lands (The Hon. P. B. Arnold)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Geographical Names Board of South Australia—Report, 1979-80.
- ii. Crown Lands Act, 1929-1980—Regulations—Fees.
- iii. Pastoral Act, 1936-1980—Regulations—Fees.

QUESTION TIME

INTEREST RATES

Mr BANNON: Will the Premier say whether the report in today's *News* that building societies have sought State Government approval for even higher home loan interest rates is correct? Does the Premier's statement to the House last Thursday that he had written to all the leading lending institutions asking them to show compassion where people

are having difficulty in meeting their repayments mean that the Government will reject further building society loan interest rises and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am grateful to the Leader for his question. At the present time, such an application has not been made. I have written to the financial institutions as I outlined to the House on Thursday last. I think, obviously, the Leader did not hear the course of action which I suggested that they should follow, so I will repeat it for him, I suggested to the lending institutions that they should show a degree of compassion in dealing with these increases in interest rates which would lead to increased payments. I believe that it is possible for lending institutions to lengthen the term of a loan rather than to require any increase in the amount of instalment which is paid.

I believe it would be a fitting course of action for such institutions to take. This does not, of course, take away from the need to increase interest rates in line with general movement if that is what the general interest rate movement is, but it will remove the load and take the immediate urgency out of the home loan interest increases, which basically I think all members of this House would agree is a matter of grave concern indeed. Whether or not interest rates stay at this level, I said, I think on Thursday, that unfortunately there are expert opinions which say that interest rates are likely to increase before they turn the corner and start coming down. That is a sad thing to contemplate. The only way that we can overcome that problem is by asking the institutions to lengthen the term for the time being until interest rates do begin to come down again, at which time the term can be revised. For the matter of perhaps a few weeks, or a month or so, it may be all that is necessary to take the pressure off.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: But you've got the power to interfere if you want to.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I think that any move at all (and I think that the Deputy Leader would know this) to interfere on the local scene could seriously disadvantage borrowers in the long term. I believe that what I have suggested is the most sensible way in which to handle this matter. I have not heard from the Leader about this matter. I remind honourable members that I suggested that if he concurred with what I had to say when writing to the Prime Minister, the Treasurer and the financial institutions, I would be happy to pass on his support for the suggestions I made, but I have not heard anything at all from him.

Mr Bannon: You were too late.

The SPEAKER: Order!

HOSPITAL INSURANCE

Mr OSWALD: Has the Minister of Health seen the report in this morning's *Advertiser* regarding hospital insurance for people on low incomes who do not qualify for free medical and hospital treatment? Can she comment on the suggestion that these people should obtain—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member should not ask any Minister to comment. He may ask for information to be given.

Mr OSWALD: I ask the Minister for information concerning the *Advertiser* article which would advise the public how these people should obtain basic hospital insurance to cover both hospital and medical needs. I refer to the article on page 10 of this morning's *Advertiser*, under the heading 'Hospital appeal to low earners', part of which states:

Australians not defined as disadvantaged for purposes of free hospital care were urged yesterday to take out a hospital-only health insurance fund package. The executive of the Australian Hospitals Association meeting in Adelaide said it was essential that

low-wage earners should have some insurance protection against crippling hospital charges to be introduced from 1 September.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I have seen the report. I am pleased to advise the honourable member that the suggestion made by Mr Pickering is one that has already been considered by me and by the Health Commission in conjunction with the Department of Social Security. A person who is not eligible for a health care card, but who does not consider that he or she can afford the cost of both medical and hospital insurance, can indeed take out basic hospital insurance only, and can in that way be covered for virtually all the medical and hospital procedures necessary to ensure that people have access to high-quality medical care.

Contributions to hospital-only insurance are eligible for a tax rebate of 32c in the dollar, in the same way as contributions to both hospital and medical insurance are eligible. With hospital insurance only a person will have access to in-patient services of hospitals and to out-patient services of a hospital for medical treatment. So, as an indication, a person can receive full hospital treatment. As a non-in-patient, a person could receive medical or paramedical treatment in any casualty or out-patient department of a recognised hospital. It is important to recognise that people who take out that kind of insurance—basic hospital insurance—are not entitled to treatment in a private hospital or to treatment by a doctor outside a recognised hospital without being charged, or to treatment by a doctor of the patient's own choice in a recognised hospital.

The question of those who fall just above that line which entitles them to free treatment is one that has been causing me great concern. I have asked the Health Commission to liaise very carefully with the Department of Social Security, because I believe it is absolutely essential that these people are cared for and have access to quality medical and hospital services without undue financial burden. As a result, the Health Commission is in the process of preparing an explanatory pamphlet which will provide all the information necessary to enable these people to make an informed choice, and the Department of Social Security has undertaken to make certain that, when it advises applicants that they do not qualify for a free health care card, those people have carefully explained to them the option available, which will enable them to have high-quality health care at the least possible cost.

WAGE INDEXATION

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Will the Premier instruct the Minister of Industrial Affairs to initiate and support a relaxation of the wage indexation guidelines at the State Labor Ministers' Conference to be held in Brisbane this week? It is apparent that industrial chaos will increase unless effective changes are made to the current guidelines. The Premier would be aware that on Friday the Prime Minister, in a joint news conference with the Victorian Premier, Mr Thompson, indicated that the present inability or unpreparedness of the commission to hear disputes was making industrial tensions worse. It was a welcome break from union bashing, at least.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: It is quite clear that application of the current guidelines is preventing legitimate concerns from being heard in a court of appeal. The guidelines are effectively closing the commission's doors to many people with a case to argue. This is preventing agreement and driving people into disputes. I think many people concerned about achieving better industrial relations—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Leader is now commenting. I ask him to stick to an explanation of the question.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I will do my very best to do that, Sir. I am informed that many people concerned about achieving better industrial relations believe that the inflexible application of the guidelines is defeating the commission's purpose, which is to hear grievances and to resolve disputes after consideration of the arguments. I am further informed that the Victorian Government has made its position on guidelines clear, as has the Queensland Government with respect to the State electricity workers. I understand that the New South Wales Government is also prepared to support a relaxation of the guidelines. Mr Bob Hawke has outlined the A.L.P. attitude in today's press. However, the South Australian Government is yet to make its position clear, if it has one; I hope it has.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I will not instruct the Minister of Industrial Affairs in this matter. He has the subject well and truly under control and will be discussing it with his colleagues from other States at the meeting he will attend within the next day or so. Certainly, there is a need to examine the guidelines very clearly, but I point out that it is not directly the responsibility of the Ministers of Industrial Affairs to set the guidelines. I rather thought that it was in the hands of the Federal Commission.

SUCCESSION DUTIES

Mr RUSSACK: Is the Premier aware that at the opening today of the annual conference of the United Farmers and Stockowners Association of South Australia the Leader of the Opposition gave an undertaking, on behalf of the Labor Party, in respect of succession duties? Can the Premier describe the impact of that promise on future State financial management?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes. I was very interested to hear about this. I launched the conference, a most important one as it is the first held by the one organisation made up of two organisations—the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia and the Stockowners Association, now the United Farmers and Stockowners Association. It was well attended and it was a pleasure to be there and to reassure members of that very important body that they have played a fundamental part in the development of South Australia, and that they will continue to do so.

Mr Langley interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I do not know what that was all about; I wish somebody would tell me.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: In my opening speech, I said that I understood our political opponents were rather of the view that they would reintroduce succession and gift duties. I was delighted to have reported to me the comments of the Leader of the Opposition, who sought time to put the Labor Party's point of view. Those comments made very good reporting, because the Leader has today apparently categorically given his support to the abolition of succession and gift duties.

Mr Bannon: No, they have been abolished.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: As it was reported to me, the Labor Party would not reintroduce succession and gift duties, which are presently abolished. I take it that the Leader does not suggest that there is any difference between failing to reintroduce them and maintaining abolition.

The news was indeed good, but it raised a number of questions in my mind, questions which will be reflected in the minds of many other people in the community. I must say that I was rather surprised that there had not been

wide publicity given to this significant policy turn-around on the part of the Australian Labor Party. Judging from the remarks made by various members of that Party before the last conference of the State A.L.P., I think there will be some surprise in those quarters at the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition.

I am surprised even more because, as the member for Hartley will well remember, before the last State election there was a studied and indeed fierce opposition to the present Government's policy of abolition of succession and gift duties. Ever since the last State election, the Government has been subjected to the most carping criticism from the Leader of the Opposition, who has been constantly criticising it for taking that action. Now, apparently, although it was wrong last week to go into deficit budgeting because we have abolished certain taxes, it is all right this week. I am not too sure where the Leader will finish up, because he has again spoken at great length against any increase in State charges, so obviously if he does not approve of any increase in State charges—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much interjection.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I do not mind, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier has the call.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Presumably, if the Leader does not approve of cutting down on the size of the public sector and if he does not approve of raising charges in line with increased costs, but now supports the very moves that we have made, he has some miraculous way of managing the Budget.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: He's not in favour of Roxby Downs.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I can say only that his attitude is compounded entirely by the fact that he wants to leave all forms of mining and mineral development with any trace of uranium in them totally and absolutely alone. I am quite staggered at this turn-around in Labor Party policy. For that reason, I had to stop and wonder whether this was a change in Labor Party policy. I wonder whether the reason why it has not been more widely proclaimed is that perhaps it might be a personal turn-around, a change in attitude by the Leader.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: He might get another phone call.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: He might have to go back to the U.F. and S. meeting later on and retract what he said; I do not know. If it is a personal change, I can only applaud this change in personal attitude, but I would like to say that I believe that the Leader, if he had this in mind, should have adopted an attitude towards the Government's management of the finances which was more in line with that change in attitude. Then I looked at some other things. For instance, a motion was proposed by the Whyalla sub-branch and moved by the Hon. Mr Blevins, no less, which called on the next Federal Labor Government to take urgent steps to implement a wealth tax into Australia, and matters of that kind. I thought perhaps the Leader of the Opposition had now finally decided that he could afford to support the situation where succession and gift duties were abolished because he will now bring in a wealth tax. I am delighted that the Leader has adopted this attitude, but I do hope he is able to persuade the members of his own Party at its convention to support what he has said because all of the word that I have is that there is no agreement to maintain the abolition—if that makes him feel better—of succession and gift duties, and that the State Labor Party, if returned to Government, would in fact reintroduce taxation of a kind, either a wealth tax or some other tax which would be

very similar to succession and gift duties. All I can say is that, if the Leader is fair dinkum about abolishing and maintaining the abolition of succession and gift duties, I wish him luck with his Party.

MINISTERIAL PRESS RELEASES

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Will the Minister of Education accept the blame for the serious mistakes in press releases attributed to his name during the period 22 to 24 June 1981? On 22 June, certain sections of the electronic media gave coverage to an item on the ancillary staff dispute and mentioned that the freeze deadline had been extended until 'at least October'. Requests to the Minister's office about this statement elicited a copy of a press release bearing the date 22 June under the title 'Ancillary staff freeze extended'; that release read in part:

Temporary ancillary staffing arrangements will continue until at least August.

Apparently, the media report had incorrectly reported the Minister. However, an approach to one outlet of the electronic media for a copy of the press release it had received from the Minister's office resulted in the receipt of a press release issued under the Minister's name, bearing the same date and same title and, save for one word in the very first line, exactly the same wording. The one word different was 'October', which made the amended sentence read:

Temporary ancillary staffing arrangements will continue until at least October.

No notation existed on either press release indicating the existence of the other version, nor was there any explanation as to the apparent reason for the difference in date. The plot thickened when on 24 June (I ask that the date be noted) the earlier editions of the *Advertiser* carried a report which read in part:

The Minister of Education said yesterday (namely, the 23rd) . . . temporary staffing arrangements would continue until the end of the year.

That was a prescient statement, in the light of last week's joint communique by the unions and the Minister, but at that time quite out of step with every other official Ministerial communique.

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw the attention of the honourable member for Salisbury to the requirement that fact only be dealt with in relation to an explanation of a question and that there be no comment.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: I take your point, Sir. In the middle of this trilogy of dates, namely on 23 June, by which time the Minister and his staff realised that there were people outside his office who were aware of the two versions of the release of 22 June, a memorandum to the media was issued, which read in part:

Due to a typographical error on press release headed 'ancillary staff freeze extended' the first line should read . . . August not October.

That memo does not answer the matter, however; it only raises questions of its own. Why was it issued a day later when a correct edition of the press release was issued on the same day as the offending one? How did the Minister or his staff miss an error of such significance, indeed the keypoint of the release, when the issue of the date of the implementation of the cuts had figured so prominently in the dispute? How was it that the *Advertiser* carried a report of a totally different date one day after the correcting memo, ascribing the statement to the Minister and indicating its date of issue as 23 June? This whole episode reeks of incompetence.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have already warned the honourable member for Salisbury about commenting, and I

also draw his attention and the attention of all other honourable members to the fact that, in posing a question, the question comes first, the explanation follows, and it does not require a series of further questions posing as an explanation.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: This matter is rather past history.

Mr Lynn Arnold: It is not past history.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: It should be past history. The honourable member obviously has not read or listened to the news today. Rip Van Winkle has friends! The issue refers to a typographical error. In fact, the Minister was doing what he has been doing for the past four months, that is, visiting schools extensively in South Australia.

The typographical error which had been circularised to a limited number of the press was picked up by the Minister's Press Secretary. The correct information was circularised to the press, which had been notified already. As I have said, this is past history, because the honourable member surely must be delighted to realise that all of those dates are no longer relevant. We have extended the moratorium to the end of this year, and that really is the most significant date. It means that this Government has deferred taking any compulsory action in this matter for two whole years when in 1977, overnight, the former Minister, currently belonging to the Opposition, said that he would not defer for one minute. All the honourable member is doing is highlighting the fact that this Government has bent over backwards to negotiate and has continued to defer any compulsory action. That is still the case, and we will defer until the end of 1981, when the rationalisation was to have been in February 1980. This is a very compassionate Government by comparison with the previous Government.

The SPEAKER: Order!

BRIGHTON ROAD

Mr MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Transport say whether his department has yet arrived at any decision regarding the future of Brighton Road in relation to the installation of the dreaded median strip right down the centre of it? The Minister will be aware of the concern of local residents about the possible effects of this median strip—

Mr Hamilton: You've been reading the *Weekly Times*.

Mr MATHWIN: At least I can read, which is more than the honourable member can do.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MATHWIN: Many feel that it may cause great problems to all users of Brighton Road and could be detrimental, being in effect a safety hazard rather than a safety haven.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Indeed, I have ordered a review of what the honourable member refers to as the dreaded median strip on Brighton Road, and it will be deferred for at least 12 months.

KANGAROO ISLAND LAND

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Will the Minister of Agriculture say what he has done in relation to the possible development of unallotted Crown land south of Gosse, on Kangaroo Island, since his cavalier rejection of expert advice from a group of his own departmental officers on the subject? What is to happen to that expert advice? Has it been withdrawn, is it to be amended by Ministerial direc-

tion, or is he seeking more compliant advice from different officers?

My question relates to the contentious future of 14 000-odd hectares of native vegetation to the immediate east of the Flinders Chase National Park. We have on record opinions of various authorities, including the Minister, adjoining landowners, tour operators, and the conservation movement on whether this land should be turned into farm land or added to the national park. When the Minister of Environment was asked his opinion, he told this House in November last that an inter-departmental working party would be established and that it eventually would report to the Parliamentary Land Settlement Committee.

Eight months has passed, and nothing has been put before the committee, nor has it been warned of any imminent business. Officers of the Department of Lands, the Department for the Environment and the Department of Agriculture have been investigating and compiling reports. The Department of Agriculture report, which seems to be in fairly wide circulation and which stressed the overriding importance of increased stream salinity resulting from the clearing of the North-West River catchment, was presented to the working party. When the same report later reached the Minister, he expressed his disagreement with it in unambiguous terms, terms not always very flattering to the officers concerned.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now going far beyond the explanation and is starting to comment.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I am sorry, Sir. The exact status of this challenged report apparently is not known to anyone from whom I can get any information. People are speculating as to whether the Minister is arranging another version more congenial to his own personal opinion.

The original report has been sighted by officers of the two other departments involved. There has been considerable delay, and the Minister's virtual recall of the considered opinion of his own experts seems to be the cause. If he could take us into his confidence about this matter, which is apparently very close to him personally, many people would be very grateful.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call upon the Minister to answer the question and not to answer the comments.

An honourable member: Which question?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I think the interjection raises a good question, because the honourable member did raise a number of questions apart from his several comments, in his attempt to have the situation clarified. I apologise for the voice problem that I have today, but I believe my voice will be sufficient to convey the message that the honourable member seeks. It is true that there is a large area of land at the mid-western end of Kangaroo Island which, for a number of years, has been considered, in part, to be most suitable for agricultural purposes. That land is, in fact, Crown land and under the care and control of the Minister of Lands.

As a result of considerable interest being shown by several parties in its future use, a Cabinet subcommittee was formed some months ago, consisting of the Minister of Lands (who, as I have said, is directly responsible for the control and future of that land), the Minister of Environment and Planning, and me. Each of us has commissioned officers from our respective departments to investigate certain aspects that are within the boundaries of the terms of reference of the study and to report to that Cabinet subcommittee. Upon receipt of their combined report, the Minister of Lands, the responsible Minister in this instance, will report to the Government. The Government may, in due course, make a decision as to the future use of that land.

By implication, if not directly, the member for Baudin said today that I have a personal interest in that land. I take exception to that implication. It is true that I and my family own a considerable area of land on Kangaroo Island, but it is not within or about that plateau region of which the Gosse land referred to is a part, nor has it been, nor is it now, nor is it likely to be in the future an area of land which either I or any member of my family would be interested in. My general interest in the area is as local member and, more especially, as Minister of Agriculture, and it is in the direction of a suitable portion of that total area being ultimately available for that purpose.

The further reference by the honourable member to my sighting of a working paper produced by an officer of my department is broadly true. Indeed, I have sighted not only that paper but also a number of other working papers that have been produced. Whether that paper or subsequent papers are amended or changed is really quite irrelevant to the exercise, because, as Minister of Agriculture, I will ultimately be responsible for the factual information produced for that joint working party. It is true to say that during the processes of preparing the initial working paper by an officer of my department some new information came to hand from another Government department which required the Director-General of my department to draw that information to my attention. He and I believe that that information should be incorporated in that document, and that is being done.

TRANSPORT STRIKE

Mr EVANS: Is the Minister of Industrial Affairs aware of the severe difficulties that the current Transport Workers Union strike is causing to many people in this State? What action can he take to release trucks to ensure that economic hardship and loss of jobs do not result from this industrial action?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I am aware of the considerable personal hardship and the economic hardship being caused to many people in South Australia by the current strike by the Transport Workers Union. It is unfortunate that that strike is taking place, particularly as the matter is currently before the Federal commission, and I believe that, while the matter is before the commission and is being decided upon by that commission as quickly as possible, such a strike causing such economic hardship should not continue.

I am also aware of the matter concerning some 50 000 cases of oranges being prevented from being loaded on to a ship because the oranges cannot be transported from the Riverland to the ship at Port Adelaide. That shipment of oranges is an initial shipment in an endeavour to break into a new market in the Middle East, and one can imagine that if that shipment does not proceed it will be likely to jeopardise the future marketing of South Australian oranges and therefore the economic viability and employment within the citrus industry. In fact, I have been in touch with the Transport Workers Union and have asked for the release of trucks. However, because the oranges do not come within its specific guidelines in terms of human safety and welfare of animals the union is not prepared to release trucks for this consignment.

Once again I draw to the attention of members the considerable economic hardship being caused; many workers have been stood down. I believe the dispute has been unnecessary. It is most unfortunate. The matter is being heard by the Federal commission, where it should rightly be dealt with, and industrial action such as this strike should not take place. Also, I take up a point that relates to wage indexation and the guidelines matter raised by the

Deputy Leader of the Opposition earlier. It is interesting that he did not quote the Prime Minister. In fact, it was the Prime Minister who, on Saturday, three or four days earlier than the Labor Party spokesman, Mr Bob Hawke, came out very strongly and advocated a relaxation of the wage indexation guidelines.

I also point out that if the Deputy Leader took some interest in what goes on in the Federal Industrial Commission he would realise that the South Australian Government appeared last Friday at a hearing in Melbourne before Justice Moore and will be represented before a Full Bench hearing tomorrow. The view of the Government is that we very strongly support wage indexation. We believe it should be applied on a uniform basis throughout Australia, and that all industrial commissions should adhere to the broad principles and guidelines of wage indexation. I am very disappointed that the South Australian Industrial Commission did not see fit to do so in its recent State wage case. The view of the South Australian Government is that wage indexation should be workable and must therefore be able to deal with any industrial dispute problem that arises.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: So you support a reduction of the guidelines?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I support a change in the guidelines so that a number of the disputes occurring at present and some of the anomalies can be handled. We have experienced some of these problems and how best to overcome them. I can assure honourable members that the Ministers in Queensland will very soon be looking at the whole problem of industrial dispute. I believe it is the view of all Governments, both Federal and State, that this country has a great deal to offer at present. It has tremendous potential in the natural resource area and in other manufacturing areas, together with agriculture and other industries. However, so much of this potential is currently being damaged by industrial dispute. If this level of industrial dispute and unreasonable wage claims continues, this country will suffer as it did in the early 1970's.

My fear is that Australia is about to enter upon another era very similar to 1974, when we saw unprecedented wage claims, a 30 per cent increase in wages in one year, record industrial dispute, and, as a result, record unemployment. My plea to all the work force, to all Australians and Australian Governments, is, 'Make sure that we do not repeat the disasters of 1974. Before we take industrial action, let us consider the consequences of that action on our nation as a whole.'

EMERGENCY HOUSING

Mr ABBOTT: Can the Minister of Industrial Affairs provide the House with any information on the Cabinet decision to transfer operational responsibility for the Emergency Housing Office to the South Australian Housing Trust? How many individuals and organisations have been able to afford to rent any of the 50 homes being made available by the Housing Trust for under 18-year-old unemployed and homeless youth at a rent of \$50 a week?

I ask this question because of my concern for the thousands of young South Australian homeless people and the 10 000 people who pass through men's and women's shelters each year. I wonder what means the Government will adopt in providing adequate shelter and emergency housing in this crucial area.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Details of the Cabinet decision were given in a press release about three or four months ago, or maybe more, made by the Minister of Housing. That Cabinet decision resulted in a number of Ministers taking up different responsibilities. I am sure that the

honourable member would appreciate that on a matter like youth housing some areas come under the Youth Bureau, some under the Minister of Housing (who is also responsible for the Housing Trust), and some under the Minister of Community Welfare. Each Minister is looking after his particular area.

The entire responsibility has not been transferred from the Youth Bureau or the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment. They will still maintain an overall policy review and an overall monitoring of a situation. However, the direct leasing of Housing Trust homes comes under the Minister of Housing, and the honourable member would need to ask that Minister or his representative in this House for that information. I certainly do not have that specific information available here. I think it is obvious why, because it is of such a nature. I suggest that the honourable member might like to raise some of those points with the Minister of Community Welfare, who is responsible for certain of the areas involved.

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

Mr GLAZBROOK: Can the Minister of Health explain why there is no official medical superintendent appointed at Flinders Medical Centre? Is this why complaints are made relevant to the lack of emergency medical facilities being available on weekends and public holidays? The Minister will recall, as will members, that various complaints have been aired in the newspapers and in the electronic media relative to Flinders Medical Centre facilities and the erroneous impressions that people have that the fault lies in not enough funds being made available.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: As I understand it, Flinders Medical Centre is unique in Australia in that it does not have a medical superintendent. The reason lies in the origins of Flinders, which was established as a completely integrated university teaching hospital. The normal functions of a medical superintendent, which are to co-ordinate and control delivery of services within a hospital, are undertaken at Flinders by a committee comprising various heads of departments of medicine, who are also professors of those departments. This arrangement has certain benefits in so far as the co-ordination of teaching services is involved.

Nevertheless, I believe that it has inbuilt administrative difficulties, which means that the control normally exercised by a single person is in a committee's hands. In other words, it is a matter for collective decision making. I assure the honourable member that the South Australian Health Commission, together with the board and the administration of Flinders, is currently reviewing the situation regarding medical administration at the hospital, and examining ways and means in which control and co-ordination can be improved.

It is true that Flinders is a university teaching hospital, but it is also true that the State Government regards Flinders Medical Centre as having a primary responsibility for the delivery of health services to people of the southern area. That responsibility must be recognised by the board as being foremost, and one to which priority should be given. Delivery of service is basic to the responsibility to that hospital. If there is a conflict between service delivery and teaching requirements, service delivery must be given priority. I should also point out in response to the honourable member's allegations—comments—

Mr Trainer: Allegations?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:—remarks about allegations of long waits, there have been allegations in the press and elsewhere about length of time to wait for services

at Flinders Medical Centre. I point out that in the last annual report of Flinders Medical Centre it was stated that more than 50 per cent of the cases presented in the Accident and Emergency Department of Flinders Medical Centre are cases which would and should normally be referred to a general practitioner. It will be interesting to see, after the introduction of the new health funding arrangements on 1 September, whether the pressure on that department is relieved when people realise that they have a responsibility to pay for those services or to insure against the possibility that they might need those services and whether, as a result, people would tend to go to their general practitioner instead of using the cheap convenience of a teaching hospital, which is in fact by no means cheap and is one of the most costly forms of provision of services that can be undertaken.

AIRPORT RUNWAY

Mr PLUNKETT: What investigation has the Minister of Education ordered into aspects relating to safety of children attending schools on the flight path of Adelaide Airport? Members will know that there are plans to increase the size of planes using Adelaide Airport. Wide-bodied Airbus planes are likely to fly to Adelaide in mid-1982, and possibly larger Boeings will come in later. The Airbus needs a runway of 9 845 feet to take off or land. The present length of Adelaide Airport runway is 8 000 feet; and it is due to be extended to 8 500 feet, shorter than the Airbus requires by over 1 300 feet, and 1 800 feet shorter than a Boeing 747 requires. Since there are many schools that come within what might be called the crash zone (Cowandilla, Hindmarsh, Thebarton, Netley, and Brooklyn Park Primary Schools, Thebarton High School, Salesian College, Kilmara Junior and Secondary School) and since neither the British Caledonian nor the Laker airlines, those it is suggested might come to Adelaide, has established safety records and since, despite TAA's safety record, the Airbus will be landing on a shorter runway, it is vital that the Minister have this matter investigated and that emergency safety plans be prepared in the unhappy event of a crash ever occurring.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I thank the honourable member for his obvious interest in this matter. I was not aware that these aircraft were any less safe or carried any more risk than other aircraft already operating. As my colleague has mentioned, there will, in fact, be fewer traffic movements when the new aircraft are brought into service. I thought the honourable member was going to refer to the sound factor, but I understand that the new aircraft are quieter than a number of other aircraft already in service. I will take up this matter with the departmental officers and bring down a considered report for the honourable member.

TRANSMISSION LINE

Mr OLSEN: My question is to the Minister of Mines and Energy. Once the route of the new 275 kilovolt transmission line is determined, will the Minister seek an assurance from the Electricity Trust of South Australia that it will consult with individual property-holders and, where practical, place the 275 kilovolt transmission line towers in positions which minimise disruption and inconvenience to landholders? Media reports have highlighted the disquiet in the northern part of the State at the prospect of the line traversing prime agricultural land. Whilst several proposed routes have met with significant dissatisfaction and resentment from those directly affected, it has been suggested that an undertaking

by ETSA to consult those involved and slightly amend the location of the towers in accord with individual landholders difficulties would improve the situation.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I shall be happy to take up the question as outlined by the member for Rocky River. The fact is that there is some consternation whenever a power line is mooted, and a lot of it is rightly directed. There has been some consternation expressed in relation to this power line. I was a bit alarmed a couple of weeks ago when, in relation to this general question, the Leader of the Opposition sought to put forth a cock-and-bull story about a power line to the South-East. There was some nonsense about there being a power black-out in the area, or some other figment of the imagination. I put that sort of comment in a completely different category from the genuine concern of landholders, such as the member for Rocky River has mentioned.

I shall be quite happy to look at that question and see whether slight variations can be made. The Leader of the Opposition seems amused by the fact that I referred to that completely irresponsible statement he made to the press. He must have shuffled up his bundle of leaked documents and that one must have fallen out. The fact that it was about six months out of date did not deter him from raising the matter. I shall be happy to follow through the question raised by the honourable member.

FOOTBALL PARK LIGHTING

Mr HAMILTON: Can the Minister of Recreation and Sport state the current position relating to the lighting of Football Park, as residents in that area were told in March this year that an announcement would be made within six weeks? I understand that the Government is near to a solution of this matter. However, it has been reported to me that the latest proposal will provide an even greater spill of light in the local area and will involve a substantial cost increase to the South Australian Football League and hence to football followers.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: According to the technical information I have, the latest proposal does not provide a greater spill of light. The latest proposal is a compromise proposal of 43-metre towers. The league and the Government have negotiated a solution, which has to be agreed to by the league. When that has been agreed to by the league, there have to be negotiations with West Lakes Limited, the residents, and Woodville council. When all of those bodies are happy with the scheme, we will be able to make an announcement, and that should not be too far away.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: SUCCESSION DUTIES

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

Leave granted.

Mr BANNON: In reply to a question from the member for Goyder, the Premier misrepresented me in referring to statements I had made at the United Farmers and Stockowners Association conference today. The Premier referred to my seeking time to make some statements. In fact, I did not seek time; I was invited by the President to say a few words to the conference. I think that was quite proper and appropriate, and I was grateful for that opportunity.

Secondly, the Premier went on to say that my remarks were not in accord with previous statements and generally

misrepresented what was a quite clear statement which should be put on the record. Whilst speaking to that gathering I mentioned the great financial problems that the Premier's miscalculation had created in relation to the abolition of succession and gift duties. I responded to his categorical statement that a Labor Government would reintroduce succession and gift duties by saying that we have no such intention. I had, in fact, already said this on at least two occasions. There is a world of difference in the case of fighting to retain something in operation, and with that I fully concurred. I think major miscalculations were made. The succession and gift duties scheme had been introduced and maintained by a Liberal Government. In fact, it had been successively improved by our Government in terms of making sure that the threshold was constantly raised and the burden of it fell only on those people most able to afford it. Nonetheless, it was abolished by this Government, and we make quite clear that we will not be reintroducing succession and gift duties.

At 3.19 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council notified its appointment of sessional committees.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer) brought up the following report of the committee appointed to prepare the draft Address in Reply to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor:

1. We, the members of the House of Assembly, express our thanks for the Speech with which Your Excellency was pleased to open Parliament.
2. We assure Your Excellency that we will give our best attention to the matters placed before us.
3. We earnestly join in Your Excellency's prayer for the Divine blessing on the proceedings of the session.

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): I move:

That the draft Address in Reply as read be adopted.

The South Australian Government can be very proud indeed of the success that it has achieved in attracting industry to South Australia since its election in September 1979. When it is borne in mind that from August 1977 to August 1979 the number of people employed in our State fell by almost 21 000, or nearly 4 per cent of the total labour force, the turnaround that has been achieved in the first 21 months of the Tonkin Government is truly remarkable. The accuracy of this statement can be seen from figures obtained from the Australian Bureau of Statistics monthly labour force survey, catalogue number 6 203.0, in which it is shown that 12 800 additional persons have been employed in South Australia during the period September 1979 to March 1981.

Subsequent to that time, even more jobs have been created, and approximately 15 000 new positions are now available in South Australia that were not available in September 1979. These figures clearly demonstrate that through the Tonkin Government's policies, with significant Government assistance to industry through the establishment payments scheme, the motor vehicle industry assistance scheme, pay-roll and land tax concessions and assistance to small business, there has been a significant strengthening

in the economic base of South Australia. This, in turn, has led to increasing employment opportunities, and I am sure all honourable members, including those opposite, must have noted in the *Advertiser* of last week the articles indicating the very real turn-around that has also occurred in the world of retailing.

Major retailers have announced rapidly increasing turn-over with growth second only to Queensland. We have just seen a report in the *Advertiser* of Thursday of last week indicating a boom in the new car sales market. Additionally, in the *Advertiser* of yesterday, a survey showed that retailers expect even better sales and more employment opportunities over the coming months. All of these points indicate that the economy of South Australia is turning around and, more importantly, the turn-around in employment is being achieved through private companies increasing their workforce.

State Government employment is decreasing and yet at the same time we are finding an increase in the number of people employed in South Australia. It is of obvious benefit to the State if additional employment can be created through the private sector rather than the public sector, for it is the private sector that produces and adds to the State's economy. As employment in private enterprise goes up, so do the gains to South Australia. The same cannot be said of increasing employment in the public sector. There, payment of salaries must be made from the public purse and, rather than contributing to the State's growth, increased employment in the public sector results in further strain on public funds.

Since the Tonkin Government came to power, we have seen more than 50 companies either locating in this State or announcing significant expansions. It is this growth which has played a major part in the increasing employment opportunities now available in South Australia. We have seen such companies as Fasson, Hilton Hotels, Grundfos and Raytheon, just to mention a few, setting up here in South Australia.

I believe the winning of Raytheon to South Australia is typical of the way in which the Tonkin Government is attracting industry to this State. Raytheon is an American company which previously had never decentralised within the United States, let alone in any other country outside the United States. Officers of this Government heard that Raytheon could be interested in developing operations in Australia, and negotiations were very advanced, in fact, between Raytheon and the New South Wales Government. However, because of the positive approach of the Premier, the Department of Trade and Industry and the Industries Development Committee, the management of Raytheon was able to see only too clearly the very real advantages of developing its operations here in Adelaide rather than in Sydney. As the principal of that company has stated publicly, it was because of the professionalism and the obvious desire of the Premier and his Cabinet to have the company in South Australia that a decision was made by that company to set up its manufacturing operations here.

This is just one example of the very real confidence that the Tonkin Government has been able to generate in companies both within and outside South Australia. Within South Australia we are seeing companies expanding at an unprecedented rate. There are Gerard Industries and John Shearer, just to mention two. With the latter, when the previous Government was in power, a major manufacturing operation was set up by that company in Queensland in preference to South Australia. The Queensland plant has now been closed and the company's operations are all now centred here in South Australia, despite the fact that most of the equipment made in Queensland was for the New South Wales and Queensland markets. That company is

still manufacturing that equipment, but it is now being manufactured back here in South Australia, and the company, one of South Australia's oldest and most respected firms, is now again a fully South Australian firm.

G.M.H. has opened its plastics plant here in South Australia. Mitsubishi and Mobil, two further international companies upon which the economy of South Australia is heavily based, have announced considerable expansions. There are many, many other companies which I could mention, but the fact is that South Australia is again now open for business and, hopefully, we will never return to the steady decline of the 1970s, when we saw a Government totally disinterested in the welfare of industry in this State, which almost led to the complete bankruptcy of what was once a most viable economy.

Let us look at some of the incentives that the Tonkin Government has provided to attract and expand industry in South Australia. The establishment payments scheme is now being used far more effectively than it ever has been used in the past, and the Government has deliberately streamlined its operation and placed greater emphasis on encouraging the adoption of new skills and technology, and also on the development of markets outside this State and this country. Since September 1979, this Government has provided grants to more than 50 firms for an amount of some \$3 000 000. As a result of these incentives, capital expenditure from those companies will be in the order of \$31 500 000. Since October 1980, the scheme has accelerated even more rapidly in its activities, and we have seen approval given for grants to a further 19 companies totalling \$1 600 000, resulting in a capital expenditure by those companies of a further \$14 300 000. Applications covering a further 20 projects involving capital expenditure of \$11 500 000 are presently being processed, and each of these expansions will mean additional job opportunities.

There is no doubt that in its revised form, and under the guidance of the Tonkin Government, the establishment payments scheme is proving to be an extremely effective means of attracting new investment to South Australia. Additionally, the pay-roll tax and land tax rebates of this Government have resulted in further expansion. Without this help, employment and industries would not have developed in this State as they have done. In the 1981 financial year, 201 firms received pay-roll tax rebates totalling in excess of \$2 500 000, and 120 firms have received land tax rebates in excess of \$20 000.

In July 1980, the Tonkin Government provided interest-free bridging finance to supplement the assistance provided under the Commonwealth Export Market Development Scheme to business men undertaking overseas travel to develop export markets. To date, this bridging finance of nearly \$146 000 has been provided to 76 firms and has resulted in assistance to South Australian industry in obtaining new export markets.

A small business advisory council has been developed to assist the all-important small business sector. The council, which met for the first time in March 1980, is made up of members having very deep knowledge and detailed experience in the operation of small business.

A small business consultancy grants scheme has been established, and there is a definite move toward strengthening this vital area (and, remember, small business employs in total far more people in this State than do the large industries). The Tonkin Government must be commended for the positive and aggressive steps it is taking to assist this vital sector.

At the same time, the Tonkin Government has not ignored the needs of the large industrial companies operating in this State. Close attention is given to the key motor vehicle industry, for, without a doubt, South Australia's

economy is vitally dependent upon the welfare of both G.M.H. and Mitsubishi Motors. Associated with those major companies are a number of smaller manufacturers providing components and materials necessary for the manufacture of both Holden and Mitsubishi vehicles. The Government has provided considerable assistance to these smaller manufacturers to adopt new technology to develop products that will enable them to participate in the new ranges of vehicles, including those based upon the world car concept. Some \$1 100 000 has been made available to 23 such supplier companies in South Australia. The Government has also worked very closely with the motor vehicle manufacturers in this State and has assisted them in the development of various export programmes.

I am fortunate enough to have been able to work on the Motor Vehicle Industry Assistance Committee, and the officers involved with that committee are undoubtedly the best informed in Australia on the industry, and I have had much feedback, both from suppliers as well as the major manufacturers, that the assistance provided by those officers is very greatly appreciated indeed. This active interest has played a vital role in the establishment and expansion of many South Australian supplier firms to the major motor vehicle manufacturers.

Unfortunately, this Government has inherited huge debts, such as the Frozen Food Factory, Samcor and the Riverland Cannery, which are somewhat of a millstone. In spite of these very real difficulties, it has made tremendous advances in putting the State back toward a safe footing. Not only do we have industry developing in South Australia as never before, but mining exploration has increased out of all sight. We have off-shore oil exploration, on-shore oil exploration, and a tremendous amount of mineral prospecting going on throughout South Australia.

Work on Roxby Downs is moving at an ever-increasing rate and it would appear that we have at Olympic Dam an ore body which is one of the biggest in the world. Members opposite, of course, have indicated that, presently, under no circumstances would they allow the development of the mining of uranium at Olympic Dam to proceed. In other words, it is their aim to prevent one of the very real major world ore bodies from being developed for, as members opposite are only too well aware, although there is a vast quantity of ore, the grade is not high. In other words, it is only because there are uranium, copper, gold, rare earths and other minerals in combination that this mine can be considered financially viable.

If the mining of uranium is prohibited, then the development at Roxby Downs just cannot proceed. So, members opposite are determined not to allow Roxby Downs to proceed, in spite of the fact that a town bigger than Mount Isa or Broken Hill will almost certainly be required to service the mining community once production operations commence. The town will, of course, generate employment, not only in the mining industry but in the support industries through the building industry, the retail stores, the schools, and all of the other support activities so necessary in a town's welfare and advancement. The multiplier factor is something which members opposite wish to ignore, but the point is that not only will Roxby Downs generate tremendous and desperately needed mineral royalties for this State, but it will also generate a vast number of jobs and income for this State in the support industries. As well as the development at Roxby Downs, we have the establishment of a uranium conversion plant subject to a feasibility study by three major companies. Liquids from the Cooper Basin are to be piped adjacent to Whyalla, and we will have there the basis of a boom for that city.

The bright future that South Australia has under the Tonkin Government is shown only too clearly through the

new foreign and domestic investment in State projects approved by the Foreign Investment Review Board. This investment has jumped from \$17 000 000 in 1979 to \$1 180 000 000 today. This is an increase of 6 800 per cent.

The board's figures also reveal that the State's share of proposed investment through the country to June last year was 22 per cent, compared with 3.5 per cent in the last year of the previous Labor Government. The Tonkin Government, as I have said, can stand proud on the great achievements that have already resulted from its positive determination to attract an industrial base back to South Australia.

One can only shudder to consider what the situation in this State would have been had the Labor Government been retained in power at the 1979 elections. Members opposite must have their tongues in their cheeks when they criticise this Government for its alleged poor record in relation to employment. Certainly, the level of unemployment is still too high in South Australia, but the point is that when the previous Government was in power the number of jobs available was declining at a disastrous rate. Not only has the Tonkin Government halted that decline, but it has increased the number of job opportunities in South Australia by approximately 15 000.

Unfortunately, there is one very dark cloud on the horizon in relation to the continued industrial development of South Australia, and that is the apparent determination of some sections of the union movement to do all that they can to bring the growth in South Australian productivity to a halt. And before members opposite accuse me of 'union bashing', let me say at the outset that unions do have a vital and essential role to play in the community. I wish to point out, however, that presently that role is being exceeded, to the detriment of industrial growth, and it is therefore some aspects of some union activities to which I now refer.

South Australia has been enjoying the best industrial relations record of all States, but we have seen over the last few weeks an unprecedented growth in industrial disputation in this State. The most alarming feature of this industrial disputation is that much of it is the totally unjustifiable demarcation dispute. For sheer stupidity and pigheadedness, nothing can approach the blinkered outlook of unions involved in demarcation disputes. We have seen it far too often in the past, and now it is affecting such major developments essential to South Australia's future as the new power station at Port Augusta. In spite of earlier agreements between the two unions involved, work has now ceased because of the stupidity of union management arguing over just whose members should be allowed to do certain jobs at that station. South Australia just cannot afford these senseless disputes. They will deter investors, and therefore reduce employment opportunities as well as delay vital projects. And we have seen demarcation disputes in other building areas. The building industry in South Australia has problems enough at the moment without the determination of the union movement to bring it completely to its knees. Builders labourers have been complaining that there are not enough jobs for them to work on and yet, when building is available to them, they are determined to have that building come to a halt.

If South Australia is to continue its industrial expansion, additional sources of electric power are essential. One must consider seriously that elements within the union movement are determined to bring the democratic society of South Australia and of Australia to a halt simply to advance their political aims.

We have also seen the 'softening up' strike growing in use. Unions use this unfair tactic before going to arbitration.

Much more is lost than profits when workers use the strike weapon. The social costs of a strike just cannot be

measured. For the individual employee, a strike could totally ruin his and his family's life. A strike can destroy a company, and we have seen that occur. Today, strikes are occurring in a commercial environment of extremely strong competition for the market. If South Australia is not able to offer a sound industrial base with a minimum of disruption, companies will look elsewhere, either to other States or to overseas countries, so that they can be competitive. We have already seen the Japanese, for example, looking for contracts for the supply of iron ore from countries other than Australia.

Until recently, Australia enjoyed the supply of virtually 100 per cent of Japan's iron ore needs. Now, because of the total unreliability of the union movement, the Japanese Government is looking to other countries as suppliers of iron ore, purely and simply because the supply from Australia has been so unreliable due to the industrial disputations of many of the unions involved.

One of the major features of strikes in South Australia and Australia is their unpredictability. This, I believe, can be attributed to two main factors: first, we have trade unions in this country rather than industry unions, and secondly, there is no doubt that there are professional agitators in the union movement whose sole aim is to destroy the economy and the political structure of this State and country. This fact is exemplified in the United Kingdom where, through the sheer pigheadedness of unions, major car manufacturing companies have been completely brought to their knees. Despite the tens of thousands of jobs that were lost in that industry alone because of union action, union officials in that country are still persisting with their disastrous policies.

I am fortunate in that I am in a position to be able to compare directly the actions of unions in this country with those in the United States of America. In the United States, of course, unions are industry unions. There can be, and are, long and protracted industrial disputes, but these are predictable in that every three years companies in the United States are required to negotiate with the unions on pay and other package deals for the ensuing three years. Until agreement is reached, it is not uncommon for a company to be closed for weeks and sometimes even months. However, once agreement is achieved between the company and the union involved, the company is secure in the knowledge that there will be no further strikes for the next three years. Political strikes and demarcation disputes are totally unheard of, and American unionists just cannot understand the Australian unionists' involvement in those two areas. Those areas have absolutely nothing to do with the working conditions or other factors directly involved in the employment of the individual.

Political disputes are exactly that—set up by unions purely and simply to embarrass a Government. This was shown only too clearly when the container vessel *Paralla* was held off-shore here by the Seamen's Union and Federated Miscellaneous Workers Union. The reason given by the spokesman of the unions was:

The bans imposed in this instance should serve as a warning to the Federal Government and the mining companies that Australian workers have the right and the power to shape and determine the future course of their society.

Political and demarcation disputes are totally without defence. Again, in the United States the legal protection of the courts is available to both union and management.

If management does not adhere to its agreements, it can be taken to court by the union. Similarly, so can companies take a union to court if that union has a blackleg strike or in any other way breaches its industrial agreement.

Mr Hemmings: You don't believe that, do you? It never works in practice, and you know that.

Mr ASHENDEN: I have seen it work very well indeed in the car industry in the United States. The sooner such a system can be introduced into this country, the better. In addition to awards being legally enforceable on both sides, I also believe that it is essential that, when agreement between employers and unions cannot be met within a fixed time, both go to arbitration and the decision of the commission then be legally binding on both parties.

There is no doubt (and this is supported by public opinion polls) that unions today are exercising far too much irresponsible power. The trade union movement in this country has always sought the protection of the law and yet, at the same time, to escape from restraints imposed by law. This was only too clearly indicated by the dispute of the Utah company last year. Although many unionists broke the law during the period of that strike, and although agreement was reached by unions with management, the unions still decided to remain out until such demands as all lost time be paid, and a project manager be sacked, were met and all charges which the company had laid against officials and labourers such as trespass, malicious damage, etc., and all police charges such as resisting arrest, hindering arrest, inciting a riot, etc., were dropped. In other words, the unions want *carte blanche* to be able to break the law, act with impunity and get away with it. They expect to be able to go on strike and be paid whilst they are not working. These demands are ludicrous, and the sooner that this type of union irresponsibility is brought to heel, the better.

When all aspects of a strike are taken into consideration, the cost to a company has been calculated at over \$300 a day for each employee involved. This includes loss of sales, loss of profit, legal fees, loss of productivity, the multiplier effect in that, when production is not going on, other staff cannot be productively utilised, overtime is required after the strike is settled in an attempt to catch up on production, and many other areas of loss are incurred as well. It is no wonder that this State and this country will be seriously disadvantaged if the present industrial unrest continues.

There is no denying that the strike is a legitimate weapon available to the worker, but unfortunately it is rarely that the strike is used for legitimate purposes, and I repeat that far too many strikes are of a purely political basis or due to demarcation disputes.

While I am discussing difficulties confronting industry in South Australia, I feel I must raise the issue that is presently before the Federal Government, namely, whether the present protection is to be continued for the motor vehicle industry in this country. Should there be any change to the present tariff and import requirements along the lines recommended by the so-called Industries Assistance Committee, the effect in South Australia will be disastrous. Should a larger number of vehicles be allowed into this country to compete at a price which could not be matched by Australian manufacturers, then there must be a loss of production and therefore a loss of jobs and income. I want to stress at this time, however, that, although imported vehicles could be sold more cheaply than those that are made in Australia, this in no way reflects upon the efficiency of the Australian motor vehicle manufacturing industry.

Certainly, if we go back five or 10 years, there is no doubt that Australian motor vehicle manufacturing was extremely inefficient, and quality control was also leaving much to be desired. Today, however, allowing for obsolete equipment, companies such as Mitsubishi are undoubtedly as efficient as are any of their overseas counterparts. Some 10 years ago it took over 80 man-hours to build a car at the then Chrysler plant. Today the time is down to almost 20 man-hours per car at the Mitsubishi plant. This increased efficiency has been achieved through a very close rapport between management and worker, with the result that an

extremely efficient manufacturing process is now in operation. Additionally, again because of the close co-operation between worker and management, quality control is far better than it has ever been before, and undoubtedly the Mitsubishi range of vehicles which are available to Australians are at least equal, if not superior, in quality control to their Japanese and other overseas counterparts. The day of the Australian car being inferior is gone.

I am aware that at this stage neither G.M.H. nor Ford has yet achieved the efficiency or quality control of Mitsubishi. However, they are advancing in both of those areas and undoubtedly there will, in the very near future, in both of those companies, be an achievement such as has occurred in our South Australian based company of Mitsubishi. However, this progress will be completely destroyed if the Federal Government does not ignore the report of the I.A.C., whose recommendations would spell disaster for this State. They would, in fact, if adopted, lead to the closure of Mitsubishi, and I have been absolutely staggered at the ineptitude of the various so-called economic experts who have made such ridiculous statements as 'We should allow imports into Australia and just pay all of our car workers \$10 000 to do nothing.' These so-called experts are intimating that the cost to the Australian motorist is such that a payment of that order could be made and cars sold more cheaply from overseas. This ignores so many points that I am staggered that press space was given to such utterances.

These so-called experts have completely overlooked the tremendous number of jobs and firms that are involved in supplying the major manufacturers that exist in this country. There would be far more jobs lost than just those involved in Holden, Ford and Mitsubishi. South Australia's manufacturing base is the car industry. If Mitsubishi or G.M.H. were to cease manufacturing operations, hundreds of smaller suppliers and thousands of jobs outside of those in Mitsubishi and Holdens would go. The economy of this State would receive a fatal blow, and I certainly trust that the Federal Government will listen to the representations of the Tonkin Government, the union movement and the motor vehicle manufacturers. An industry has been established. It is becoming more efficient, and in no way must the Federal Government allow any action to be taken that would result in the loss of jobs and income based upon motor vehicle manufacture.

I wish now to contrast the positive plans and actions of the Tonkin Government with resolutions passed at the 1981 State Convention of the A.L.P. held in Adelaide recently. A recipe for industrial disaster is the only description that can be given to that conference. Let us look at some of the specific decisions which were taken at that conference, and remember that Parliamentarians of that Party sitting in this House are all bound by the decisions of that conference. They must abide by them and that makes them members of a Party determined to bring the development of this State to an even greater decline than that which occurred during the seventies, if ever such decisions were implemented. An opportunity must never be provided for that Party to again destroy the industrial base of this State.

Let us have a look at some of these issues. First, Labor would legislate to ensure that no State Government employee or statutory body employee would be retrenched or suffer a drop in salary or be forced to transfer to a place of employment more than 30 minutes from his or her present place of employment. How on earth are we going to get teachers, policemen, and so on to work in the country?

Also, members opposite are bound to support the introduction of the 35-hour week. This will result in a vast increase in the cost of production and undoubtedly a considerable loss of jobs, as companies will be forced to close, as they will no longer be able to compete effectively or efficiently. In this week's *Bulletin* we see just how out of

touch the Labor Party is on this matter, with an opinion poll showing quite clearly that the majority of Australians do not want a 35-hour week, and that majority is growing. Let us make no mistake—the only reason the unions want a 35-hour week is so that additional income can be earned by getting into overtime five hours more quickly than is presently the case. As I have said, the cost of production will skyrocket with the result being closure of firms and loss of jobs. A more short-sighted policy you just could not find. What is the good of a hoped-for extra five hours overtime if the job disappears altogether?

Additionally, do A.L.P. members realise that their motion concerning no employee being transferred to a position more than 30 minutes away from his present position would mean that a person presently employed in Morphett Vale, Modbury or Elizabeth, for example, would not be able to take up a job in the city of Adelaide?

Also, Labor would legislate to ensure that no employer could retrench or lay off a person without giving at least six months notice. Its requirements on severance pay, compensation, so-called capital loss on homes following transfer, and so on (and nothing is mentioned about capital gain, of course) are again a recipe for economic disaster. It expects employers to pay for lost time, fares, removal expenses, and so on if any of their employees are retrenched or laid off to enable those employees to obtain work elsewhere. Do members opposite not realise that any money which an employer spends must come from the income derived from the sale of his goods? The requirements on severance pay and all of those items I have just mentioned would make the cost of manufacture in South Australia prohibitively expensive. We could not compete with interstate markets, let alone overseas markets, and South Australian industry just would not exist.

We have seen that members opposite want to have South Australia as a nuclear-free zone. Again, this would wipe out any development at Roxby Downs, any development of a uranium enrichment plant, and just the loss of these two projects alone would result in a vast loss of income to this State as well as employment opportunities, particularly, as I have said earlier, when the multiplier effects are taken into consideration. Without a doubt, the left wing of the A.L.P. has flexed its muscles well and truly, compelling even the more moderate members opposite to be under the control of that wing. I am sure that many members opposite are just as alarmed as are my colleagues and I on this side of the House at the irresponsible motions that have been allowed through the Labor Party conference. Of course, let us not forget that it is still Labor Party platform that industry should be nationalised. As the member for Elizabeth stated at the convention.

Let us be honest and put into our policy that we should remove exploitation and that means nationalisation of the means of production, industry and exchange.

There can be no clearer statement than that as to what members opposite would have in store for this State if ever they were to gain power.

I would like now to refer to an issue which is of vital importance to my electorate of Todd, and that is the development of the north-eastern busway to provide essential rapid transport facilities to the north-eastern suburbs. As members are probably aware, both the member for Newland and I travelled overseas recently at our own expense to fully investigate all forms of public transport. I would like to report briefly on my findings.

I would like to stress from the outset that I did not go overseas with a closed mind and, in fact, I spent more time studying light rail and heavy rail transport systems than I did bus systems. There is no doubt that all three methods of transport are now extremely effective and extremely

efficient. I visited public transport authorities in both Europe and North America. Some of those authorities had just one form of public transport, while others had a number.

The first system I studied in detail was in Essen, West Germany. There could not have been a better point for a study tour to commence, for the public utility controlling public transport in that city is such that it has as part of its operations heavy rail, two forms of light rail, buses and a section of guided busway. I found this to be extremely valuable, for it meant that I was able to discuss the relative advantages and disadvantages of each system with an engineer who was familiar with all forms of public transport. I was fortunate in that I was able to hold detailed discussions with the Chief Engineer of the Essen Public Transport Utility. This was invaluable for it meant that my many technical questions could be answered by a person who was in an extremely strong position to proffer advice and to make suggestions concerning the situation we are facing here in the north-eastern suburbs of Adelaide. And I stress that he had no axe to grind because there were no sales contingent on any recommendations he made. I was also fortunate enough to be able to travel on all of the various forms of public transport operated by that utility.

The most disappointing area of the public transport system in Essen was heavy rail. However, I believe from discussions with my colleague, Dr Billard, that this was certainly not a common experience in Europe and that evidently the heavy rail systems elsewhere were considerably superior to those I used in Essen. I also, particularly in the United States, found vastly superior heavy rail systems. Of the remaining systems, there is no doubt that both light rail and busway are very efficient methods of transport. The light, light rail, or what we would call a tram system here in Adelaide, was rather old and certainly was both noisy and uncomfortable. The heavy light rail, which is more in line with the type of system suggested by the previous Labor Government, was modern, and considerably superior to the light, light rail. However, it was noisier both inside and outside of the vehicle than the guided busway vehicles and was not as comfortable to ride in.

Essen is one of the cities I visited where light rail is actually being extended, although as Mr Albrecht, the Chief Engineer, indicated to me, this was a political decision. If he were to have his way, he would stop extension of light rail and concentrate purely upon extension of the guided busway which was recently opened in Essen. It is also interesting to note that the length of the guided busway is to be more than doubled in the immediate future, with further extensions planned.

I must admit that, prior to my departure overseas, I did have doubts whether a bus could possibly be as smooth to ride in as a tram, particularly when accelerating. However, these worries were very quickly put to rest as, once I had ridden on the busway, I was more impressed than I could possibly have hoped. The bus itself was well appointed, very quiet and extremely smooth riding. In fact, when sitting in the forward section of the bus, it was impossible to hear the engine noise or to detect gear changes. This latter factor, of course, is in stark contrast to the Volvo buses which we now have in our fleet here in Adelaide.

It was pointed out to me that the transmissions used in the Volvos here are obsolete by about 10 years, and any person who has ever ridden on our S.T.A. bus fleet would be only too well aware of both the noise and the discomfort that is experienced with gear changing. The automatic transmissions are extremely jerky and result in quite uncomfortable journeys. However, the automatic transmission of the Mercedes-Benz buses that I rode on in Germany was as smooth as, if not smoother than, the transmission which

is presently in my own car. I have been advised by my colleague, Dr Billard, that the M.A.N. vehicles provided a similarly smooth and quiet ride.

The Chief Engineer, Mr Albrecht, also indicated to me that noise tests have been undertaken, and that noise levels within and outside the bus are lower than those in either their light rail or heavy light rail vehicles. There is no doubt that the busway track was also much more attractive than any of the light rail tracks. There were no ugly overhead wires and the cement guideways were much more easily blended with the environment than was the case with the steel rail and its sleepers. Again, a great distinction between the buses available in South Australia and those overseas was not confined just to comfort and noise levels. Entry to the buses is very easy, since the doors and doorways are much wider, and platforms are frequently provided so that there is no necessity for the steep steps which are found in our buses in Adelaide.

Naturally, I asked Mr Albrecht of any difficulties that his authority had encountered in relation to the use of buses and the busway. He said that only two areas had presented problems. The first of these will have no effect in Australia, as it relates to the cold winter months that occur in Europe. Evidently, there has been some difficulty in having the bus tyres retain traction along sections of the guided busway when water freezes on the cement guides. As I said, this would be no problem in Australia because our winters are not nearly so severe as those of Europe.

The other problem raised by Mr Albrecht was that, when a bus leaves the busway, damage can occur to the guide wheels when a driver is approaching a kerb outside of the guided busway itself. On occasions, the guidewheels have been clipped against a kerb, which has distorted them. This, of course, means that the bus cannot then be used on the busway until repairs have been made.

Contingency plans have been set up in Essen for such an occurrence. The buses have radio control and, should any damage occur, the maintenance section is immediately contacted and a repair vehicle dispatched to the terminus. When the bus arrives at the terminus, repairs are immediately undertaken and schedules maintained. I see no reason, however, why this problem could not be overcome on a preventive basis. I am sure a hydraulic guard could be lowered when the vehicle is running off the guideway and raised when the vehicle was utilising the guideway. The guard would then act as a buffer and prevent damage should a driver approach a kerb too closely. Mr Albrecht indicated to me also that, in his opinion, the guided busway is the best of all public transport systems available to him, and, remember, he has under his control heavy rail, two systems of light rail, as well as a guided busway.

I carefully described to him the situation we have here in relation to a system to serve the north-eastern suburbs, and he felt there is no doubt that the correct decision would be to develop a busway system. He based this judgment on a number of reasons, but the predominant factor most in favour of a busway system is cost. For approximately one-third of the cost of light rail, a system can be developed which is almost as fast, more comfortable, and quieter, which has less effect on the environment, and which is more flexible.

From Europe, I travelled to North America where I again studied a large number of public transport systems. The first of these was in Washington D.C., where I used two systems, namely, the fully automated heavy rail metro system, on which I travelled from the airport to Washington, and, secondly, the conventional busway. Without a doubt, the two most impressive public transport systems that I used whilst overseas were both heavy rail. One of these was the metro to which I presently refer, and the

other the Bay Area Rapid Transit or B.A.R.T. in San Francisco. With the latter, the original teething problems now appear to be predominantly overcome, with the result that both it and the metro in Washington D.C. are now fully automated, absolutely first-class rapid public transport systems.

Unfortunately, their cost would be totally prohibitive to any State Government in Australia. This is unfortunate, for there is no doubt that such an underground system with full automation has resulted in extremely rapid, very comfortable, very quiet public transport. The busway itself in Washington left, I felt, much to be desired. The standard of bus was certainly not as good as that I found in Europe or as that I found in other cities in North America. Additionally, the busway is used by private vehicles as well as emergency vehicles.

I firmly believe that busways should be exactly that—a route for the use of buses only. In the United States, public pressure has been brought to bear on the management of transport authorities to allow the busways to be used by private and emergency vehicles, and I would certainly hope that we do not succumb to any such pressure here in Adelaide. Additionally, a guided busway does not lend itself to use by private or emergency vehicles, and this is a positive attribute of the guided busway.

The next major transport system I studied was in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. This provided me again with a considerable degree of information. The Pittsburgh Public Transport Authority controls both light rail and conventional busway systems. At the moment, just one busway is in operation, but another much longer busway is presently under construction. Again, I was fortunate enough to ride on the busway, and the Pittsburgh Public Transport Authority has recently purchased a large number of new General Motors vehicles. These were most comfortable and again very quiet. They were not as good as the Mercedes-Benz vehicles in use in Europe, but were superior to the light rail vehicles in use in Pittsburgh.

It is interesting to note that this transport authority is not only extending its busways but is, as is Essen, closing down some of its light rail sections and converting them to busway. I was informed by officers of the Pittsburgh authority that there is tremendous public pressure on them to expand and extend their busways. In fact, the authority there attributes the very rapid growth in passenger numbers to its busway programme. As I am sure we are all well aware, the American and his car are inseparable. However, in Pittsburgh 70 per cent of all persons working in the downtown area now travel to and from work by public transport. This has certainly not always been the case, and the growth in passenger traffic, as I said, parallels the introduction and expansion of the busways.

From Pittsburgh, I travelled to Chicago, a city which has no busways but which is heavily dependent on light rail. Certainly, the vehicles in use are comfortable and fast. However, they run upon an elevated section in downtown Chicago which can only be described as visually hideous. The elevated rail and the loop are an absolute eyesore, and it just goes to show what happens when costs are cut in the provision of light rail facilities. The light rail system in Chicago was developed to a price, with the result that a most ugly structure will now be permanently foisted on the people of that city. In fact, I would go so far as to say that the elevated rail itself is possibly the ugliest structure that I have ever seen. This system is being extended to provide a rapid system of transport from the O'Hare International Airport into downtown Chicago.

I would again like to make quite clear that there is no doubt that light rail is an extremely effective and efficient form of public transport. This is particularly so where there

are centres of heavily concentrated population and, therefore, requirements for large numbers of people to be moved at any one time.

This situation, of course, does not apply here in Adelaide, or in the movement of the residents of the north-eastern suburbs to and from the city of Adelaide. There is not the high concentration of population that warrants the very greatly increased expenditure that determines the difference between the cost of a busway and the cost of a light rail transit system.

I can see no reason whatsoever why this Government should spend three times the amount of money on a light rail system when there is no doubt that either a conventional or a guided busway, or a combination of both, will serve the area just as well. The buses I travelled on in both Europe and North America are as quiet as, and in some instances quieter than, light rail, and certainly are just as smooth. They are able to travel just as quickly and they have the added advantage of being considerably more flexible in that, just as overseas, we plan here in Adelaide to have buses utilising the busway and also travelling into the suburbs on conventional roads, thus reducing the necessity for interchange and providing a facility whereby it is more convenient for a traveller, who is able to board one bus and travel right to the city rather than having to catch a feeder bus service with a transfer to a light rail system.

Of all the busways I studied in North America, the most impressive was that in Los Angeles. There, a conventional busway has been developed which acts in exactly the manner that we plan for the north-east busway. There is a section of busway approximately 12 miles long which travels from downtown Los Angeles out to a suburban centre, much like Tea Tree Plaza, where the buses then radiate out to the various suburbs using normal roads. Also, like the Adelaide proposal, the buses in downtown Los Angeles utilise existing city streets, so the parallel between that operation and the one planned for Adelaide to the north-eastern suburbs is very close indeed. It was interesting to note that the buses were able to move along the ordinary roadways in downtown Los Angeles with ease, because a similar system to that planned for Adelaide is in use whereby there are specific lanes for the buses to travel along. It was also interesting to note that the problem in North America of cars illegally using the bus lanes has been overcome by having buses travel in the opposite direction to the ordinary traffic flow. It would be a very brave person indeed who would drive along a bus lane with a large G.M. bus bearing down on him at some 80 kilometres an hour in the opposite direction. The officers of the Public Transport Authority in Los Angeles have indicated that their busway system works extremely effectively, and undoubtedly moves people from downtown Los Angeles to the outer areas much more quickly than even cars on the freeway.

Whilst in North America, I was also fortunate enough to travel to Seattle and use both their mono rail and light rail. The mono rail, of course, is extremely expensive and was only built for an exposition which was held at that city. The light rail system was, as with other light rail systems, very smooth, quiet and efficient.

A final point I would like to make is that, in the *Advertiser* of 29 June, the results of a Gallup poll were presented which indicated that 60 per cent of Australians say that buses are the form of public transport that serves their area best. It is interesting to note that, at the same time, only 5 per cent of Australians felt that trams served their area best.

I wish also to comment on other aspects of public transport that I noted while overseas. Certainly the ticketing arrangements that I saw both in Europe and North America

are far more efficient than any I have seen in South Australia. Ticket vending machines which are fully automated are available and enable intending passengers to obtain their tickets with considerable ease. Machines have now been developed which can accept both notes and coins and provide change. Other machines provide tickets for a certain cash value, and that ticket can be used until the total amount has been spent. All of these systems are fully automatic and computerised. I would certainly hope that the S.T.A. will look at such systems for installation in the future, both for the heavy rail section of its system as well as the busway. No transactions involving change are conducted on buses or rail vehicles, providing added protection to staff from robberies and violence.

Another innovation which I found extremely useful was the utilisation of electronic destination signs. These were very easily readable from a distance, and would also overcome the problem of the roll system, whereby a large number of potential destinations need to be printed, many of which are, most of the time, superfluous.

It was also most interesting to observe overseas the steps being taken to cater for the handicapped. Such systems include in Pittsburgh the use of specific vehicles virtually on a basis as operated by taxis, with specially designed vans taking the handicapped passenger directly between points of the passenger's choice, that is, from door to door. In Los Angeles, hydraulic platforms were provided on the buses so that wheelchairs could be taken aboard the buses by use of self-contained hydraulic lifting equipment. In Europe, the most simple and effective method of all was used by having a platform level with the floor of the bus and an extension from the floor of the bus moving out to the platform enabling a wheelchair to enter directly on to the bus.

In conclusion, I can say that there is no doubt that the public of South Australia will, by having a busway system provided, have available to it public transport equal to any in the world. Along with light rail, busways are now extremely effective and efficient. Busways are much cheaper than light rail, are just as fast, at least as comfortable, more quiet and have less environmental impact than light rail, and certainly in a situation as we have in the north-eastern suburbs, where we do not have a high concentration of population, it is the only responsible decision that could be taken. For one-third of the cost, a system will be provided which offers all that could be asked.

In view of the population size being serviced, there is no doubt that the South Australian Government is acting most responsibly in providing a busway system. I look forward to the day when constituents within the electorate of Todd will be able to board a bus far more advanced than any which we now have here in Adelaide—a bus which will be fast, smooth, and quiet and which will offer every advantage of the most modern public transport systems anywhere in the world.

It would be remiss of me not to take this opportunity to speak of the late Sir Thomas Playford. I spoke earlier in this speech about the growth the Tonkin Government is reintroducing into South Australia, a growth which was set in motion without doubt by Sir Thomas Playford. The debt of this State to that man will never be calculated. I am fortunate enough to have known Sir Thomas personally. He was a close friend of my grandparents, who owned a cherry orchard almost next door to the Playford property. My grandparents always spoke highly of Sir Thomas's humility and of the fact that whenever anyone was in trouble the first person there would be Sir Thomas.

In a time of bushfires he might have been Premier but he would be one of the first to fight the fires. As soon as any members of his community were in any trouble he would be the first to be alongside them to provide the

support they needed. It was with real regret that I learned of the death of Sir Thomas Playford. I acknowledge in this House his very real and great contribution to this State.

Mr RANDALL (Henley Beach): I have pleasure in seconding the motion. I wish to devote as much of my time as I can to the Speech with which His Excellency the Governor opened this session of Parliament. The first part of the motion expresses our thanks to His Excellency for the Speech with which he was pleased to open Parliament. When a new session starts there is a buzz of excitement and an air of expectancy. I shared that feeling because we came together again to bring further benefits to the State, by making improvements to the legislation which we as a Government believe will further the interests of this State. I believe it is a great State, and I am proud to be here this afternoon as the member representing the District of Henley Beach and to take part in the formulation of Government policy. I am also proud to be a member of this Government Party.

I would also like to pay tribute to the late Sir Thomas Playford. As a new and junior member of this Parliament, I was privileged to sit at the same dinner table as Sir Thomas soon after my election to this House and to discuss with him some aspects of the role of a Parliamentarian. I count that as a privilege, because as a young person growing up in South Australia I heard a lot about Sir Thomas Playford. I well remember a day when my parents were voting, and of course the name of Sir Thomas Playford was being mentioned. They were talking about whom they should be voting for, and I can well remember his name being mentioned. Throughout my childhood I heard a great deal about Sir Thomas, and when I was studying politics the name of this great character was mentioned in relation to the history of South Australia. Sir Thomas played a great part in the development of this State.

The final great moment came when I met Sir Thomas, sat down with him, and began to know him as a person. Unfortunately, I did not have the opportunity to get to know him over many years, as did some of my colleagues on this side. I listened with interest to the messages of condolence that were expressed throughout the community and from both sides of politics. I remember most clearly the sentiments expressed by the member for Hartley, who highlighted some aspects of Sir Thomas Playford's character of which the community was perhaps not aware. When I was doing research for this speech, I attempted to find something a little unique about Sir Thomas so that I could tell the House about it, but unfortunately because of lack of time and other pressures I was not able to make full use of the tremendous library facilities with which we are provided to gather the sort of information for which I was looking.

Those people who wish to write about Sir Thomas should try to ascertain his underlying philosophy. What made him the unique man that he was? What was different about him? What was the basis of his life that led him to become the sort of person that he was? We all know that he had a political philosophy and he endeavoured to further that philosophy in the community, but he also had a personal philosophy which bridged the divisions of politics and which enabled him to sit down with the member for Hartley or the member for Mitcham and talk about something, or move across the spectrums of politics in Federal and State areas so that he made his mark in our community. It is that area of his personal philosophy that must be considered.

In response to the Governor's Speech, I will refer to several areas: first, care for the aged in our community; secondly, housing for new families in the community; I will

then bring those two topics together and talk about quality of life in a metropolitan community; finally, I will comment on an issue that has lately raised its head, that is, a cemetery for West Lakes.

Mr Keneally: What about land clearing on Kangaroo Island?

Mr RANDALL: Unfortunately, I cannot comment on that, because it is out of my district. I have not yet had the privilege to visit Kangaroo Island. My comments are related to paragraph 21 of the Governor's Speech, which referred to the amalgamation of the Department for the Environment and the Department of Urban and Regional Affairs to form the Department of Environment and Planning. It is appropriate that the roles of those two departments be brought together, because they interact and complement one another, I am sure to the benefit of the community. The new department will advise the Government on policy and guidelines to achieve a balance between development and environmental protection in conservation and the use and development of the State's natural resources. We should recall that in the last session of this Parliament the Minister of Planning introduced a Bill dealing with planning that was laid on the table for public comment, and no doubt there has been public comment. We will debate this Bill quite vigorously at a later stage. I am sure that, in the long term, with the implementation of the Bill, a streamlined and more efficient process for planning will emerge to the benefit of South Australia.

I refer now to planning for accommodation for the aged. On Monday, 29 June 1981, an editorial appeared in the *Advertiser* under the heading 'Caring for the Aged'. I believe that the editor was prompted to write the editorial by a warning made by the Chairman of the South Australian Health Commission, Mr McKay, when addressing the South Australian Council for the Aged at the council's conference, that South Australia was heading for a period of crisis in the care of aged members of our community. He also stated that some authorities now question the worth of the present emphasis on institutionalised care for so many elderly people, not on the grounds of cost, but because elderly people are likely to be happier and healthier in a family-general community situation.

Mr McKay also stated that the Health Commission is now responding with a dual policy. One aspect was to start to move resources from acute care to other programmes, encouraging care for the aged in their own home. The other aspect was to move resources from institutional care to domiciliary and support services within the community. I will elaborate on those two points. In recent years, the aged have tended to be isolated and cast on to the human scrap heap long before their potential to contribute to the well-being of the community has ended. From time to time, articles have appeared in the local newspaper in my district expressing a desire for planning in regard to accommodation for the elderly in the community. As the member for the district, I am aware of the concern. We must plan for our elderly citizens.

It has been revealed that the Henley and Grange council area began as a resort-retirement centre after the Second World War, when one person in 10 in the district was more than 65 years of age. According to a population projection made in 1979, the number of retired people in the community will increase by 60 per cent in the next 10 years, while the number of people in other age groups will increase by only 6 per cent. It is because of that sort of population projection that the council has begun to think seriously, and it is because the council has begun to think seriously that I have decided to take up the challenge to examine Government policies in this area. There are two kinds of accommodation for elderly people. There is a glaring need

for accommodation for self-sufficient elderly people. They should be able to purchase or lease a unit or a hostel room, and remain self-sufficient. They can then retain their identity as a person and not be cared for and waited upon when that is not necessary. Self-contained units in groups and individual units are dispersed throughout the community. A pleasant and attractive environment must be created to enable elderly people to retain their independence and dignity. Small garden plots should be included in any plans, as well as larger landscaped areas that would be separately maintained.

There is a realisation in our community that the sort of accommodation that has been provided for elderly people has not measured up. It is a time for change but, before we can effect that change, we must consider the accommodation that is now available. There are places such as the Hampstead Centre, which is run with funds provided by the South Australian Health Commission, and there are organisations such as the Home for Incurables that receive Commonwealth nursing home benefits. Unfortunately, the cost of running this kind of establishment is tremendously high, and Commonwealth benefits do not cover the full cost. Obviously, a deficit occurs which unfortunately must be made up by the State Government.

As well as Government institutions, there are religious and charitable nursing homes receiving capital subsidies from the Department of Social Security for new buildings, and also a small capital subsidy from the State Government for furnishings and equipment. Like the Home for Incurables, they operate at a loss, but that loss is made up by the Commonwealth Government under the Nursing Homes Assistance Act. In the religious and charitable sectors, residential care hostels attract Commonwealth subsidies from the Department of Social Security, not through the Department of Health, but through the personal care subsidies. In the private sector, nursing home fees are controlled by the Commonwealth; hence, they are of no concern to the South Australian Health Commission.

Therefore, we have another group of people in the community attempting to accommodate the elderly, but running at a loss, that loss being made up by the Commonwealth Government. Again, the group is tied back to a Government instrumentality and to Government policies and direction. There is also a need for the Commonwealth Government to look at providing subsidies for sheltered accommodation for the aged in the private sector in the same way as in the voluntary sector. Often, what we call hostels in this State are known as rest homes, established under State legislation. I believe the Commonwealth Government should have some responsibility towards those privately run rest homes.

Whilst I am on that topic, let me say that some of the problems of private rest homes have been drawn to my attention. A case was pointed out to me recently where an outbreak of scabies has occurred over the past two years. The health authorities have been contacted time and time again to highlight the area of concern. I am not able to mention the nursing home concerned at this stage in this House because of a case presently before the workers compensation courts in this State. However, at a later stage, if the nursing home does not come up to scratch, I will be willing to bring the matter to the attention of the Minister in this House, so that people will be aware of the sort of accommodation provided and some of the abuses taking place in private nursing homes.

Another matter of concern to me is my belief that elderly people are going to nursing homes far too early in life. This occurs because, over the past few years in South Australia, we have gained a significant amount of Commonwealth money to build nursing homes. Figures from the 1976 census show that South Australia had only 9.4 per cent of

the total aged population in Australia, but had received grants under the Aged Persons Homes Act to accommodate 18.7 per cent of all aged persons. We could contrast that situation with what is happening in New South Wales. With almost 37 per cent of the total aged population in Australia, New South Wales receives only 29 per cent of the funding, so we can see that there is an imbalance.

We have in this State a glut of nursing homes, because that has been the easy way out. Governments of the day have not had to grapple with finding alternative means of accommodation, so nursing homes have been built and people's names have been put on waiting lists. Now, we find that the transition for elderly persons is from home to a nursing home, because their name comes up. A bed becomes vacant and they feel that, if they do not take it, they will miss out when they need such accommodation and care. Therefore, elderly people are going into nursing homes far too early.

Unfortunately, the environment of the nursing home is such that, once a person becomes bound to a bed and waited on hand and foot, day and night, that person adjusts psychologically to that environment. Over a period of months or years, they become adjusted, and they are then in need of nursing home accommodation. I believe that there is sufficient evidence to show that, if we keep people out of nursing homes and provide alternative accommodation with some heart in it, they will realise that it is not the end of the world to become old and that, when they reach retirement age, that is not the end but the beginning. Many would then stay out of nursing homes for a further 10 or 15 years, and their lives would be extended in that way. The quality of life of our elderly people would be extended, too.

Having visited some of the nursing homes and some of the alternatives, I am convinced that the alternatives are worth trying. South Australia needs to look to private enterprise to establish, with Government help, alternative styles of accommodation for our elderly people. A style I am investigating in my own area is a village complex in which a large number of people are housed in an area of 10 or 12 acres. On that land are built units which are bought by the residents. There may be cluster homes built on the land. Because of the price of land in the metropolitan area, we must have an efficient return, and we need to build accommodation that is within the reach of the people involved. At least 50 per cent of people of more than retirement age own their own homes. When one of the partners has died, the surviving partner, instead of living in a big home and paying council and water rates, electricity charges, telephone bills, and having maintenance worries, and so on, could give up that worry, sell the home, invest the money in a unit (a sound investment), and then live in a close community where support services for the elderly are available. These support services include doctors, physiotherapists, and other services needed by the elderly.

One village I visited was unique in that every unit was linked to a master switchboard staffed 24 hours a day by a nursing sister. If anything went wrong, the resident could push a button, transmitting a signal to the central receiving station, and the nurse would know that urgent care was needed in the unit. She could be there within minutes, and the appropriate action of calling a doctor, and so on, could be taken. If we can offer support systems and take away some of the hassles of later life, offering incentives to live in such a community, I am sure the elderly will take up the challenge.

I was impressed by the ability of elderly people to continue to exercise and keep fit. That is a new area for the Government to look at. We need to establish keep-fit classes for the elderly and to provide facilities where they can

perhaps swim every day in a pool. That in itself is preventive medicine. The member for Albert Park has been on about a hydro-therapy pool which he thinks the Government should be providing in the Western Domiciliary Care Centre. He believes that the Government should be providing it, but other groups could provide such a facility, which can be shared. What is better than to have an elderly citizens meeting hall with a heated swimming pool attached for use for exercise on a daily basis, if necessary?

Mr Keneally: If other groups can't provide it, do you believe that the Government should?

Mr RANDALL: It is debatable whether other groups cannot provide it. I am sure they can, and I am sure it would be far more attractive to other groups if there was better usage of it. That is what I am attempting to show. If we can offer a facility where people can exercise daily, and where patients can be referred for hydro-therapy treatment, that would be excellent. The people concerned would not have to be elderly; they could be of any age group. The local community benefits by having such a facility close by, where muscles can be exercised, restored, and developed.

Of course, we as a Government have laboured in this area of preventive medicine. I think it is time that the community got the message that the Government intends to get stuck into this area to make sure that people understand that preventive programmes are far more economical for this State than are curative programmes. Perhaps I need to spell out the general principles involved in preventive programmes. Many of the disabilities and handicaps experienced by elderly people are a direct result of their not having lived a healthy life during their youth and middle age. Matters such as the effect of smoking, obesity, inappropriate diet, not enough exercise, stiff joints and social withdrawal are all matters that young people can confront and do something about. This is the biggest single issue facing our health promotion services in the next few years. I believe that the Health Commission is beginning to make a start in the area of smoking. It is being helped along by the fact that the community has accepted that smoking can no longer be tolerated in buses and perhaps should not be tolerated in trains or restaurants, either. What we need to know as a community is whether we want to take this line of action. We need to find whether the community wants to take on board this new approach—the preventive medicine approach. We need to encourage not only our elderly people but also our young people to take on a life style which will be of benefit to them as they grow older.

I have already mentioned swimming pools, and I turn now to another area in the elderly citizens, village, that of craft activities. It is clear to me that we have many elderly people who retire at their peak of development. They have developed as tradesmen, perhaps in the fine art of stone cutting, woodworking, etc., but unfortunately our craft system of training apprentices has changed and these people with this expertise have retired and quite often withdrawn from the community. I believe that they have a lot to offer the community, if they can be utilised.

There are young, unemployed people in my area who are part of a programme to learn various trade activities. I am sure that, if we utilise these older persons who have the knowledge and the trade backgrounds to pass on skills, and if we give them access to reasonable facilities, this can be achieved. The expertise held by these older people could be passed on to the young in the community, thus bridging the gap between the young and the older people. Unfortunately, the trend of western society is to shunt off our elderly people at too early a stage.

I was able to see what I would term 'therapeutic activities' where elderly people were able to garden on a daily

basis—they had their own plot of land where they were able to grow vegetables which were used in their village. They also have hostel-type accommodation provided for them. They were also able to propagate plants in glass and shade houses and to engage in craft activities. For the older people there were crocheting, pottery and other things that they could learn and pass on to one another. On that very basis those elderly people had something to live for on a daily basis. When they got up in the morning they had the day before them, a day of activity, of things to do as a group, so that they were not just sitting around in the sun reading and reminiscing about years gone by. They had a genuine programme with which to become involved if they desired to do so. It is that very approach that I am sure added many years of life to their activities.

I move now to a new area which concerns me—housing for new families. I believe that there is a need for review in the community which should take place quite quickly, because we are running into the problems with housing that we heard highlighted today in Question Time. I am speaking of the area of young people who commit themselves to a home and then find that, with interest payments, that commitment is hard to meet.

Mr Keneally: Caused by increases in State charges.

Mr RANDALL: That is part of the whole problem. That is something that happens under a Labor Government or a Liberal Government. There must be increased State charges, because the State does not run on nothing—somebody has to pay. The other thing is that, quite often, young couples enter into mortgage agreements or loan arrangements with their bank or lending authority without any consideration for State charges increasing in the years to come, or without realising that local government charges will increase in the years to come. I believe that, with education and perhaps the highlighting of this problem, young couples may come to realise, before they sign on the dotted line, before they sign a contract for their home, before they commit two incomes so that they can make repayments and have all the furniture they want as quickly as possible, that there are other costs, such as local government costs, water rates, council rates, and electricity and gas charges, all of which can be expected to rise. Of course, the difficulty for us as a Government is to restrain those charges and to keep them to a reasonable rate. It is when that rate becomes excessive that the matter becomes difficult for a Government to grapple with.

Another way in which young people can be helped with their homes, of course, is for unused land to be developed. For instance, in my electorate there are acres and acres of unused land—I think about 25 acres in one spot is worth about \$1 000 000. Obviously, to subdivide that land into blocks involves the outlaying of substantial moneys for the provision of water services, electricity, roads, etc., which are all part of the planning requirements of local government today. If that were done, a young person seeking to buy a home built on that land would be facing a considerable expense and in most cases an amount of money which is outside his reach.

Therefore, we need to look at some alternatives. In my first speech in this place I quite clearly outlined, as a person who came from a local government background and who is interested in the cost of alternative housing styles to accommodate people in South Australia, certain facts. I believe that the inner metropolitan area, areas such as Henley Beach, need to be developed. Of course, the new Planning Bill will enable local councils to take some initiatives in these sorts of areas. I am sure that when we as a Government set our policies quite clearly regarding the cost of housing, people will find it attractive to develop more houses on areas of land than would normally be developed.

The interesting thing about the cost of housing is that there are some attractive options to offer. One of these is shared facilities. For instance, one can imagine half a dozen houses quite closely grouped but still having the privacy of their own backyard through good architectural design. They could share, for instance, a community facility such as a swimming pool so that instead of each person buying a \$10 000 or \$15 000 swimming pool, which we see occurring in suburbia now, that group could get together and have a community swimming pool included in the cost of the housing development. There are many other things such as playground equipment and space for children which could be developed better by half a dozen families developing a playground for their children because they could obviously afford more as a group than they could as individuals. The home handyman-type tools, such as a wheel-barrow, could be shared. We find the ridiculous situation where young couples are setting up homes and every couple in the street buys a wheel-barrow, an electric drill or a paint brush.

What I am suggesting is that we encourage young couples in our community to get together and share some of the facilities and some of the opportunities they have, thereby cutting costs and financial commitments. By encouraging single income families we can again get to the business of raising families in this State, using facilities that we have in the inner metropolitan area as well. One of the disappointing things in my own electorate is to see facilities that have been developed by the Education Department, and private facilities developed by local churches or clubs which have memberships that are on the decline. Local school numbers are dropping, but excellent facilities have been developed at the schools. They may need some upgrading, but the facilities are basically there. Children of the future will need to have the use of such facilities. Obviously when one thinks of encouraging older people to leave their big old homes to go into a retirement type village, when one considers developing the open space land that we have in the Henley Beach area, and the building of homes in such a way that it is cheaper for young people to buy them, we can encourage young couples and families back into our community, and I speak particularly for the electorate of Henley Beach.

I turn to another matter about which I want to speak, namely, quality of life in the community. I wish to indicate briefly that the Minister of Planning is attempting to set up planning policies which will improve the quality of life in our community. One of these policies raised in this House during the last 12 months concerns a major revision of retail centres. The policy for the metropolitan area was completed and a supplementary development plan was issued. Now councils are being assisted in revising their centres policy in accordance with the Government's policy. As I come from the local council, I concerned myself with these matters knowing full well that there was a growth in shopping complexes—in many cases an uncontrolled growth.

Measures that we have grappled with over the last 12 months include the development of rural land, the Hills face zone, dual occupancy of housing, and the deferred urban metropolitan land policies. We can cope with the quality of life in the community not only by planning but also by controls. I wish now to talk about some of these controls. One that needs to be looked at is litter control, particularly in relation to our Beverage Container Act. Quite uniquely, I guess, under consideration at the moment is the two-litre P.E.T. bottle, which stands for polyethylene terephthalate. This type of container, I believe, will be the beginning of the future of this type of container being used in the community. The Government must look at this now and make a decision as to where we are going. Some people within the community, as evidenced by the signing of

petitions and letters forwarded to me, are encouraging me to move to ban such containers and greatly emphasise that point. This is occurring particularly among councils in sea-side areas, because the people who live there feel the brunt of our litter problem along the foreshore.

The recent rains highlighted to me the problems that we have in the community concerning plastic type containers. I found that all the containers and all the forms of litter washed down into the sea at Henley Beach by the River Torrens waters were the plastic containers. They are the ones that seem to last the longest and they were quite obvious by their colour. They will be the most difficult to get rid of. The Government needs to be concerned about P.E.T. containers. People need to be careful with what they do with them. With the sort of pressures in the community about this matter, the Government should move, if not to ban them, certainly to make sure that a heavy deposit is levied on them so that they are returned. Unfortunately, the sad story about P.E.T. bottles is that they are not suitable for recycling. They cannot be washed and reused. That is unfortunate, because, if they could be reused, I am sure we would have the answer to the problem and that we would have a great container which would be useful for the community. The fact that they cannot be recycled, in my opinion, makes it a useless piece of containerism.

Litter control also needs to be looked at in the area of bottles. As a seaside resident and the representative of the people of Henley Beach one must be concerned about beer bottles, perhaps not so much about beer bottles lying on the beach, although it is nice to see them not there, but with the broken ones, which of course are dangerous to children, adults and dogs that use the beach, because they cut and injure. We need to look closely at encouraging an increase in the deposit on beer bottles, so that what will happen, as has been seen to happen with cans, is that their recycling time, the time they will be lying on the beach, will be lessened. For instance, if a can is dropped on the beach today, by the end of the day that can has usually been picked up and deposited in somebody's sack, by a child or an adult who collects it for remuneration. Unfortunately, the beer bottle stays because one does not get quite so much money. The greater the deposit on a container the lesser is the recycling time.

The community usually wants to see containers removed, and the deposit provides an incentive to do so. Part of the problem we face with litter control is that either we have a dictatorial local government employing many inspectors at great expense who go around and police areas and hit people with heavy fines (controlling it a little that way), or we can provide a bit of incentive for people to pick up litter. I think our litter problem is indicative of our affluent society. We live in a society where most people can afford to pay as much money for a drink as is necessary, no matter what form of container it is in, and then to throw it away afterwards. Most people do not really care. Fortunately, with a deposit system some of the money is being transferred to those who need it, perhaps, because not only children pick up cans as a form of income or for pocket money, but also older people, pensioners, and unemployed people do so. They assist in the recycling of cans, and in some cases raid rubbish bins on beach fronts in order to obtain full benefit from those containers.

As a person who lives near the sea front, I am aware that marine pollution is a significant factor of such an area. I am happy to see that the department is continually monitoring pollution and hazardous chemicals and upgrading methods. Also it has set up a Waste Management Committee which demonstrates that the Government has acted in the management and investigation of forms of waste

disposal. Unfortunately, hazardous chemicals are prevalent in the community and play a significant role.

Another area of pollution concerns the control of nice fresh air. Fortunately I live in a seaside suburb which I believe has fresher air than do some other suburbs. It is my endeavour to encourage the Government to make sure that that air remains fresh. To do that, one of the things the Government is looking at (and I am sure the Minister of Environment and Planning is closely watching this) is the preparation of a clean air Bill, which will ensure that those who pollute the air are made aware of what they are doing and that they are controlled to some extent.

Another area that concerns me greatly (and I recall the member for Albert Park making a strong speech about this last week) concerns noise control. Like the member for Albert Park, unfortunately I have had to grapple with some noise control problems in my electorate. Noise is becoming a greater problem in our community caused by the availability of modern technology which enables disco groups and musicians to use higher and higher power type amplification.

Usually, two distinct components are involved in the noise problem. Usually, there is noise from activities within certain premises and noise from patrons in the street outside. In my electorate, there is a confrontation between a local hotel, which runs a disco, and a residential area across the road. That area is zoned residential, but the hotel, a mere 20 feet away, is in a commercial area. The council encouraged planning development to take place but did not consider the noise problems emanating from the hotel.

The Minister has set up a working party to look at this situation. It has highlighted the sorts of problem I have found, and I hope it will ultimately make strong recommendations. Quite often ancillary and *bona fide* meals are served in hotels to encourage people to stay at the hotel longer. The report to the Minister states:

It is felt that such variation and lack of particularity has led to the present sham of some licensees providing token meals which are often deposited in available receptacles by patrons who wish to remain on licensed premises after 12 midnight Monday-Saturday, or on Sundays, to drink and/or for the entertainment.

This highlights a practice that has grown up to circumvent licensing laws; a licensee provides people with a token meal which, in most cases, is purchased at the door and ends up in the rubbish bin. That enables the licensee to carry on after midnight to provide the form of entertainment that the patrons enjoy.

Longer bar trading hours and open-ended hours in dining rooms in hotels and restaurants have had a marked effect in increasing noise and behavioural complaints. The working party considered a blanket reduction in trading hours but the approach was rejected as too drastic because, compared with the number of licensed premises concerned, the noise problem is very small although there is a need to devise a way of overcoming the few but difficult problems.

I believe that disco mania is just starting in this State. Hotel proprietors realise the potential of patrons aged between 18 and 25 years coming to their premises for that type of entertainment. In a couple of years in this State we will face the same sort of problems faced by New South Wales.

In other Australian States statutory hours of trading of licensed premises and in dining-rooms are less generous than in South Australia; extended hours for entertainment, etc., are available only by special approval of the licensing authority with adequate safeguards provided by way of right to impose conditions or of revocation, or suspension, or attachment of appropriate conditions in the case of substantiated complaint.

The position in South Australia is perhaps different from that in New South Wales. Recent amendments have occurred in New South Wales legislation. Present week-day hours for trading by publicans and wine licensees are now from 10 a.m. to 10 p.m., with permits available from the Licensing Court to extend trading hours until midnight, where patrons have supper or a meal.

In South Australia, the hours can be extended from midnight to 2 a.m., when the patrons leave the entertainment venue, slamming doors. The behaviour of some patrons under the influence of alcohol has an impact on the local community in the residential area. Cars are parked in side streets near premises where some 800 people attend the disco on Friday and Saturday evenings, and on Sunday evenings if a public holiday follows on the Monday.

With 800 patrons, there must be an impact on the neighbourhood. When those 800 patrons regularly stay until 2 a.m., the residents of that area are confronted with a noise problem. I believe New South Wales has gone a long way towards solving this problem by reducing the hours and keeping them sensible. We need to take heed of the adjustments which have taken place interstate. We need to look at what New South Wales has done in that regard.

Another area I have highlighted in this House before is the role of the Coast Protection Board. Recently a certain newspaper paid heed to the former member for Henley Beach (Mr Glen Broomhill) by saying that he was the man Don Dunstan turned to when he wanted someone to organise South Australia's first environment department.

Mr Millhouse: He didn't do it very well.

Mr RANDALL: The article also stated:

One branch of this department proved to be of immense benefit to the entire metropolitan coastline. That was the Coast Protection Board, one of the many success stories of the Dunstan regime. Glen brought in Marine Minister Des Corcoran and got the help of Henley Mayor Bronte Edwards to get the board into quick action. The result is now plain for all to see.

I believe that is a misleading article. The member for Mitcham has already made his comment. My understanding is that a group called the Seaside Councils Group met together to discuss common problems.

Mr Millhouse: I see, that is not what—

Mr RANDALL: All Glen Broomhill did was take over that concept.

Mr Millhouse: I thought you were talking about it.

Mr RANDALL: I was.

An honourable member: Was that in the *Herald*?

Mr RANDALL: Yes, it was in the *Herald*. The local councils group, having been made into a Government department, endeavoured to do something to grapple with the problems. This took place in the early 1970s because of the problems major storms were creating along the Adelaide coastline. In June this year we had major storms, and earlier this month we had two record high tides. It was because of such storms that Mr Broomhill took over the Seaside Councils Group and made it into a Government department, setting in train some form of coast protection which has had some impact because, as the Minister quite rightly says, had not the Coast Protection Board done some significant work on the metropolitan beaches, the damage would have been much greater when we had the storms in June and July.

Unfortunately, I believe, the former Minister forgot to look after his own electorate first and make sure that the correct protection work was done in his area. The Henley Beach coastline suffered more from erosion than did any other part of the Adelaide coastline during the recent storms.

Mr Keneally: Are you saying that he should have looked after his own electorate before he looked after anything else?

Mr RANDALL: I believe he should have done some research. He would then have discovered that his own district could be faced with severe problems as a result of storms and he should have looked after that matter first. When I stood on the esplanade at Henley Beach and saw the rate at which it was gradually disappearing into the sea and found that it kept on disappearing as the waves kept bashing in, because there were no support work and no rocks to protect the houses, which ended up only 10 feet away from the foreshore, I was a bit amazed to realise that the former Minister had not done his homework and realised that the coastline in his own electorate needed to be looked after just as much as did the coastline in the electorate of Brighton, which seems to have got the best part of the deal, for some unknown reason, since the early 1970s.

I believe the Government will take up the challenge and will implement a rock foundation which will protect those homes at considerable expense to the State of South Australia; it will protect that coastline and, in the long term, we will have beach restoration in that area which will be to the benefit of the local community. The local council is soon to meet with the Minister to discuss the form of development that will take place and to make recommendations back to the council so that jointly the City of Henley and Grange and the Government can solve the problems that exist. Therefore, in perhaps 10 years, when we have another major storm or high flood potential (although it may be tomorrow or at the end of the year), some form of protection will be there for the people in that district.

I need to place on record my thanks to the Minister, who acted so promptly because this problem arose on Friday afternoon at 5.30 with the coming of the high tide. It was unannounced, as was the previous storm in June. People did not realise that it was potentially so dangerous. I was able to see myself the erosion of a car park. No local council workers were on hand to block it off. No public servants of the Coast Protection Board were available to see that urgent corrective action was taken. However, that evening the Minister, having arrived back from overseas, was able to contact me and we were able to set in train action to take place the following Saturday morning so that, by the end of the weekend, a complete barrier of protective rocks was built up. In conjunction with the local council, the Government spent \$40 000 to protect homes in that area. Unfortunately, those are band-aid measures at this stage but, in the long term, once these measures are fully developed and consolidated, they will be of use to the community.

At this stage, I would like to comment on the West Lakes cemetery which is to be built on the foreshore at West Lakes. I refer to the comments by the member for Albert Park, published in the press this morning. He proposed a form of concrete cross which he wanted to see constructed along the foreshore at West Lakes in order to break up wave action, as a buffer to the erosion of sandhills. Before the member for Albert Park pursues this matter, he should do a bit more homework. First, he should consult the West Lakes people to see whether they want that cemetery-type illusion created along the foreshore, and he also needs to find out from the West Lakes people why they developed and how they were allowed to develop properties on those sand dunes in the past five or six years.

Mr McRae: I hope that you are not intruding into the honourable member's electorate.

Mr RANDALL: I am intruding by way of observation. I have made a commitment as a local member that I will

watch closely the development in the sand dunes in that area. The Government will be looking at the preservation of major sand dunes in that area. Unlike the previous Government, it should not allow sand dunes to be eroded. With all the knowledge that the Coast Protection Board has gathered over the past 10 years, it should not allow sand dunes to be flattened and built upon by private enterprise.

That brings me to the last point that I wish to make this afternoon. I refer to the flood mitigation works proposed for the Torrens River. In June I successfully held a public meeting in my district, and I thank the Minister of Water Resources for attending that meeting. We were able to fill a hall at Kidman Park High School with local residents who were concerned about the potential flooding of the Torrens River. Like those residents, I have known over the past five to 10 years that there is the potential for much flooding in the western suburbs.

What has annoyed me more than anything, especially when one looks at the history of this matter, is that in 1975 the Engineering and Water Supply Department commissioned a study which was released to the public in 1976 and which clearly showed that there was a serious problem for the western suburbs, as well as for areas on the other side of town. It was particularly frustrating for me as a member of the council to realise that nothing seemed to be done. The matter seemed to be kept quiet, yet there was that potential danger whereby millions of dollars of damage could be done to properties in that area. Should such potential for flooding be allowed to occur?

In 1975, the River Torrens Committee was established to study and determine effective means of developing the river and its surrounds in order to promote its use by the public. The report, which was entitled 'River Torrens Study', was released in 1979. As a member of the River Torrens Committee, I was involved in that inquiry. I listened with interest to the submissions that were made, especially in regard to the future plans for the Torrens River. Reference was made again to the potential that this river has as a linear park. In press releases in recent months the Minister has announced that the Government will spend \$4 200 000 to protect the metropolitan area of Adelaide against potential flooding.

That was a relief because this Government has demonstrated that it is not only concerned but that it is prepared to act. The most annoying thing came from the lips of the member for Norwood, who condemned the Government's clean-up campaign of the Torrens River as a programme of vandalism. The member for Norwood either did not do his homework or he misunderstood what the flood mitigation programme was all about. Certainly, people in the western suburbs will appreciate the Minister's coming to our area to ensure that work will be undertaken to overcome potential flooding problems there. We appreciate that, and will be glad to see the work commence, as I am sure it will, at the end of this winter season.

Mr Ashenden: They were appreciative in Todd.

Mr RANDALL: If one looks at the history over the years—and I have not time to go through it now—one sees that the western suburbs councils have wanted to see work proceed in regard to flood protection, but it has been councils on the other side of the city that want to hold work back because they have been reluctant to commit themselves to financial outlays.

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

Mr KENEALLY (Stuart): The Governor's Speech was significant not so much for what was contained in it but for all those Liberal Party promises omitted from it. I will

be addressing myself to some of those Party promises later in my speech. It is unfortunate that this will be the last occasion when His Excellency (Mr Seaman) will present the Governor's Speech to Parliament. I wish him well in whatever work he pursues upon retiring from his Viceregal position. He has served the State with great dignity and to good effect. However, I trust that His Excellency's retirement is of his own choice and is not another example of this Government's paranoia about Labor Party appointees.

The damage done to the State Public Service because of this paranoia is well known. The abysmal treatment handed out to Mr Bakewell, Mr Innes and so many others has dealt a shattering blow to the Public Service morale. So many competent, ethical and loyal people have been gravely reflected on by the Tonkin Government. No matter how the Government tries to dress up the treatment handed out to those people, its real motives are as transparent as they are misguided, and they stand condemned. I expect that the Government's habit of rewarding political friends with plum appointments will extend to the choice of the next Governor of this State.

Today, I want to concentrate my remarks on three distinct areas. However, a number of matters contained in His Excellency's Speech beg comment, no matter how brief. The Premier is most anxious to promote his Administration as small government. 'We will not over-regulate,' he has been frequently heard to say, and we have heard *ad nauseam* his claim that a Liberal Government will get out of the way of business. However, to convince the electorate that the Government is diligent and concerned, the Deputy Premier promises a busy session with more than 130 pieces of legislation, many measures bearing directly upon industry and commerce. Small government, indeed! The conflict between the rhetoric and performance is so obvious that even Liberal Party supporters (or should I say, ex-supporters of the Liberal Party) are aware of the hypocrisy of this Government.

We must be thankful for small mercies, because, although the performance is almost uniformly bad, the rhetoric is positively frightening. The Premier, frankly, cannot be trusted. It is my belief, naive though it may be, that principles held strongly in Opposition should be reflected when in Government. Unfortunately, the Liberal Party does not share that belief—witness last week's performance by our Premier on the subject of departmental leaks. His moralistic attitude contrasts completely with his actions in Opposition. This is a report of what he said about public servants and the leaking of confidential documents, as reported in the *Advertiser* of Friday 17 July:

I think it is contemptible and I believe those who break that professional trust are, in fact, contemptible. Mr Tonkin said his feelings for people who used the information were only a little less strong.

I hope his feelings are retrospective, because all those members who have been in this House for longer than one term well know that the Premier, in Opposition, was wont to use leaked documents, and they well know that the Minister of Industrial Affairs, the Minister of Environment and Planning, and the honourable gentleman whose interest in what I am saying has just sparked the knowledge in my mind—the member for Hanson—were notorious for their use of leaked documents.

The difference now, of course, is that the Liberal Party is in Government and, as a consequence, belatedly has discovered morality. There appears to be a conflict between the Premier's desire for open Government and his feelings about leaked documents; this is strange indeed. I challenge the Premier to give this Parliament and the people of South Australia a categorical undertaking that, in Opposition, neither he nor other members of his Parliamentary Party

will ever use a leaked document. If he is unable to do that (and in all honesty, of course, he cannot), he should never again subject this Parliament and the community to another of those sickening performances of cant, humbug and hypocrisy as was witnessed in this House last week.

The Opposition supports the concept of reviewing the relevance, efficiency, and effectiveness of statutory authorities. However, I believe that the establishment of a separate Parliamentary committee for this purpose is an irresponsible waste of public money. It is significant that, in the public statements made on this subject, the costs of operating the committee have not been canvassed, and I think it appropriate that the taxpayers ought to be aware of the additional cost to the State revenue of this proposal. My costing, of course, is only approximate, because I do not have the intimate detail of the proposal, but, approximate as it may be, I think members of this House will agree that I am close to the mark indeed.

A Chairman and four members of the committee will cost approximately \$20 000 in additional salaries and expenses. Staffing, which I imagine would include a secretary, a research officer, and at least a stenographer, would cost approximately \$50 000 a year. A car for the Chairman, of course, plus a driver, with running and maintenance costs, would cost another \$50 000. Office rental and furniture would cost at least another \$30 000, so that a conservative estimate would show a total cost of not less than \$150 000.

Mr Becker: Where did you get that figure?

Mr KENEALLY: For the benefit of the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, I say it is a figure not unlike the costing of his own committee, as he would see if he was aware of the line in the Estimates. He now acknowledges that I am on the ball, and I appreciate that acknowledgment.

This extravagance is totally unnecessary. If the Public Accounts Committee were provided with two extra staff at a cost of \$35 000 to \$40 000, the job could be done equally efficiently and much more cheaply. I am a member of the Public Accounts Committee and currently we are examining statutory authorities. A very minor amendment to the Public Accounts Committee Act, if any alteration at all, would enable it to do the task that the Premier envisages for the new committee. However, this will not be done, because the Premier needs another senior Parliamentary position, complete with car, either to placate the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, who is becoming a nuisance, or to replace one of the many Ministers whom he needs to replace and who are already a nuisance.

I notice in His Excellency's Speech that the Minister of Lands has opened a regional office at Berri. It is nice to see the honourable gentleman pork barrel in his district! I hope that the promised amendments to the Irrigation Act are not going to be more of the same.

The amendments to consumer legislation are ominous. Under this Government, the rights of consumers have been whittled away, and I fear that we are going to be faced with future erosion of consumer rights. We are also promised a complete review of all matters relating to the fisheries of this State. That is a surprise, as only a few months ago, when the Government defeated my motion for the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into the fishing industry, I was told that everything was all right in that industry. I will be looking at this legislation with some interest to see what the Government intends to do.

I am forced to say that Fisheries is a difficult portfolio for any Minister. Even the best Minister in our memory, the Hon. Brian Chatterton, found that his value was not always appreciated by fishermen in South Australia. Well, all that has now changed. I am being told repeatedly by leaders of the various fisheries and by people within those

fisheries that it has only been since the election of the Liberal Government and the appointment of the Minister and the *de facto* Minister, the member for Alexandra, that fishermen have fully appreciated how good Brian Chatterton really was.

I want to bring together some aspects of State taxes and State charges that are not always fully understood, certainly by members of the Government and by members of the community. Before the 1979 election, the Liberal Party made great play of the virtues of reducing taxation. It used the Californian experience of Proposition 13 as the example to prove that, if capital taxes were reduced, the community would benefit through increased private investment, resulting in greater economic activity, more jobs, and higher returns to the State Treasury in other forms of taxation. The Liberal Party believed that South Australia could withstand a reduction in wealth taxes without any effect on the State's ability to maintain the level of services that it provided, so in September 1979 part of the Liberal Party election manifesto was the abolition of succession and gift duties.

We all know that any political Party that promises a reduction in taxes is on a winner. No matter what form the taxes take, everyone in the community fancies that he or she will benefit, so that part of the Liberal Party policy had wide appeal and, now that the Government has fulfilled its promises, those reductions in taxation are still seen as its major achievement. How realistic was the community's perception of benefit and how much of an achievement was the Government's action?

Under the concessions proposed by the Labor Party, fewer than 15 per cent of South Australians would have been liable for duty and within that 15 per cent provision for concessions due to hardship was available. In addition, gift duty exemption was to be increased to \$10 000. Clearly, the overwhelming majority of South Australians had nothing to gain from the Government's action. Certainly, fewer than 5 per cent of my constituents, for example, would have been dutiable, so the perception of benefit held by the average citizen was illusory. However, the perception of benefit by those who would have been subject to succession duties (and they include the State's most wealthy people) was very real indeed.

The wealthy section of the community, which is confined to less than 15 per cent of the community, is \$20 000 000 better off. Inherited wealth and not earned wealth will become even more the major cause of affluence in our society, and the Government's widely applauded action resulted in a loss to the State Treasury of some \$20 000 000 a year. That is very much the point that was made today.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

Mr KENEALLY: I have been challenged from across the Chamber in regard to the reintroduction of those taxes. The Labor Party's position has been made clear, and I will canvass that point. What interested me was that, when the Leader of the Opposition gave a clear undertaking that the Labor Party in South Australia did not intend to reintroduce this tax, all members on the Government benches seemed to have had a weight lifted from their shoulders. The delight with which they received that statement could not be reflected in their interest in their constituents but in the interests of their own income. That is the very point I make. Some people in the community have benefited greatly because of the lifting of those taxes, and it is not the people whom I represent.

The promised fillip to the State's economy did not eventuate, so that \$20 000 000 had to be found elsewhere or State services would completely founder. We know how the Government is recouping that money: it is increasing State charges. That is a regressive form of taxation which falls

most heavily on those who are least able to pay. Because of State Government actions, the affluent are even more affluent and are shielded from increased charges because of their increased wealth. The majority of South Australians who are now paying the \$20 000 000 have been placed in financial difficulties.

Does it not occur to Government members to ponder on their actions when their constituents tell them of budgets so tight that increases in water charges, motor vehicle charges and electricity charges threaten their financial viability? Do they not feel guilty when young couples in receipt of two incomes cannot afford to start a family and live on one income, because of increases in charges? Surely, they must feel ashamed when faced with a pensioner or an unemployed worker who cannot afford Housing Trust accommodation, and this includes the hundreds of homeless youths in South Australia. These and countless other examples are the direct result of the Government's transferring the taxation burden from the wealthy to the poor. The concept of fattening the rich man's table in the hope that enough crumbs will fall to feed the poor is totally unacceptable in a humane society.

The Liberal Party has repaid its wealthy friends, but its action has far greater effects than that: it has denied to successive Governments a form of income introduced in this State by the person whom members opposite eulogised so much last week—the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford. It was good enough for him and his Government, because he realised that people must either be taxed in their lifetime or succession duties must be levied. The State requires income, and, if the taxes of the wealthy are reduced, the reduction must be picked up in the other sectors of the community. Whenever a tax is abolished it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to reintroduce it, and other forms of taxation must be devised.

I hope that this Government will quickly come up with a tax that is progressive and based on people's ability to pay, so that the intolerable burden of paying for the Liberal Party's election promises is lifted from the poorer section of our community and met by that sector that stands to benefit most from the present Administration.

Proposition 13 has been a tragic disaster, as the Labor Party predicted. California has gone from being the State with the best services in the United States of America to being the State with the worst services, and unfortunately South Australia is following the same track.

I read that the Government is to continue its initiatives in regard to crime and punishment. Surely that statement is nothing but a sick joke. Under this Government, violent crime in South Australia has increased dramatically, despite quite clear promises that, if the Liberal Party was elected to Government, crime would be curtailed. We all remember the advertisements that were designed by the Liberal Party's publicity agency, paid for through Liberal Party funds and authorised by Liberal Party stooges, the hooded men, which outlined promises to make our streets safe again. We remember the fearless member for Coles linking pornography with rape and Dr John Courts' high public profile. We also remember that notorious woman who would waylay innocent members of Parliament with reams of pornographic literature and a strange look in her eyes, a similar look, on reflection, to the look seen in the eyes of Dr John Court.

Where have they all gone? Pornography and crimes of a sexual nature were abominations under a Labor Government, but apparently they are acceptable under a Liberal Government. The words 'pornography' and 'rape' have disappeared from the vocabulary of Liberal members of Parliament. The Minister of Health's only contribution in Gov-

ernment to this problem has been to complain about a copying machine advertisement—

Mr McRae interjecting:

Mr KENEALLY:—and, as the member for Playford says, the so-called sexist advertisement about a dog and a familiar brand of beer. The only conclusion we can draw from this apparent disinterest is that this very critical area of human suffering was used by the Liberal Party merely as a tool for political point scoring. The electorate had every right to expect a reduction in crime: the Liberal Party promised it. The Government should fulfil that promise, because some members on the Government benches are in this place because of their Party's promises in that area. These members should be requiring the Government to fulfil the promises that were made to the community.

If I appear to be resentful, then appearances are accurate. As a member of the Parliamentary Labor Party, which was subjected to vicious attacks on the subjects of pornography and rape, I deeply resented the imputations of that campaign, and I still deeply resent those imputations, despite the laughter of the member for Mallee. I take it as a personal slight, as do all my colleagues.

Our opponents won political favour: they were seen to be concerned about crimes of a sexual nature, and we were pictured as uncaring. The community should ask where all these concerned citizens have disappeared to. The truth is that all members of Parliament are concerned about these things, but only one-half of their numbers were despicable enough to make political capital of such serious matters. I find pornography distasteful and boring. I have never been able to view more than a few pictures. It is a total turnoff to me. I have always been suspicious of those who obviously keep themselves abreast of the latest in pornography or pornographic literature, because on the basis of their own argument they are either corrupted by it or addicted to it.

Since the abortive debate on the Murray River in this House on 11 June 1981, two significant developments have occurred, about which comments are appropriate. These developments are, first, the move for the establishment of a freshwater institute and the presentation of the document titled *A permanent solution to the Murray River salinity problem*. On 4 June the member for Hawker, the Hon. Ralph Jacobi, introduced a Bill in the Federal Parliament for an Act to provide for the promotion of research and planning in connection with freshwater resources, and for that purpose to establish an Australian institute of freshwater studies. It is regrettable that this very original concept that could only benefit the users of Murray River water in this State has not received the support of one South Australian Liberal member of Parliament. Not one Liberal member of Parliament supports that scheme, and yet all Liberal members try to convince the electorate that, on issues such as the Murray River, politics plays no part in the decisions that they reach.

Not one Liberal member of Parliament has seen fit to support this very worthy and original move of the member for Hawker. It is interesting, nevertheless, that the Save the Murray Campaign strongly supports this initiative. I shall quote from a speech given to the Australian Finance Corporation by a gentleman well known to our Premier, to the Minister of Water Resources, and to all honourable members opposite. I refer to Mr Alexander Downer, Chairman of the Political Committee of the Save the Murray Campaign—the Political Committee, no less! One wonders about his political background, but nevertheless I read his speech. Apart from some small areas with which I disagree, I found it quite interesting and one I could agree with. He said this about Mr Jacobi's move:

In recent weeks, two proposals have been canvassed which I believe are practical and attractive. One is the call for an Institute

of Freshwater Studies to be set up by the Commonwealth Government. Although such an institute would only be a first step, it would be an independent research body able to provide impartial information on all aspects of River Murray problems. It would cover the whole river system, it would be free of Government interference, and it would help with the introduction of new technology to deal with Murray problems, including salinity. It seems extraordinary that in the driest continent we have an Institute of Marine Science, that we spend millions of dollars on research in Antarctica, but we cannot find the funds to set up an institute which will help to solve the problems of one of our most vital economic assets.

It is of great credit to Mr Jacobi, the Federal member for Hawker, that the idea of a freshwater institute has been brought to the attention of the Federal Parliament; it is a cause of concern that the Parliament has not so far seen fit to support the proposal.

Those are the words of Mr Alexander Downer, as I understand it, a gentleman who worked for the Federal Government and is currently working for the State Premier. He is a gentleman who, on the score of that statement alone, is prepared to divorce himself from his Liberal Party colleagues and he is to be commended for that.

Sir Barton Pope is a well respected and very successful South Australian business man, and he, too, has supported Mr Jacobi's move, as have many other people throughout the nation, yet not one word of support for that move has come from South Australian Liberal Party members. I cannot but believe that the reason for their reluctance, the reason for their silence, is that it was moved by a Labor member of Parliament, and in no way are they prepared to concede that a Labor member of Parliament has a good idea, whether in this House or in the Federal House. There is no other explanation for the silence of Liberal Party members on this issue, and they stand condemned for that.

Mr Lewis: You've never asked us.

Mr KENEALLY: I have publicly called for this Government to support the move of the member for Hawker, and I am doing so again. I have been challenged to do so by honourable members opposite. I ask the Government publicly to support Mr Jacobi in his efforts on behalf of not only South Australians but all Australians who rely on the water of the Murray River and the Darling River basins. Mr Jacobi's second reading speech should be compulsory reading for all members, and I commend it to them.

Members will be very interested also in the contribution to that Federal debate of the member for Wakefield, Mr O'Halloran Giles, whose comments are in direct contrast to those made by the State member for the area, as I will show presently. I have read the document titled *A Permanent Solution to the Murray River Salinity Problem*, and I compliment the department on an excellent technical submission.

The Opposition hopes that the Premier is able to persuade the Prime Minister to fund the necessary salt mitigation works. If he can do so, he will receive our approval and that of all South Australians, but, unfortunately, the realities of political and economic life tell us that the prospects of Federal Government support are very dim indeed; would that it were otherwise, but I believe that that is the economic and political reality. Therefore, the Government should be strongly supporting the freshwater institute concept. The two projects are not mutually exclusive; in fact, they complement each other admirably. There are, however, two aspects of the permanent solution proposal that worry me. On 11 June I moved:

That this House calls on the Federal Government to make an immediate vote of funds to implement the proposals of the Maunsell Report for the control of salinity in the Murray River.

The Government, led by the Minister of Water Resources, defeated that motion, yet 18 days later, amidst a great fanfare of publicity, the Premier launched a proposal that is exactly what my defeated motion had sought. What happened in those 18 days? Was the Government so em-

barrassed by its voting performance that it felt compelled to right a serious wrong, or did it know, when it voted against my motion, that it intended to comply with it in the almost immediate future? Whatever the reason, it raises serious questions as to the motives and the genuineness of the South Australian Liberal Government in this matter.

My other concern relates to page 9 of the submission, where figures for upstream salt input are quoted. No reference is made to our own State's input. There seems to be a paranoia about acknowledging our own contribution. In any submission to Federal Government where senior Cabinet Ministers hold upstream river electorates it is important, in seeking responsible action from upstream States, to be responsible ourselves. Reading the Premier's submission, the logical question these gentlemen will ask is this: why do South Australians not concede that they also make a contribution to the river's salinity? I had personal experience of that comment, and I can confirm that is so.

Why does this reluctance exist? By reading the speech of the member for Wakefield in Federal Parliament, the reasons become clear. We can recall the statements of the Premier and the Minister of Water Resources on Darling River water. Let us read what Mr O'Halloran Giles said on this subject—and I will quote briefly from his speech to the Federal Parliament, as follows:

In this year of drought the salinity level of the River Murray as it enters South Australia is lower than it has been in any dry year for quite a period. In fact, due to the influence of Dartmouth Dam, which is built in an area where water quality is good, and due to the fact the Hume Weir also with fairly good quality water is being drained during the 1980-81 season, the quality of the water, measured for salinity and not turbidity, has been line ball, up and down only a little bit from the desired quality of excellence in the River Murray system.

Remember what the Premier and the Minister had to say—quite contradictory! Mr Giles further stated:

In dry years the additional waters from the Darling River have no impact at all on the volume received. The entitlement exists without the microscopic volume of water supplied in dry years by the Darling.

He goes on to say:

I do not believe this totally, but one could argue from that point—

I ask honourable members to listen to what he said—

that South Australia would be better off if New South Wales harnessed the Darling and if no water from the Darling entered South Australia. It is at the times that the water enters the Murray from the Darling that the situation is critical; and the critical time is in dry seasons. It does nothing but add pollution and difficulty, particularly from turbidity and salinity during dry years. Where it is still of course of grave importance to South Australia—this a folk lore belief in my State—is in providing the freshest that comes down the Darling periodically. It saves our lives. It helps to flush in good years. I think that people should recognise that though the Darling and its tributaries are important, in dry seasons they are a positive disadvantage to irrigators and to the quality of water for much of South Australia's capital city and many of its towns.

I understand that the comments of Mr Giles have brought him great disfavour in his electorate, no matter that what he has said is basically correct. Alternatively, the comments of the Minister of Water Resources have been received favourably by his constituents, no matter that much of what he has said is misleading and politically motivated. The Minister of Health described the Minister of Water Resources as a 'son of the River Murray, an authority without peer on matters of irrigation'. I do not dispute that, despite the fact that I could, because the Minister is an irrigator and obviously knows his business. However, over 1 000 000 South Australian consumers of Murray water are not irrigators and this is the impossible position in which the Premier has placed the Minister. He may well be a competent administrator. He may, by his administrative performance, treat all South Australians as equals, but his public position quite blatantly panders to the feelings of his

own electorate. He is not prepared to acknowledge publicly that the activities of his constituents contribute to the disadvantage of all other South Australian users of Murray water. I can understand that, but I do not condone it.

Because of this failing of the Minister, this conflict of interest, he ought to be removed from that portfolio so that a person with no direct electoral conflict can be given control of this vital area of State concern. If that is done, I feel certain that the bi-partisan approach to this national problem that is so sorely needed can be developed. Political point scoring will cease and South Australia's vital interests can be better promoted. Having said that, I was interested in the comments of the member for Newland, who interjected earlier today, when that honourable member said that the first responsibility of a Minister is to look after his own electorate. That is not the first responsibility of a Minister. The first responsibility of a Minister is to look after the interests of all South Australians. The first responsibility of a local member is to look after the interests of his electorate. When those two responsibilities are in conflict (and I put to this House that they are in conflict so far as the Minister of Water Resources is concerned), the Minister ought to be relieved of that responsibility and it should be given to another.

Mr Hemmings: Who is going to do it?

Mr KENEALLY: I am sure the honourable member can think of some other member who could perform that task. I understand the predicament the Premier would find himself in, however. Despite the fact that there is no-one else who can perform the task, the Government should bite the bullet and relieve this gentleman of this responsibility and give him another area, which I believe his competence would enable him to handle, but where the conflict would not be present.

One of the promises made in His Excellency's Speech was the introduction of more severe penalties in certain areas of crime. I will, at a later stage, expand on the area of sentencing and on prisons generally. I thought it appropriate today (and I have no doubt that I will repeat these quotations at a later date) that members ought to be aware of the comments of some authorities on the effectiveness of imprisonment. In its report the Law Reform Commission of Canada of 1976 is reported as saying the following:

Imprisonment is an exceptional sanction which should be used only: (a) to protect society by separating offenders who are a serious threat to the lives and personal security of members of the community, or (b) to denounce behaviour that society considers to be highly reprehensible and which constitutes a serious violation of basic values, or (c) to coerce offenders who wilfully refuse to submit to other sanctions.

I think most members of this House would agree with that, as I am sure that they would agree with the following quotation taken from the *Australian Law Journal*, volume 55, of March 1981:

Few would dispute that imprisonment, even though unavoidable in some cases, is generally harmful to the individual offender and his or her family, and also, none could doubt that prisons are extremely costly to administer.

An even more pertinent quotation to which I ask honourable members to pay attention is that of Ann Newton, of the National Council On Crime and Delinquency, as follows:

Imprisonment is neither socially nor economically desirable for the hundreds of thousands of non-dangerous and non-violent offenders among the population of inmates. Prisons have been proven to be ineffectual in rehabilitation, probably incapable of being operated constitutionally, productive of crime, and destructive of the keepers as well as the kept. Imprisonment provides no benefit to the community or to the individual victim of crime who has suffered damage or loss.

I believe those three quotations encapsulate a philosophy towards our prisons that we all ought to consider. There is no proof anywhere that increasing the penalty for a certain

range of offences will prove a deterrent—no evidence whatsoever. Where a serious crime is committed, no doubt the penalty for that ought to befit the crime, but we should be well aware that, if we extend the penalties, we are doing it from the point of view of retribution and retribution only. It is not a deterrent; it will have no real rehabilitative effect on those prisoners when they come back into society. They will not have been improved by the additional prison sentence. But, of course, there are occasions when it is absolutely essential for the wellbeing of the community that serious offenders should be withdrawn from the community. I will be expanding on that subject when the measure is before the House, for I have much more evidence that indicates that, while retribution is an element of punishment, it is not the only part, nor can it be the prime part, of punishment.

Mr Evans: It's difficult to find a balance.

Mr KENEALLY: As the member for Fisher has said, it is difficult to find a balance—I do not cavil at that. It is as difficult for a Labor Party legislating in this area as it is for a Liberal Party legislating in this area. It is one matter where a balance has to be drawn. I suppose it is one where the problems have to be met. Nevertheless, it does not make the difficulties any the less.

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

Mr KENEALLY: Prior to the dinner adjournment I called for the removal of one of the Ministers from his portfolio, and I suggested that he ought to be found a place elsewhere. I am impressed that the Deputy Premier and many of his Ministerial colleagues have returned here after dinner, because I expect that they want to know whether they are going to be involved in a move. Unfortunately, I do not have any power to make the moves that are necessary, or even to recommend what ought to be done. Suffice to say that the argument I put prior to the dinner adjournment is valid and one that ought to be acted upon.

I refer now to a letter I received by a most circuitous route which refers to the Yatala Labour Prison. I am pleased that the Chief Secretary is here to listen to what I have to say, and I hope that as a result of my contribution he will see fit to instruct his department to do something about the matter. A lady wrote to the Federal member for Port Adelaide, Mr Young, who passed the letter on to the Labor Party's shadow Attorney-General, who passed the letter on to me. The letter, dated 11 June 1981 and written by a lady who lives at Pooraka, states in part:

At Yatala Labour Prison a short time ago, a break-out occurred, involving four prisoners. Three were apprehended almost immediately, but the fourth one was captured in the Highways Department depot some time later.

As this break-out occurred when there were many children in the area playing in the streets, and a lot of elderly people at home by themselves, I would like to know why no warning was given to the residents in the areas surrounding the prison. Surely some short sharp blasts of a siren, given every few minutes over a certain period of time, would warn people, and allow them to take the necessary precautions.

When a break-out occurs, usually the only indication we have that something is amiss is the swarms of police officers descending on our local creek—a place, may I add, that is frequented by many Pooraka children.

I have discussed this situation with other residents in the area and have elected to write and see if something can be done. I am not suggesting that any resident was in grave danger due to the break-out, but one would hope that we could have sufficient warning in the future to avoid this situation ever happening. I remain yours sincerely, Sandra Linklater (Mrs).

This lady has raised a very serious matter that requires a remedy. Her concern for the welfare of persons residing near the Yatala Labour Prison is well placed. Residents ought to know when a break-out has occurred immediately it is detected, and they should not have to wait until they hear it on the evening news. Her suggestion of short blasts

on a siren was a sensible one and should be carefully considered. I do not know what procedures the Department of Correctional Services uses to notify residents of break-outs from near-by prisons; in fact, I think I have been negligent in my responsibility, as I should have discussed this matter with the honourable member who has responsibility for this area and who may have been able to advise me, but I shall certainly do that. The member for Florey who is in the House now—

Mr Mathwin: Can you remember his name?

Mr KENEALLY: I can remember his name all right, but for a moment I just forgot the name of his electorate, whereas with regard to the honourable gentleman who just interjected I can never recall either his name or his electorate. That might be an advantage to him. I happen to be facing him all the time and he makes so very little impression on this House and its deliberations that I could be forgiven for forgetting him totally.

Members interjecting:

Mr KENEALLY: Was that a womanly voice I heard interjecting over there? Surely there is not a woman over there in the ranks; we have not heard much from her recently. This is a very serious subject, and I do not want to treat it otherwise. Whatever system of warning that is currently used, it is obviously inadequate; the woman who has written this letter indicates that she is unaware of a system, if one exists at all. I draw this matter to the attention of the Chief Secretary in the hope that he will have his department investigate the matter and come up with a suitable method of advising people in the area who may or may not be at risk as a result of prison break-outs—

Mr O'Neill: Ask him if he can get them to lock the gates whenever there's an industrial dispute.

Mr KENEALLY: —and who ought not be put at risk. I am sure, also, that the Chief Secretary well heard the request of my friend the member for Florey and may at the same time put that suggestion into effect. I do not intend to take up the rest of my time in the Address in Reply debate. I could well do so, and I know that it would be the desire of members opposite that I do, but on this occasion I intend to disappoint them.

Mr OLSEN (Rocky River): I support the adoption of the Address in Reply. I want to refer, first, to some of the comments of the member for Stuart, who has just resumed his seat. The honourable member's imagination certainly runs riot on occasions and his speech on this occasion has been no exception. What speculative nonsense the honourable member has put forward in a number of specific areas during his contribution on this occasion, a contribution which in some respects (and I say advisedly 'in some respects') is devoid of constructive comment suggesting alternative policies for the consideration of South Australians.

One matter that he raised was in relation to statutory authorities and the Government's intention to establish a committee for the purposes of reviewing the financial resources and the operations of statutory authorities in South Australia. The honourable member suggested that indeed the work that is envisaged to be undertaken by this new committee might well be undertaken by the Public Accounts Committee. That surprised me, for he, as a member of the Public Accounts Committee, would be well aware of the enormous work load that has been embarked upon by that committee over the past 18 months. Indeed, to suggest that there is scope for enlarging the work load of that committee is nonsense. I believe that, from the honourable member's personal experience and involvement with that committee over the past 18 months, he would well know that it would be impossible to achieve the desired results through that committee. I am sure that he would

not want to leave the electorate of Stuart any longer than he already has to do, in connection with his current commitments as a member of the shadow Ministry of South Australia.

The other area the member for Stuart referred to during the course of his speech was in relation to taxes in South Australia, and he specifically related his comments to the reduction and the abolition by this Government of gift duties and succession duties in South Australia. There is no doubt that the only way by which we can rebuild the economy of the State, rather than by levying high tax rates on South Australians, is to obtain for South Australia revenue from royalties, the like of which we see other States of Australia enjoying. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* a purely statistical table which clearly identifies the amount of royalties South Australia receives (this is on 1977-1978 figures), compared to our interstate counterparts. I draw attention to the fact that during the course of that year we received some \$4 000 000. There was only one State which received less royalties, and that was Tasmania, which received \$2 000 000. In all other States enjoying royalties during that year they amounted to \$48 000 000 or more. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* the purely statistical chart to which I have referred.

The SPEAKER: Is leave granted?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: With the assurance that the matter is purely statistical the Opposition raises no objection but notes that the figures to be quoted are for 1977-1978. Despite my best endeavours, I have not been able to get the latest figures from the Minister.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will have an opportunity to make a speech in due course.

Leave granted.

REVENUE FROM ROYALTIES

South Australia lags well behind in revenues from royalties in mineral mining and processing.

State	Royalty Receipts (1977-78)	Royalty Per Head (1977-78)	(1966-67)	Change
	\$	\$	\$	%
N.S.W.	49 062 000	9.79	7.75	26
Vic.	48 446 000	12.69	0.36	3 425
Qld.	53 651 000	24.76	2.71	814
S.A.	4 109 000	3.19	1.95	63.6
W.A.	54 519 000	44.58	5.76	674
Tas.	2 093 000	5.06	0.45	1 024

Source—Commonwealth Year Book—1980.

Latest figures available to show comparisons between the States. Between 1966-1967 and 1977-1978, South Australia slipped behind Tasmania and Victoria to be the State with the lowest royalty receipts per head of population.

Mr OLSEN: The resource boom is something that South Australians should be energetically supporting within their own State. The Government has embarked on a very progressive programme of resource development, and as such is attempting to lay the groundwork by which we can participate in the benefits flowing from such development, those that I have just alluded to in relation to royalties that can be obtained for the benefit of the State, so that South Australia is not, as it was at one stage in the 1970s, the highest taxed State in Australia.

There is absolutely no doubt at all that the resource potential of this State is inextricably linked to the opening up of the Roxby Downs project. So that this State can

financially participate in levels of royalties enjoyed by other States in Australia, we will no doubt be embarking on a very tight monetary programme within the next 12 months or so—a tight budgetary situation wherein the Government is attempting to provide levels of goods and services to the community that they desire. That level of goods and services to the community can be provided only if the funds are there to be expended to provide those goods and services.

Unfortunately, some of the decisions of the former Government, contracts entered into and bills established, are being presented to this Government for payment—payment with interest accrued. Such bills relate to Monarto, Samcor and the Land Commission, to mention a few. In establishing the State's finances so that future Governments will not have that shackle around their ankle, the Government has to look critically at the allocation of the financial resources of this State.

If South Australians want to continue to enjoy the standard of living to which they have become accustomed, if they want to expand the range of goods and services they are demanding, there are two options: the development of the resource potential and its flow-over effects, that is, the multiplier effects in job opportunities in the service industries throughout the State and, more particularly, the metropolitan area of Adelaide.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: What factor are you using as a multiplier?

Mr OLSEN: Four, to which I will refer later in my speech. The other option (indeed, as the Australian Labor Party has suggested at its recent conference) is to increase taxes to pay for the goods and services. This State was once the highest taxed State in Australia. The efforts of the Tonkin Government have taken that very embarrassing first away from South Australia. We cannot allow that situation to prevail again. And only by taking this aggressive move forward in resource development can we achieve that objective.

The dilemma of the Labor Party is indeed profound on this issue. Of course, with Roxby Downs, amongst other minerals, uranium is but one, a mineral that has potential for sale throughout the world. The Government is to be commended for undertaking to be a party in the feasibility study into the establishment of a uranium conversion plant at Port Pirie—an initiative fostered, encouraged and promoted vigorously by the Premier. It will lay the foundation and base on which this State can be self-reliant and have the capacity to provide those goods and services to the citizens.

In addition to that, of course, it will have some effect on reducing the unemployment levels in South Australia—unemployment levels that were allowed to seriously deteriorate under the former Administration. We saw under the previous Government in the two years prior to the election in September 1979 a reduction in the number of people employed in the work force by 20 900, and yet since that period we have seen the reverse, where this Government has been able to open up job opportunities, open up the market place and create confidence in business enterprises to put on about 12 600 more employees. If the Tonkin Government can maintain that pace of growth in job opportunities in the State, within the next 18 months we will have corrected the anomaly that we inherited of having the highest level of unemployment in Australia to a situation which comes down to the national average. That is no mean feat to achieve in a short period of time, the life span of one Government.

A number of misrepresentations of fact have occurred in relation to the Government's will to proceed enthusiastically with the resource boom. The best service we can do for ourselves is stop talking about living in a lucky country,

about what that lucky country should provide us with, and about what that lucky country owes to us as citizens, and recognise that we have to work hard for a living, the same as applies everywhere else throughout the world. We have to contribute to the development of the lucky country to maintain that status.

Misstatements can be put quite clearly into perspective. The total land area of Australia affected by all mining operations put together in this country is smaller than the area of Adelaide. And yet it has the capacity to provide us with great wealth and significant job opportunities. South Australians can embark on an exciting, vibrant future, a future that will have flow-over effects and touch the lives of every South Australian.

The somewhat hypocritical approach of those associated with the Friends of the Earth, who almost at all costs would prefer to see no uranium projects proceeding, was brought to the fore recently in relation to the high tide created by the abnormal weather conditions that occurred in June, wherein at Port Pirie the high tide gave no consideration to the tailings dams that were there. In fact, Ms Ally Fricker, of Friends of the Earth from Port Pirie, pointed out in a letter to the Editor that the tailings dams were overlooked by local authorities when the high tide was coming in, that, consideration was given by the local authority to a number of other areas, and that this particular area was ignored. In her words:

Three members of the Friends of the Earth stood at the dams in the approaching darkness last Monday week and watched the high tide do its work. All was not well and their fears about degradation of the gulf, far from being dispelled, were confirmed.

In the next issue of the paper, a J. Jenkins put the whole matter in what I thought was the appropriate perspective. Incidentally, Ms Fricker has not responded to the allegation, to my knowledge. Commenting on the local media coverage, he said:

You do not employ the sensationism as did some sections of the Adelaide media, aided and abetted by Ally Fricker. Her latest appeal to you is typical of her attitude (particularly the last paragraph [to which I have just referred]). If Ms Fricker and her colleagues were so concerned, why didn't they ring the SES, City Council or District Council in whose area the dam was located?

Of course, that would be far too constructive: they would be acting as the majority of other citizens in Port Pirie did to assist under the conditions that were prevailing and to ensure that no difficulties arose. To quote again:

They would much rather stir; that's their usual pattern of activity.

In other words, they were content to see the wall breached rather than call the council in to take preventive measures. By allowing it to be breached, it would not then destroy a good story. It would not then deny them the opportunity to play on the emotions of people within the community, indeed throughout Australia, as Ms Fricker gained national media space on that occasion.

One should heed the comments of Leslie G. Kemeney, Senior Lecturer in Nuclear Engineering at the University of New South Wales. They deserve repeating. He said (and I quote):

The continuing misrepresentation and sensationalised reporting of radiation incidents of little significance in terms of human health and environmental impact in the electronic imprinted media has caused more and more Australians considerable dismay and frustration. For professional nuclear scientists, technologists and educators, this neurotic preoccupation of the Australian media for orchestrating sensation and promoting fear of the unknown in the absence of informed realism is understandable.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Who was that?

Mr OLSEN: Mr Leslie G. Kemeney, Senior Lecturer in Nuclear Engineering at the University of New South Wales.
The Hon. R. G. Payne interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: I said that it was a quotation. It does not take too much mental effort to understand that screaming headlines promote newspaper sales. It is time that responsible journalists and broadcasters practise some form of self-regulation in this area. Indeed, the wellknown political journalist, Allan Reed, has recently said that, in the light of the Iraqi and Iranian trouble, it is timely that somebody should have discussed this subject passionately and documented the use of the uranium power in a future in which its use could be vital to the Western world.

It is the time for us to put to bed this myth, this fear of uranium. It is time we realised that we have levels of radiation around us on all occasions. Because of the levels that are there naturally in our environment, the contribution factor of the nuclear industry is negligible.

Indeed, throughout the world today there are some 522 commercial nuclear power units above 30 megawatts in operation, being built or ordered. With a total population in those countries of nearly two billion people, countries such as Canada, France, East and West Germany, Japan, the United Kingdom, United States and, of course, Russia are all participating in the provision of power from nuclear energy.

Certainly one of the interesting factors is the referendum that was undertaken after the Three Mile Island accident in March 1979 in America, which accident was widely reported throughout the world. It has demonstrated that Americans publicly support nuclear power. But, in addition, those polls indicated that the public has little understanding of it.

Recent reports indicate that, in 500 reactor years of service in America, there has never been a death or serious injury in plant employees or the public caused by commercial reactor accidents or radiation. The accident on Three Mile Island came nowhere near a catastrophe: it released little radiation, and killed or injured no-one. During the accident on Three Mile Island, people within 80 kilometres radius may have received an additional dosage which was about 1 per cent of typical medical X-rays, or about as much as one gets in a year from one's colour television set. Despite all the headlines, the accident's radiation effects were insignificant.

Radiation is a fact of every-day life, and indeed is used extensively for medical purposes. But, the fact remains that radiation is unknown to most of us. And we fear the unknown. Now let us put into perspective the matter in relation to waste. Waste from one year's operation of a 1 000-megawatt plant would easily fit in a cube 4 by 4. Compare that with the ashes alone being discharged from a 1 000-megawatt coal-fired power plant. It could fill tens of thousands of trucks. Coal-burning plant produces waste at a furious rate: more than 200 kilos per second of carbon dioxide, 450 kilos of ashes a minute; and a ton of sulphur compounds every five minutes, belching this smoke over populated areas and workers within plants: a far more harmful energy source than the uranium industry. Yet where are the emotional headlines and the aggressive reporting? Clearly, one is known, whereas, because the other is an unknown quantity, it generates that fear within the community.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: So, you want to see the coal-fired northern power stations close down and we switch to uranium generation. Is that what you're arguing?

Mr OLSEN: I have no doubt that at the turn of the century we will be seeing developments of that nature in Australia. Indeed, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists, jointly with the American College of Radiology, recently indicated that, as a result of a nuclear reactor accident at Three Mile Island, radiation exposure

to people in the area was much less than the levels of background radiation experienced by persons living at high altitudes in the United States of America.

The 1980s and 1990s hold promise for exciting developments for growth in South Australia's mineral industry. South Australia is well placed to benefit from this growth, provided that we approach the opportunities in a rational and constructive manner. We need enthusiasm and optimism to take advantage of the opportunities but, above all, we need realism and a positive attitude from the community. A positive attitude will only emanate from the community when the multiplier effects of the resource boom here in metropolitan Adelaide are clearly understood and recognised, and the fear syndrome promoted vigorously by opponents is put to rest, or put into perspective.

We can understand why the Labor Party wants confusion to reign supreme over this issue. For in fact you have a situation where the Opposition Leader must realise that, if he is ever to attain Government in this State, his only hope of staying in Government is through the provision of funding by resource development.

It was interesting to note the comments of Mr John Spalvins of the Adelaide Steamship Company, which is, incidentally, now recognised throughout Australia as one of the most progressive companies with an excellent managerial team. In June, Mr Spalvins said:

The South Australian Government has very sound policies. Of course, it is very difficult to restructure something that has been destroyed, particularly some of the advantages which this State had that have been destroyed. Back 10 or 20 years ago, South Australia had distinct cost advantages, particularly with respect to labour costs, but, of course, today, with increasing labour costs, the margins in favour of South Australia have disappeared. So, the South Australian Government has a fairly difficult task ahead. Given inherent difficulties such as that the markets are in the Eastern States, that there is a freight disadvantage, and that labour costs are now the same, the South Australian Government is doing an excellent job.

For to implement the plank established at the recent A.L.P. Convention, namely, to raise taxes and trim the tall poppies would spell disenchantment with voters. South Australia's future should be decided by those elected to do it, not by the faceless people on South Terrace. What an interesting example we saw recently in the media when the Government announced the consortium to undertake the feasibility study on the uranium conversion plant at Port Pirie.

On page 1 we had the Opposition Leader, Mr Bannon, saying that in no way would South Australia under Labor embark on that course. On page 3 we had the Federal Leader, Mr Hayden, saying that technology had improved to the extent that, within a short period of time, say, two or three years, it would be perfectly safe to mine and export uranium. It was conveniently timed, I thought, with what would be the next Federal election. And yet we had Mr Uren, a member of his Party, saying with great authority (one knows not how, presumably A.C.T.U. or trade union movement authority) that any contracts would be repudiated. What a divergence of views emanating from a political Party on one issue, on the one occasion.

It certainly highlights the variants of opinion and the very difficult problems that are being experienced by that Party when determining its policy in relation to the resource development of this State. Mr Bannon would do well to heed the call of his Federal Leader to recognise that, if he fronts up to the polls in 19 months to two years with a negative policy for the development of the mineral resources in South Australia, he will have immense difficulties in explaining to the people how he is going to run the services in this State, other than taxing the people, raising the taxes again to the highest level of any State in Australia. He clearly has no choice and he knows it. He clearly has to

convince South Terrace that these policies are the best policies for South Australia.

Opinion polls have shown that public opinion is shifting markedly towards the development of these resources. South Australians want to participate in it. Indeed, there is a majority of Labor voters who are indicating their support for the development of resources in this State. Therefore, South Australians want to participate in this development, particularly when they see what their Western Australian and Queensland counterparts are reaping in benefits. South Australia can be one of those States to participate in development and to be a go-ahead State if we grasp the nettle, if we are prepared to sell the positive side of the story to dispel the mis-statements and inaccuracies laid down by our political opponents and by those small vocal minority groups in the community who are ill-informed in relation to what those dangers are and have little regard for the provision of the better life style for South Australians. And of course they do not share the responsibility, because they are not in a position to be called, to provide and create that life style and provide those goods and services to South Australians.

A matter indeed of being vocal, being forceful, creating fear, without the responsibility of actually implementing those concepts and policies. South Australians are demanding, and any member of Parliament with a conscience would want to respond to the demand, a reduction in the unemployment levels in this State. And that can only be done effectively on a long-term basis. The short term *ad hoc* band-aid schemes, such as the Red schemes, did nothing to bolster a person's opportunities for permanent jobs. It established for them one thing—an employment record that did not stand them in good stead when applying for jobs. It did not give them the support they needed, because it reaped disappointment upon disappointment upon those people without decent job opportunities that gave continuity of employment.

But rather, we have to create long-term job prospects, so there is some security for them. The multiplier effect of the resource boom through manufacturing plants in Australia generally will supply this. The more significant mining and minerals processing investment projects which are either committed, planned or in the preliminary stage, of which in 1980 \$24 billion is estimated for planned expenditure in Australia, will generate multiplier effects to the benefit of those people. As to the multiplier effect, in a report published by the University of Queensland, entitled 'Economic Impact of Industrial Developments of Gladstone', which was carried out by that university last year, it estimated the direct, indirect and induced employment multiplier effects was around four. That is, that report suggests that up to 160 000 extra jobs could be created through the economy, which I believe to be feasible. Indeed, Mr Nandevill from the Economics Department of that university also published last year a study on the Weipa bauxite mine, where he found an employment multiplier effect throughout the Queensland economy of about four.

In looking at the Pancontinental mining operation at Jabiluka, some 1 100 constant employment jobs have been created and a further 650 to 850 production jobs, or at the Ranger plant, 750 constant and 350 in production. With the multiplier effect of four, one can see the impact that has on reducing unemployment levels in the community.

The recent study prepared for Commonwealth and State Labour Ministers entitled 'Prospective Demand for the Supply of Skilled labour 80-83', with particular reference to major developer projects, indicated an above average proportion of the jobs created will be in skilled occupations. The study estimated that for each of the next three years approximately 7 000 additional metal, clerical and building

tradesmen would be required for resource development. And it is encouraging to see the effect that Labour Minister Dean Brown's policies in South Australia are having in attracting extra apprentices into the South Australian workforce to meet this demand when it comes on stream. For we all must recognise that with major developments of this nature there is a four to five year lead-in period. And whilst jobs are created in the short term in the provisions of the infrastructure, the permanent jobs, the flow over jobs for clerical assistants in the metropolitan area, for example, and for other job functions come as a result of the operations of these mining developments.

This Government, through dedicated hard work, has been able to establish that foundation, a foundation upon which we have attracted companies to the extent that the infrastructure for these projects has commenced. We as South Australians will reap the reward of those in the next three to four years. We stand on the horizon of an exciting vibrant future. It cannot be put at risk by those who spell doom against booms in this State. The community does not relate to the lack of boom, the lack of prospects, the lack of future in South Australia. For one of the greatest indicators of the future for the confidence the people have in the future, is reflected in retail sales: South Australia currently runs second of any State in Australia in its increase in retail sales, ahead of New South Wales, Victoria, Western Australia and Tasmania. Indeed, a sharp turn around.

In my Address in Reply speech last year I said that we needed to give a direction of encouragement for people, to generate confidence, so that they would unlock those massive bank deposits that we have in South Australia, per head of population, higher than any other State in Australia, and that we have got to generate a consumer-led recovery in this economy. Currently, some \$36 billion in interest bearing deposits in Australia needs to be released into productive sections of industry and commerce. That is now happening as a result of the policies of this Government. The quiet confidence being generated by this Government is having an effect. I believe over the next 18 months that confidence will reflect excitement in the future as South Australians become aware of what the multiplier effects of the resource boom will mean in jobs and what those extra jobs will mean in boost to the economy, and hence the cycle continues.

We could have been participating now in the multiplier effect had the A.L.P. embarked on resource development, as former Premier Dunstan and Minister Hudson wanted but were denied by Trades Hall dictates.

One of the main areas that will have to be closely checked in the development of the resource boom and particularly for South Australia now that it is embarking on resource development somewhat later than its counterparts is to ensure that, of the \$24 billion estimated in 1980, escalating to \$33 billion in 1981, estimated capital injection of funds in Australia, that proportion of funds will be left to service the traditional needs of small business operators, housing loans and bank investors within this community?

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Won't they all be in that multiplying effect you are talking about? They will not need any help.

Mr OLSEN: Of course they will. If the honourable members listens to the further comments that I intend to make, he will have the benefit of hearing comments in relation to the management of the money supply that I will be putting to this House in relation to the resource boom. A concern of mine is that with the narrowing of competition in trading banks in Australia at this time, despite the fact that the Campbell Committee of Inquiry may recommend five new licences for foreign banks, there is no doubt that the major trading banks in Australia are gearing themselves up to have their asset backing and deposit base widened so that

they can provide the funding and compete with merchant banks and those that are likely to receive new licences.

It is far more efficient for a bank to service one large account than to maintain a branch network to service the needs of small people within the Australian banking system. Indeed overseas, as a result of bank mergers, a system exists in the United States whereby no more than 10 per cent of a bank's share capital and reserves may be lent to one customer, while in the United Kingdom loans of more than 5 per cent of total loans in advances must be reported. Now with those large resources projects being developed in Australia such a restriction may have to be considered to limit the out-flow of funds to those single customers which are certainly cost efficient but which may deprive small operators. Therefore, these bank mergers are obviously set to offset restrictions that would result from the introduction of such a plan.

There is no doubt that the immense appetite of resource development for funds over the next decade will reduce the amount available for small consumers and vendors. There is no doubt it is already biting into housing finance, and even an extension of that causes me concern, particularly in regard to my constituents, that is, people in country areas. Small businessmen could be disadvantaged by this lack of competition, first, on the local scene with the number of banks within their communities and, secondly, with competition for funds on the Australian scene. This has not been examined critically by the Federal Government at this stage. Therefore, I hope that the Campbell Committee of Inquiry will address itself to that possibility.

Certainly, the Government must undertake the responsibility of adequate provision of bank services to all citizens of this country, not to a selected few. Let there be no doubt that I am a very strong and forceful advocate of the resource development of this country. There is no alternative. Legislators have the responsibility to protect the small operators, for let us not forget that in the United States 75 per cent of the new job opportunities created were achieved by the small business community. In an election promise in 1979, the Premier indicated that 7 000 jobs would be created in South Australia. He has doubled that. He is well on the road to establishing new levels of job creation in South Australia. The resource boom will give a great fillip to that election promise, fulfilled by the Tonkin Government.

An honourable member: Which years?

Mr OLSEN: In each comparison of the figures I used in the earlier part of my speech, I referred to the two years prior to September 1979, and I referred to the period from September 1979 to the latest periods available. They are somewhat similar periods. To have a viable small business community, it has got to have capacity to take account of finance opportunities. Small businessmen cannot expand their output or provide more jobs without adequate finance, and certainly initiatives undertaken by this Government in terms of pay-roll tax concessions and the like, have given a great boost to that. For there is no more iniquitous tax rendered on small businessmen and jobs in the State than to be taxing someone at high levels for the privilege of paying someone else a wage. There is no greater disincentive to employment opportunities in South Australia than that tax.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Have you raised that with the Premier?

Mr OLSEN: The fact is that this Government, unlike the former Administration, has taken two initiatives in regard to pay-roll tax to reduce the burden of that tax. The former Administration was prepared to continue the flow-on and let inflation pay part of it so that it increased significantly the revenue obtained by the State from pay-roll tax receipts.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: From those who were in employment. They had a business or else they would not be paying them.

Mr OLSEN: They were putting them out of employment. One could see the reduction in the number of job opportunities that the honourable member, as a Minister of the Crown at the time, witnessed and presided over—a decline of thousands of jobs.

It may well be on the positive side that these mergers may be seen in the light of providing and easing bank regulations that will enable new entrants into the industry by removing some of the restrictions applying to the banking industry in Australia. It may allow them to be more flexible in relation to their guidelines to loan applications, etc. Mergers result in greater efficiency and in conjunction with greater efficiency and therefore the capacity to provide greater goods and services to the consumer. That, in fact, has to be put to the test. That is the question yet to be answered. Therefore, it is imperative that, knowing of the possibility of the difficulties that might arise, planning now takes place to ensure they do not provide those problems.

It is interesting to note that 45 per cent of the total assets of all financial institutions are under control of bank holding companies. About 75 per cent of the top 40 listed companies in Australia have an account with either the WALES or the A.N.Z. Thus, even after the proposed reorganisation in relation to who looks after Australia's top commercial accounts, it would basically be unchanged. The *status quo* may be maintained; after the mergers, the addition to profits will be substantial, because corporate quadrants with large cash flows present bulk business in single, easily manageable blocks. The bank would find it difficult to acquire from individual customers and therefore the incentive will tend to lead banks to look to that lucrative market rather than providing services to what have been traditional buyers of finance in Australia.

We have a number of difficulties already in relation to the finance industry in Australia—doubtless, one of the reasons why the Federal Government established the Campbell Inquiry. One reason is that trading banks in recent times brought in a new scheme of lending funds under what is termed fully drawn advances rather than the overdraft system.

Fully drawn advances have the advantage for the banks of establishing a specific amount repayable in five years or seven years with a fixed interest rate. To the banks it is more lucrative because, with an overdraft, the account can fluctuate and go into credit on occasions and give at least some interest relief to the person requiring those services. However, the fully drawn advances do not give credit when bank accounts fluctuate in that manner. It will become an ever increasing problem in relation to the provision of finance and will no doubt be aggravated as the resource boom takes off.

Therefore, it is a problem that will face Governments in South Australia, indeed, every Government in Australia, over the next few years. Banks have never lent risk money. They have loaned funds against asset backing, and there is a big difference between the two functions. The American system, that bastion of free enterprise throughout the world which operates on risk capital, depending on the significance of the venture and the prospects of the success of the venture, has never applied in Australia. Accountants will tell you that the economy is picking up. The inhibiting factor is finance and its availability, and perhaps we need to introduce a system whereby there is protection of funds traditionally channelled to the small business sector, so that we will not create the devastating problem of small business finance being syphoned off into the more lucrative areas of resource boom finance.

Of course, a contributing factor will be, as a result of South Australia's retarded entry into resource development within Australia, that our infrastructure programmes are years behind those of Western Australia and other States, a legacy left over by the former Labor Government in this State—a legacy that could well cost the viability of some projects to get their fair share of Australian infrastructure costing.

Small businesses are finding it difficult to obtain finance at reasonable interest rates. Many small businesses are being forced to borrow at high interest rates from finance companies, because the supply of lower-interest finance from banks is limited. There appear to be three reasons for this difficulty of small business to obtain bank finance. The first is that the heavy demand for finance is encouraging some banks to shed smaller high risk clients. Secondly, in some country centres the recent bank mergers may have reduced competition between the banks and thus affect the availability of finance for small business. Thirdly, there is the difficulty in obtaining finance which stems from the discrepancy in the controlled interest rate on small loans.

However, the loss of concessional interest rates for small loans would force those who are fortunate enough to get a small loan to pay a higher interest rate. The only solution is to require a small portion of bank finance to be allocated for small loans.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: How would you do that? By Government edict?

Mr OLSEN: You can do it by several means and the American Government has clearly established one to which I will refer later. The small business administration in America fills the void and covers the gap to which I have referred. Small business, along with home purchasers, is being caught in an interest rate spiral because of the international influences that control the money supply and are needed there to reduce inflation and the large demands for finance being placed on the domestic capital market by resource development. In addition to these problems associated with current financial developments in the Australian economy, small businesses find it difficult to obtain finance for a number of other longer-term reasons. Sometimes, of course, what appears to be a finance problem is often a problem of inadequate earnings. Despite good management, many small firms will face financial problems because in a tight market the economy is oversupplied with producers of their goods or services.

There are several other areas, and I acknowledge that there may be some difficulty in providing capital and finance for small business operators. They include over-conservatism or undue risk aversion on the part of lending institutions, coupled with a trend towards institutionalisation of savings and a decline in the importance of banks relative to institutions such as merchant banks and super-annuation funds which traditionally do not lend to small business.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Why should not small business owners have to take their chance in a free market situation? Why should they be given special consideration?

Mr OLSEN: I am an advocate of the free market. Indeed, Liberal Governments in this State have advocated that but, as Sir Thomas Playford recognised in pragmatic terms and for the well being of South Australians generally, there had to be control in some areas of the free market. This Government determined earlier this year that there needed to be some control in relation to the price of petrol for South Australian consumers. It had hoped that the free market would be able to establish its own levels but the market had not been able to do so, because it really is not a free market when we consider that about 70 per cent of the service station outlets in metropolitan Adelaide are com-

pany-owned. It is not a free market in that respect. It is a manipulated market and, where there is a manipulated market, some controls must be instituted or directions given to protect all sections of the community. What I am saying is that I believe there ought to be the potential for the free market to operate but that in doing so on some occasions it has to have constraints so that all sectors have an equal opportunity, so that the small people in the community (and I am sure the member recognises that term) have an equal basis on which to operate, and an equal opportunity to succeed in this environment that we create. We have a responsibility to provide that. What I am saying to the House, including to the member opposite, is that I believe that we have a duty to provide the conditions and climate for those people. That will be for the benefit of the State, because small business has the capacity to create more job opportunities than has any other sector in the economy. The member would not know, for example, the difficulties that the small business communities experienced as a result of the 1972-1975 Whitlam period. Let us look at the effects on small business.

Trades Hall is only too happy to go for large wage increases that some of the larger companies can afford to pay, but the problem is the flow-over effect down the line to other businesses that have to fall in line with those wages and have not the capacity to pay them. The majority of small business men in this country must have a profit base of 10 to 12 per cent so that they can merely return profit to their business, to maintain the goods on display in the same quantities as they were in the year before. That is not retaining anything to put into the pocket to take home: that is merely earnings to retain a business, to provide a *status quo*, merely to provide on their shelves for sale the same number of articles as they had the previous year, let alone soak up such things as a 13.9 per cent wage increase last year, outstripping the actual inflation rate. That is soaking up further liquidity from the small business operators of this country and this State.

They are factors that members opposite would know little about, because they have not experienced the problems that the small people had to experience. If they had, they would have done something about pay-roll tax concessions and given direct incentives to help small business men.

The Hon. R. G. Payne interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: If the member for Mitchell had undertaken the minimum of research in the library, he would understand readily that the small business operators of this country provide more job opportunities than the major companies in Australia or the self-employed people he is talking about, the single-operated businesses.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Russack): Order! I have allowed a certain amount of latitude and I draw the attention of members to the fact that the member for Rocky River has the floor. Other members will have their opportunity later and I ask members not to take advantage of the latitude that is being given to the House.

Mr OLSEN: Small business operators cannot afford to have cost pressures put on their businesses such as that. They must have access to not short-term fixed drawn advance accounts with the major trading banks, but rather to long-term overdraft rates that give some relief when those overdrafts go into credit occasionally and thus reduce the cost burden of the interest rates on the business.

I read with interest recently a report where the A.L.P. was developing a new policy in relation to small business operations in South Australia, wherein it said that shortage of working capital was the major cause of retarded growth.

That shortage of working capital was a response to the Labor Government's ready acceptance of automatic wage

increases across the board. I have referred to when some major companies could afford those increases. The flow-over effects on to the small business man were devastating, because he could not afford them. He did not have the profit margins to provide them and he did not have the asset backing to secure the funds on a long-term basis to trade out of a devastating financial liquid position.

They say a fresh approach to local financial assisting arrangements is a priority. Yes, it is a priority, but it is interesting to note that in the 10 years of the former Administration, it did absolutely nothing in the small business area. It did nothing to offer counselling service. Rather, it downgraded it by 15 September 1979. It did nothing to establish a council to advise the Government on the ramifications of legislation that was to be brought down and on the effect it would have on the small business operators. It had no basis of understanding the effect such things as workers compensation and long service leave would have on small business operators. Labor certainly did nothing to reduce the pay-roll tax burden on small business operators in this community. That is hypocritical, in view of the Labor Party's track record.

It is interesting to note that at the recent convention it was stated that other factors, cost burdens, should be imposed on the small business community. Devastating, irrevocable harm would be caused to small business operators throughout the State if, as the Labor Party wants, across the board a 35-hour week was introduced, as well as pro rata long service leave after five years service and full quarterly cost of living adjustments based on the c.p.i., which, incidentally is inconsistent with Australia's centralised wage fixation system. What is proposed represents an attack, I believe, on eminent members of successive national and State wage tribunals who have rejected that proposal.

Indeed, in relation to annual productivity cases, the A.C.T.U. has not been prepared to take up that matter before the Full Bench. Mandatory severance pay for redundancies was also advocated. Those are the policies of the alternative Government of this State: those are the policies and burdens members opposite are prepared to consider placing on the shoulders of the small business operators in this State. They fly in the face of reality.

There is no doubt, as surveys in the U.S.A. have indicated quite clearly, that small business operators have the capacity to provide job opportunities at a greater rate than has any other sector, and yet the Opposition is prepared to inflict further cost burdens on that section to restrict it from achieving that objective, despite high unemployment levels in this country today.

As commendable an objective as it is to free up the banking system in this country to allow overseas banks to increase competition to bring an injection of funds into the country to allow the very necessary resource boom development in Australia, somewhere within the banking system there must be a requirement, a restriction perhaps, or a protection for that section of the community that provides such a large number of job opportunities—the small business sector. This could be done through a specific banking instrumentality for small business operators in this country, such as the American small business administration, which operates in every State in America and provides loans or guarantee funds for small businessmen, provision of finance at competitive rates, and direct provision of finance for the benefit of those operators so that they can survive in that climate.

One recalls that Henry Ford was once a small business man. It is easy to recognise the capacity of this sector to solve many of the problems in Australia today. If we created the climate by which every small business operator in this country was able to employ one extra employee, overnight

our unemployment problems would be solved. This Government—

Mr McRae: That's what you said in 1979.

Mr OLSEN: If the member for Playford had been in the Chamber during the early part of my speech, he would have heard me quote figures showing a significant reversal in the number of people employed in the work force in South Australia when one compares the period during which his Party was in Government with the period in which the Tonkin Government has presided over the wellbeing of South Australia, directing the State on a new course. The Government has taken the steps to which I have referred to achieve that commendable and forthright objective. At least, it has taken significant initiatives that the former Government totally ignored. The Labor Government ignored the business sector.

With interest rates climbing at present and with the possibility that the long-term rate will settle down in perhaps the 14 per cent or 15 per cent area, with, it is suggested, little movement for the 18 months after that, it appears that the difference developing between Australian and American interest rate systems may be narrow. I therefore want to stress the fact that we need to provide adequate, competitive interest rate funds for the small business sector.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: And have a free market at the same time, you said.

Mr OLSEN: I have referred to the free market and the necessity to provide in a free market the capacity for the small and the large business men to have an equal basis on which to compete, grow and prosper if they are prepared to work hard. That is the basis on which my comments are made. I want to stress that mining development is essential. The mining sector does not operate in isolation from the rest of the economy. Mining companies purchase goods and services for the construction of the day-to-day running of the mines and other operations. Last year, over 80 per cent of purchases for the mining industry were made from Australian suppliers. The people who earned their income from mining activities also purchased goods and services from other Australians and, as long as the economy is operating below full capacity, expenditure in the mining industry will create new jobs and additional income for all Australians, not only those engaged in the mining industry.

During the period of resource development between the 1980s and the 1990s, Australians, as a nation, will become wealthier. Some of this increasing wealth will result directly from the resource development. How well this boom is managed will have far reaching effects on Australia's future generally, and to that point I repeat that we must have a managed economy and a managed resource boom, a boom which, while contributing to the overall demand for housing by stimulating migration and population shifts in Australia, has the potential to—

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

Mr McRAE (Playford): I begin by paying a tribute to the way in which the member for Rocky River dealt with the plight of the small business man, but I cannot pay a tribute to the way in which the agencies of this State pay a tribute to the plight of the small business man. Let me give the House a practical example. In the small supermarket area in which my office is situated at Salisbury East, there is a delicatessen. About one year ago, the proprietor (or so he thought) of the business of that delicatessen and (so he thought) the owner of the lease of that delicatessen approached me with two legal documents. The first purported to evict him forthwith: the second purported

to remove from him any gain that he might ever have made in relation to that delicatessen.

A gentlemen of Lebanese extraction, he had worked for five years in that small business. I have occupied my office during that same time, so I have had ample opportunity to watch him and his family work night and day incessantly in the pursuit of what is undisputably a small business. I will not name any names: it would be wrong for me to do so. The supermarket was owned by a large company, which had given a lease to the small business man for a stated time. As I recall, the time was three years. The large company then, by word, extended the lease for a further period. The small business man, brought up in the context of what the honourable gentleman would call a free market economy, with competition, and those sorts of concepts, accepted that word as being fair. It was stated that the period of the lease would be extended for a couple of years while some of the technicalities were ironed out.

The problem was that the technicalities were not ironed out to anyone's satisfaction. The large business, which owned the whole of the premises and which is, or was, the landlord to which the Public Buildings Department is responsible (in the case of my office), took the document, rattled it in the small operator's face and said, 'That is the lease with which you are confronted. You had three years; the three years have expired. You are now, in terms of that document, a tenant from day to day. That is the law.'

He turned to me in despair and said, 'Is that the law?' I said, 'I hope it is not. It may be, but the only thing we can do is to go to the Supreme Court and test it out.' In desperation, he said to me, 'When I came to the shopping centre, you will vividly recall, Mr McRae, the little shop that I had was run down and somewhat unhygienic. Today, you find it bustling with customers.' He said, 'I paid \$12 000 for that business. It must be worth \$50 000 on the market today, and yet I am threatened for my whole livelihood. I have no ready cash, and I cannot afford to pay anyone.'

I consulted with the large business which owned the premises and I was told first, as member for the area, presumably in the knowledge that I was a lawyer anyway, to consult with their solicitor. I did that, and the solicitor said, 'You have got the lease. You know what the situation is. Get him out.' I said some unpleasant things, which I will not repeat to this House, but the general tenor was that I would not agree with what was said. I said, 'There will be a remedy found if I can find it.'

Let every Minister in this House (there are two present) mark this. I then went to the Legal Services Commission and explained the situation. It was not a question of my acting for the man; let no-one misunderstand the situation. I was not seeking to gain anything; there was nothing to be gained. Even if I had sought to gain a penny, hear out the rest of the story. I explained the whole situation. I explained that I had, as was my duty—and I do not complain about it—done many hours of research and found that there was a possible defence for this man—only possible, but there was a possible defence known as equitable estoppel. It was a defence set up first by the now Lord Denning, then Mr Justice Denning, in a case in England in 1946 known as the *Hightrees* case.

I gave them my opinion that it was a possible but a workable defence, but in any event it was a very good bargaining point to prevent any bailiff from actually evicting that man. Do you know, Sir, what was offered? Legal aid to the extent of \$50 was what that man was offered. I am staggered and appalled. My brother, who is also a lawyer, and I between us have 35 years experience in the law. We have, as other honourable members of this House will know, considerable experience in various aspects of the

law, never claiming to know everything or close to everything, but having considerable experience. That was the way in which we were treated.

I took that document, tore it up, threw it into the waste-paper basket, and then I found a solicitor. I said to him, 'I am so disgusted by this state of affairs that I want you to instruct me.' That is how it must be done, and I will adhere to my oath as a barrister in all circumstances and not deal directly with clients, even though they be constituents. I said, 'I want you to instruct me and, if there is a loss, let it fall on me while we have a go.' We got into the Supreme Court, and the judge, whose name I will not mention, was a very well disposed gentleman, and thank goodness for that. He was kindly disposed, and he did everything in his power. He invoked the South Australian Conciliation Act of 1929, which is so often overlooked, and he argued that the big business, represented by its very well paid lawyers, should see some common sense and justice in what was going on and be honourable with this man.

Was there a decent response? No, there was not. Three times more we were back before the same judge. All the facts I will verify if anyone questions my word, although I doubt that they will. Three times more we were back before the same judge, until finally it got through the head of someone that the publicity that I could create in another capacity would be so bad for this big company that it had better think of negotiating. I will not say that the judge actually sowed that idea in their minds, but he did not refrain from letting them think that it might happen, either. Eventually, we got a reasonable settlement. I do not care who is to blame in all this, whether it was Liberal Governments, Labor Governments, or what have you. The viciousness I see in all that is the big man against the small man.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: That's called the free market.

Mr McRAE: It is a free market situation, the big man against the small man, but it is compounded by this other element which is that the Legal Aid Service is so directed towards criminal cases that it appears to have no cognisance of the problems of the small man in business. So, God help any decent ordinary citizen in their day-to-day problems, because they will not get aid from your Government, Sir, any more than from my Government, as it was, to our eternal disgrace.

I raised this matter with the Attorney-General, and I think you, Sir, were the Chairman of the appropriate committee at that time and you may well recall it. As far as I am aware, nothing has happened to change it. If it comes to swapping punches across the table over the plight of the small business man, let me say that I am fully aware of the plight of the small business man, and I am not the only one in the Labor Party who knows it or has had the guts to do something about it.

Having said that, I want to look at the motion before us, then look back to the Speech which the motion supports, and ask myself what mediocrity inspired both. How could anyone not be ashamed of such a collection of words! His Excellency's Speech is clearly an enforced requirement of an uninspired and dispirited Government that promised so much so wrongly and has too slowly realised that it does not have the capacity to give what it offered. Too many people remember the promises to forget them. Not to continue the make-believe that this Government is going on with would be to leave the Government's ever fewer supporters in disarray. Lacking the courage to face reality, the Government wants a sandbag of words, and that is what it has provided.

To be frank, were it not for the constitutional oath that I took as a lawyer and as a member of this House, I would be very much inclined not to support the motion. I do

support it, but only with great regret that His Excellency was forced to deliver what I consider to be, in the time that I have been here, the most irrelevant, uninformative, uninspired, disoriented, and frankly very badly drafted Speech on record. I remember sitting there in the other place when we were solemnly called there, and making notes as I went along. I did not see too many other people making notes, but it is a custom of mine, one that I was brought up with. At the time, I thought that the Speech was terribly disjointed, and I could not follow the whole drift of it. I now understand that it was merely a sandbag of words. It is made worse, if you please, Mr Speaker, because of what has happened since His Excellency last addressed us.

Let there be no misunderstanding about this: of course, His Excellency produced for this Government what he would produce for an A.L.P. Government, namely, what he was asked to produce. No personal reflection on His Excellency is intended, but since he addressed us last in 1980 so much has happened on the international, national and State scenes that it should have been an opportunity for a Speech that would help inspire the community. It did not. It was very dispirited and very disjointed. Since that last speech, the first thing that happened was that the Reagan Administration was installed in the U.S.A. It is not for us in this Chamber to deal with defence or foreign policy under the constitution of our nation, but it is for us to consider the implications when the financially greatest nation on earth has a new Administration so radically different from that of its predecessor.

You will recall, Mr Speaker, that Ronald Reagan and his colleagues in the Republican Party were very much supporters of the economic policy, if it deserves the title 'economic policy', proposed by Milton Friedman. In that respect, many people who surround President Reagan were part of the infamous hoax of proposition 13 in California. That proposition was one of the greatest hoaxes on earth, and nobody knows that better than do the people of California. The actual circumstances of that situation were so badly analysed to the Australian nation that very few Australian people understood exactly what occurred—but I understood the reality of what occurred.

It must be understood that the State of California as an entity ranks as seventh among the nations of the world in terms of budgetary capacity. That is to say, if you take the big seven about to meet, the State of California would most certainly outrank Italy and would have a very good chance, I would think, of outranking Canada, its economic capacity is so vast. It so happened at the time of proposition 13 that the State, either through good management or bad management, had accumulated something like \$US6 000 000 000 in surplus. It also happened that that State at that time provided the best social welfare programme in the U.S.A., and did it with that \$US6 000 000 000 surplus. That is to say, police requirements, hospital requirements, and all of the other requirements that one would think of were fully met. That is not to say that California was a paradise; it certainly was not. Nonetheless, as a State, it held its place high in the American nation, and had every right to do so. A conspiracy of rich men associated with President Reagan (and I do not say that he was one of them, because his actual voting record while he was Governor of California would tend to show the opposite) was involved in a hoax on the whole of that State.

This was their proposition. Without explaining to the people that that \$US6 000 000 000 had been accumulated by a State, one of 50 States of the U.S.A., yet one of the big seven of the whole world, they put forward the proposition that they could afford to cut taxes enormously and still provide services. That was the catch—and still provide

services. That was never properly explained. The reality is now known to all Californians. In particular, it is known to all those who live in Los Angeles, San Francisco, San Diego and the other big cities and towns of California.

The reduction in taxes has meant a greater return than ever to the rich men of California and Californian cities. The reduction in taxes has meant the virtual bankruptcy of the State of California. The reduction of taxes has meant the cutting of programmes to a stage which is infamous. Never before in the history of what was a proud State, a history that stretches back 200 years and more to the Spanish missionaries who founded it and to all the other creeds who have been involved in the fairly tumultuous history of California, was it known in a State as rich as that that it could not afford to man its streets with policemen, yet the Police Force of California has been cut by 20 per cent. Never before was it known that a person could legitimately seek admittance to a public hospital in the State of California and not gain admittance—yet that is happening. Never before was it known that the humblest citizen of that State could call upon the State for assistance and not get it—yet that is happening and has happened already. The situation will get worse; there is no way out of that. Therefore, the installation of the Reagan Administration was one of the most important things that occurred in the interim between one Governor's Speech and the next.

There were also other international events which I agree were not directly relevant to a State Parliament but which, to any man of good will, would be of relevance. I refer to the horrible state of affairs in Poland, which the West seems to totally ignore, where the Poles have had the courage to stand up for their own national character. Yet those who stand opposite would tend to convey the impression that the Australian Labor Party blindly supports what they tend to refer to as communism or interchange the word 'socialism' and use that as though it meant 'communism', whereas in fact I think every single member of the A.L.P. deplores the horrors of what has occurred in Poland. I feel appalled at the thought of a country with the history of Poland having to cringe before a sovereign lord, namely, the Soviet Union.

Those things are fairly removed from us, but there are other things not removed from us, and I turn to the national level. Let me refer to the fiasco of the razor gang. That must be one of the great national fiascos of the whole of our federation, yet no mention is made at all of it in the Governor's Speech. How can it be that a military academy of \$80 000 000 is to be preferred to the Charles Darwin University, even though its proposed Vice-Chancellor was to be Rupert Murdoch, a person I think I have made clear I do not particularly admire?

Nothing has been heard of the fiasco of the Premiers' Conference and the scandalous dealings of the national Treasurer, Mr Howard, in cheating the States of \$70 000 000—and that means cheating our State, if my arithmetic is approximately correct, of about \$7 000 000. Then, what was worse, in what was a Nixonian situation, there was a briefing or debriefing of the press in secret to let the press know what the Premiers did not know. In other words, the people of this State had been cheated of \$7 000 000, and Mr Howard saw fit to make a joke of us all. I grant that the Premier did give him a blast over that—he deserved it. What I say for my own electorate is that I have people in it over whom, and I say this as a Christian most seriously, Jesus would weep at their plight. An amount of \$7 000 000 was lost because of what Mr Howard thought was a trick.

I have little respect for Mr Howard, and there are plenty of people in my electorate who have little respect for him after that incident. That is the first fiasco. I turn now to

another one, namely, the implications of the Grants Commission in relation to a capitulation made by our own Premier regarding the Railways Agreement. It is deplorable that in any bargaining situation, whether one is a lawyer or a politician or in any other situation where there are disputants as to what are the facts, that one gives away one's whole status at the very beginning. Did that not happen in relation to South Australia and the Commonwealth in relation to the Railways Agreement? I do not concede that it was so, but even if a mistake had been made by our legal advisers, by the draftsman or by somebody else in the course of those agreements, does one give that away in the face of a moral agreement? Of course one does not, yet on all the evidence I have it was given away—for what reason I do not know.

I have cause to think of the grave doubts that exist over the Hospitals Agreement; I am extremely concerned about this, and so is the whole of my electorate. Not only do we not have a new Lyell McEwin Hospital, which would have been of vast benefit to every constituent of mine, but also we have the threat of private enterprise, in the shape of an American corporation, moving in to cash in—and boy, they can cash in! I will come to a couple of examples of that in a minute. There is the threat that many of my constituents, decent honourable people, will have to go along and qualify themselves as disadvantaged before they can get into any hospital at all. That situation I do not take lightly.

Let me make myself quite clear about my reference to these American corporations. Again, I talk as a lawyer and not as a politician. I was appalled to find the other day that in fact there is in existence an Australian company which happens to be a subsidiary of an American corporation, which in turn happens to be based in California, and which has control, so it claims, of various private hospitals scattered throughout the northern suburbs. One might say that the fact that I was appalled is somewhat irrelevant, because I would not be in favour of private industry in the area anyway, and one would be quite right in saying that. However, leaving that aside, let us assume that it was a necessary thing that private industry enter into the hospital arena (but I do not concede that for a moment). Assuming that it was necessary, one would have to check out the *bona fides* of that corporation before the decision was made. Was it checked out? The answer is 'No, it was not.' Also, the *bona fides* of that organisation (and again, as in earlier examples, I will not give names) is quite questionable. I intend to put evidence before the Attorney-General for further consideration.

The matters I have raised are some of the things that have occurred on the national scene, and I raised them because you, Sir, will recall that I complained about the relevance of His Excellency's Speech, bearing in mind these great international and national occurrences. However, there were other national occurrences with which we must all grapple. Most of my constituents are simply looking for a life which is orderly, free and secure. However, I think it is true to say that they can be grouped into two classes. I do not use that term in the class sense, because the last thing I stand for is classes. One has only to look at Britain to see what that has brought about. The first group of persons consists of those who are disadvantaged for one reason or another and who need rental accommodation and social services of one kind or another. The other group of persons consists of those who are capable of standing on their own feet and who want to own their own homes.

What have we seen happen on the national scene since His Excellency last addressed us? Of course, what we have seen is a huge influx of international capital for resources development. I fully agree that any Australian national Government worthy of its salt would be tackling the task

of developing the undoubted resources that we have, but when we have the incredible situation of the ordinary Australian being asked to part-finance the development of those resources in a way that is wholly unjust, then I am extremely angry indeed. When I find that huge international corporations, which undoubtedly are almost guaranteed an enormous return, have imposed upon ordinary householders in my electorate increases of \$20 a month today, which will become \$80 a month within six months if my prediction is correct, then I am appalled. What I am saying to honourable members is this: what this State faces is a social revolution, and this is something that the Premier of this State and his Cabinet have not confronted in preparing His Excellency's address to us.

The ordinary householder in my electorate will not be able to afford an increase of up to 5 per cent in interest payments. How can I in any way suggest that those increases might be of that dimension? One might say that I am over-confident in ever suggesting that. I do not think I am. First, we know that there has been a large increase in recent weeks, and I certainly know that that has put an enormous burden on many ordinary householders in my own electorate. Secondly, we know that the leading spokesman for the banks has publicly stated, boldly stated, that he thinks they are getting off lightly. I do not know who this person thinks he is, but I heard him say on television 'They're getting off lightly; they're not paying the market rates.' I can assure you, Sir, that the Government had better gear itself better than the British Government did at Brixton or Liverpool if it thinks that the householders in Para Hills and in the other parts of my electorate are going to tolerate that sort of action. The fact is that they are not, and nor should they.

The reality of the situation is this: if large investors in this country believe that there are profits and super profits, by all means let them come in, but let us be the masters. I cannot and will not tolerate the philosophy of letting them cash in at our expense. I fully accept every point that Mr Howard and others have made concerning the risk of those sorts of development, but I equally point out that the risks must be balanced against the results. Quite obviously, companies of the dimension that we are talking about do not put money of the amounts that we are talking about (that is, \$6 000 000 000 in one year) into this country unless they are in the sure and certain expectation, as far as they can be, of gaining a result.

I regret to note that, even though matters of great moment are being ventilated, there is not even a Minister in the House. That goes to make my point that, of course, the Speech that His Excellency presented was extremely disjointed and irrelevant. No doubt they do not want to be here to face the embarrassment of the whole situation. Unfortunately, His Excellency was given a very hard brief. In fact, I think a high school boy would have objected to some of the drafting. I do not know who did it, but whoever did do it ought to be ashamed. Perhaps that is a bit too rough, because one must remember the Government that he or she served.

In preparing that Speech, in addition to not taking into account the international and national factors that I have mentioned, even State factors were not taken into account. It is bad enough for the major issues of the whole world to be ignored but, when it gets down to major issues which confront South Australia not even being considered, one must draw the line.

An honourable member: There was a weather forecast.

Mr McRAE: There was a weather forecast but even that was wrong. I think I was one of the few people taking notes. The member for Semaphore said to me at luncheon that day that the paragraph dealing with the weather fore-

cast did not sound right to him. I rang a friend in the bureau and said, 'Does that sound right?' and he said that it was totally wrong. He said that there was good rainfall throughout March and then there was a bad and unpredictable season until June and July. Throughout that it has been good and there have been even rains. That was wrong, and I do not know where the information came from. I refer to the serious matters inside this State.

The first matter to which I wish to refer is small business. I began by referring to that, and I now come back to it. It highlights the quandary in which the member for Rocky River finds himself. He challenged the Opposition to put forward its attitude to small business, and my riposte was to give him an example of what I had personally done, taking no credit for myself and claiming no credit for the Opposition—it was something that had to be done and should have been done. It was simply a matter of luck in many circumstances that that small business man got out of it. What the honourable member ignored is the overall quandary of his Government. I will not denigrate the member for Rocky River. I know that he is an intelligent member of this House and I know that he will be one of the newly appointed Ministers come September or thereabouts when the superannuation arrangements have been sorted out. I do not want to denigrate him. He will well realise the quandary that confronts his Government.

On the one hand it has to continue this make believe in its own sub-branches in order to keep up the numbers—God knows the numbers are bad enough. In Playford they do not exist at all. When talking to a well-known member of the Liberal Party in Playford I was told that they are serviced from Bonython. Bonython covers an enormous territory, so God help them! The honourable member knows that in normal circumstances an ordinary branch of the Liberal Party in the suburban area has a large percentage of small business men, and likewise in the country areas, in addition to the graziers, pastoralists and other such people, they would expect to have a number of small business men from the towns of the area. Those people all have their democratic choices to make, but the difficulty is that for its money and for its muscle the Liberal Party, to which the honourable member belongs, relies on big business—that is the quandary. Big business has now decided to get over the very problem with which I began. I dealt with a very specific problem in a shopping centre in which my electorate office can be found. As a result of what occurred there, big business decided that it would toughen up, and toughen up it has. It has done a splendid job.

I will explain what big business has done to the small business holder in the supermarket complexes. We are supposed to have a free market. Do we? Certainly not! First, our cash register is linked in by computer to the major cash recorder back at headquarters. Let us assume that one is purchasing what is supposedly a free-enterprise business, for example, a small deli, a dress shop, an antique shop or anything else that might be a free venture, a go at the market. You can become a millionaire if you can and lose if it is too bad. Is that the case? No, it is certainly not the case. First, we find that the agreement has been so drawn that one will pay not just an inflated rental, which you will start with, but also one will be tied down by an agreement that is invincible. No *Hightrees* case will ever get you out of it, and even if it did have the faintest possibility of getting you out of it there is an arrangement to ensure that you will be bankrupted on the way to the Privy Council. It has been worked out, I am ashamed to say, by some unions as well as by some big business men that the best way to bankrupt an honest litigant is to take him to that shameful place known as the Privy Council. If the Privy Council does not bankrupt him, the processes

of the Supreme Court and High Court will do a good job in the meantime. Not only that, but also the cash register is linked into the major computer centre. If your lease is with Myer, your cash register is linked to the Myer computer. You will not only pay lease money but also you will pay a turnover tax. In other words, we now have a hidden free-enterprise tax. How the honourable member can resolve that inside the parameters of his own philosophy, let alone his own conscience, I do not know.

Some of the devices used inside those agreements are appalling. They appal even long-standing members of the Liberal Party, and that is how I get to know these things. People that I have known for a long time, who I know have never voted for me but who may have a kind spot for me, may call in and say, 'This is the last straw; I cannot take any more—can they do this to me?' I have to say, 'Sorry, they can—that is the law, and do not seek for too much justice in commercial law.' One can never seek for too much justice. That is the basic supposition one can take from a school child in this world. In commercial law one can never seek for any justice—just seek for the law. That is highlighted by the argument between the Government, the oil companies and the so-called small business men. That is still going on.

Nothing will convince me that the last so-called solution was in any way a final solution. I happen to have yet another friend who works for a very large oil company. I will not disclose his name, but he is well placed inside a large oil company, and he has assured me of two things: first, that the small business men who were gloating (as he put it) over the oil companies loss would be run to ground very readily as time went on. They would be picked off one by one for their impertinence. I know this fellow well enough to know that he tells the truth. Secondly, he said that, if the Liberal Party does not come to heel, it will find out about it when it comes to funds, too.

Mr Bannon: The Minister—

Mr McRAE: I am not privy to what my Leader may know. However, I am certainly privy to that information, because I know that it comes from a good source. Otherwise, I would not disclose it. In this State, and again ignored in this Speech, we have had in the past year a number of unprecedented things happening. I refer, first, to the teachers strike. A teachers strike in South Australia is almost unbelievable. On one occasion, I had the honour of representing the teachers union. It was so conservative that it reminded me a bit of the Bank of Adelaide. In fact, it was more conservative than the Bank of Adelaide, because I think I had to get permission from about seven people before I could lodge a document. I am talking now not about the bank officials union but about the teachers union. The fact is that it is a very conservative organisation. For that union, or even portions of it, to go on strike is unprecedented in the history of this State. For the Minister in charge of the affairs of education (and I make clear that I do not want to talk about education) then to say that the Opposition had fermented this strike is so ludicrous and stupid.

I can say that I have acted for unions representing every conceivable philosophy in Australia. I have acted for the Maoists, the Soviet communists, for the so-called independent communists, for the A.L.P., and various brands of thought inside the A.L.P., as well as for the conservative unions. For the Minister and the Government to have the gall to say that the Opposition manipulated the most conservative of all unions is beyond my comprehension. I might say that almost half of my sub-branch is either involved with the teachers union or related to its members, and they have the same opinion as I regarding its conservatism. So, first of all, we have had that quite unprecedented thing.

Next, we have had an unprecedented disquiet in the Public Service. That is beyond any doubt. Who before has ever seen such a quiet and orderly band of persons as court reporters having a picket line? Again, that is incredible and unheard of in this State. However, it relates not just to court reporters. The brutal truth of the matter is that everyone in the South Australian Public Service knows one reality: when one goes into the Public Service one knows that there are no tax dodges and that one is paying one's taxes at full tote odds. One also knows in advance that one will get less than those working in private industry, but that what one is seeking is quiet and security.

When I say that, I am not branding anyone: everyone has a choice. If people want to go into the free market (or what I would call the jungle), so be it: that is their choice. However, if people choose to go into a job that offers security, well realising that they will not get the rewards of the so-called free market, they expect that that promise will be honoured. However, they have a deep disquiet about the matter.

It is no good any Government members, until they have been a lot more convincing than they have been until now, trying to say the opposite, because I hear it on every side of me. I hear people that I know have extremely conservative views. Indeed, even I am considered in some circumstances to be a quiet right-wing member of the Labor Party, yet many of these people would consider me to be philosophically quite unacceptable. Yet, they have come to me more and more over the past few months regarding their job security.

Job security is what this is all about, and these people are deeply disquieted about the matter. They have every right to be disquieted, because, every time that one hears a statement from a Government Minister, one has to qualify it in one's mind, as my acquaintances and friends do, with the thought, 'Is this true, or are they making room for private industry?' because that is what the Government said in its policy speech. It said, 'Make room for private industry.' That is the whole philosophy that lies behind this matter.

What we have got, in essence, in the whole of this matter is the makings for a social revolution, yet we are given a speech that is, as I have said, irrelevant, disjointed and a patchwork quilt. We, and indeed all South Australians, deserve very much better than that.

First, I would demand of the Premier of the day, to whichever political Party he belonged, a much more assertive approach. I would demand that the Premiers of this State call a Premiers' Conference to deal with the question of foreign investment in this country. I am not becoming paranoid about foreign investment. However, I am concerned about its consequences in this country. I am not naive enough to say that the problem can be easily solved, because it cannot. However, given thought, something can be done about it. Something can be done about all the so-called economic problems by means of political solutions. It is obvious to me and to those to whom I speak that Mr Howard and Mr Fraser have, by trying to placate various wings of the Liberal Party and the National Party, simply jumped from one predicament to another in the hope that the problem would go away, but it will not do so. It was put to me by the headmaster of a very conservative school recently in this fashion (and I think he was right): 'Imagine this situation. You are carrying a bucket of water and, as you are doing so, it is nearly full. Because it is nearly full, the water shifts from one rim to the other.' His analogy was between Australia and the U.S.A., as it is quite clear that, by one means or another, most of the finance entering this country comes in the form of U.S. currency or, alternatively, U.S.-backed notes of some sort or another.

The proposition that this person put to me was that whatever happened on the U.S. market was likely to duplicate itself on the Australian side of the rim. I think that that is perfectly clear. Because U.S. investment rates rose, so there was a flood of capital out of Australia. The ripost has been to put up capital and investment rates in Australia. However, there is no need for that. There is no need to ensure a consistent and uniform interest rate throughout the whole economy. It is quite acceptable that there be variable interest rates, in the same way that it was consistent back in the early 1970s that there be a variable deposit rate on money in this country or, indeed, that it is still quite consistent that there be variable deposit rates with the Reserve Bank of Australia. A conservative person put that to me in the context of a private school which, at that time, was paying \$2 800 a week on capital and interest. He was quite seriously budgeting for a 5 per cent escalation over that.

I have not much time left to address the House, so I should like to go straight from that matter, discarding a lot of other material that, unfortunately, I cannot use, to two topics that must be dealt with in this State as a matter of justice. I will try to squeeze my comments on these matters into the remaining eight minutes that are at my disposal.

I refer, first, to the victims of crimes. I see that the Chief Secretary is present in the Chamber; and I have told my colleague, the shadow Minister for Justice, that I would be raising this topic. I do so with his wholehearted approval.

On a minimum of two occasions in this House, I have asked for a Select Committee from a Government which said that that was the proper way to go about things, to look at the question of victims of crime. In this morning's newspaper I read that a woman, who was raped at the point of a knife and who suffered terribly as a result, received some \$8 000 compensation. I have looked at other newspaper clippings and seen that people have been beaten and robbed. All members opposite must know by now that I am perfectly sincere in what I am saying. I have offered over and over again to be totally bipartisan at times when I could speak for the Opposition. I am sure that my colleague the member for Stuart would still offer to be bipartisan in this matter. We can do better than we are doing at the moment.

Surely at least a few dollars of taxpayers' money is worth while investing to see whether the Opposition's proposition of a workmen's compensation type of scheme is worth looking at. The Government does not have to commit itself to saying that it is good, bad or indifferent. At least let us look at the matter; surely that is not too much to ask. Again, I ask the Minister involved, the Chief Secretary, in his own heart and conscience, to seriously reconsider the matter. Forget hooded bandits and all the other nasty things that may have passed between us, and think of the victims and a way of helping them.

I now turn to my last set of victims, and they are the worst victims of all; they are the victims of injury at work. I say that they are the worst victims of all because, unlike the person who is savagely mutilated by a rapist or criminal, they are victims of the sheer ordinariness of their experience. When one goes to work one does not expect that a heavy press will fall on one's hand, cut off one's leg, or that something else will happen. Once again, I must draw the Government's attention to the fact that the limit of workmen's compensation payable in this State is \$18 000, and that is a disgrace. It is appalling. The original calculation was made in this House with the full knowledge of the then Opposition.

An honourable member: Eight years ago.

Mr McRAE: It was longer ago than that. It was at least eight years ago. It was based on four years of the minimum

adult weekly earnings. Let me be quite clear about that. I am not talking about this ridiculous figure of average weekly earnings; I am talking about four years earnings on adult male weekly minimums. If one takes the same figure today, give or take \$1 000, it comes out to about \$40 000. That is what it is in Tasmania, which is, economically, the weakest State in the Commonwealth. That is what it is in Western Australia, and I hear this Government refer to Western Australia often enough. Whatever the figure is, again, I challenge the Government to justify a situation in which a worker can be confronted with this situation, that within a year and a half his entitlement has gone. How can the Government face a widow whose entitlement, which is currently \$25 000, was worked out on something humble enough, namely, six years at the same rate, knowing that that has been cut in value by half. How can the Government in all conscience do that, knowing full well that it is funded by insurance companies which are making enormous profits out of it?

Never forget that when the Liberal Opposition, as it then was, called for the cessation of the workmen's compensation scheme they were hit and hit hard. The only Minister present who was a member of the Opposition at that time is, again, the Chief Secretary. He will recall how the insurance companies came into this House in a flash to tell the then Opposition that if they proceeded with their motion their cash flow would be hit so hard that it would be disastrous. As a matter of justice, it is imperative that something be done to adjust these systems. Furthermore, it is imperative that something be done to overcome the artificiality of the courts, and I am referring here not to the Industrial Court but to the artificiality of the decision of the Supreme Court in reversing the whole process that this Parliament, full well knowing, worked out for the resolution of workers' disputes with their employers. Something must be done about that.

These injustices cannot be allowed to go on and on, surely. Again, if I ask for a Select Committee in that area (if we need a Select Committee, and I doubt whether we do), or for some positive action to be taken, surely that will not be overlooked as well. If in the meantime (in addition to everything else that I have mentioned) all those minimum claims (that is all they are; I have not asked tonight for more than consideration of problems and solutions to two specifics) are just pushed aside, that will be very bad for the State of South Australia, and I am very sincere when I say that. I ask the Ministers responsible in those areas to search their own consciences and canvass them heavily in Cabinet when they get an opportunity. In respect to Mr Seaman—

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

Mr BECKER (Hanson): At the outset, I compliment His Excellency on his Speech opening this Parliament. I believe that no member should ever underestimate the good work that His Excellency has done during his term of office and the service he has given this State. I sincerely hope he will be able to continue his work in that office and to enjoy good health. I have always had much respect for His Excellency.

It was saddening recently to learn of the death of Sir Thomas Playford. I can remember some 15 years ago having dealings with Sir Thomas when I was President of the Bank Officials Association. I had to approach him, when he was Premier and Treasurer of this State, to seek a public holiday for bank officers. The first time I met Sir Thomas I sat in a very plush chair and we spoke for a few minutes. Sir Thomas then came around from his desk, sat down alongside me and said, 'Now, my boy I have to run the

State; I have to pay the bills,' and so on. I left there thinking that it was a pretty hard request to make of any Treasurer. The second time I was a little better prepared.

Mr Slater: Robin Millhouse names him as his mentor—are you claiming the same?

Mr BECKER: No, I just found Sir Thomas to be a very humane and sincere person. I will never forget the first time I met him, and I certainly recall the many times I met him following my election to this House. I would also like to place on record my appreciation of the service Sir Thomas gave this State and this country. I would like to thank his family for, as it were, lending him to us, and I acknowledge his great contribution and long service in this Parliament and also as a South Australian. I hope that all members will join me in extending deepest sympathy to Sir Thomas's family. At the same time I would also like to extend my sympathy to members and ex-members of this House who have lost loved ones during the Parliamentary recess.

The previous two speakers have not been very high in their praise of my Government's preparation of His Excellency's Speech. I think they have misread the document, have not understood it, or have not fully read the document. My Government's record over the past two years has been one of which any political Party would be proud. My Government has had to make decisions on waste and mismanagement and on economic policies that very few Governments in the past have ever tried in this State.

My Government has had to face some very agonising decisions which, in the future, will be of immense benefit to the taxpayers of South Australia. It is very hard to estimate and quantify just how much money was misspent and wasted by the previous Government. It could well amount to tens of millions of dollars. We have tried to quantify, through the work of the Public Accounts Committee, the amount of money that can be saved in the future. I become somewhat annoyed when I think that a political Party which claims to be an alternative Government has conferences and allows the following sort of policy decision to be put forward (as it did at the A.L.P. conference held on 5 to 8 June at Trades Hall this year):

The following clause be added to the Public Administration Platform:

Labor will legislate to ensure that no employees of the State Government, Public Service or statutory authorities shall be retrenched or suffer a drop in salary or be forced to transfer to a place of employment more than 30 minutes from their present place of employment.

This convention instructs delegates to the Federal Conference to propose and support a similar amendment to the Federal A.L.P. platform.

If I have ever read a motion that would be almost physically impossible to implement or that would hamstring any future Labor Government, then this is it. There is no doubt that the mover, seconder and the people who supported that motion, comprising a majority of the trade union representatives at that conference, did not consider what it would cost. Indeed, what would it cost the State, and what problems would it create for any future Government? I refer to examples of mismanagement in the public sector as identified by the Public Accounts Committee in respect of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the report having been tabled in this House on 12 August. On page 13, conclusion 2.5, the P.A.C. stated in its report:

The department, in February 1980, estimated that it had a current surplus of 950 weekly paid employees. Based on the then natural attrition rate of 8 per cent and an average wage of \$10 000 per annum the cost of wages for surplus weekly paid employees from February 1980 will be approximately \$13 000 000. This will more than absorb the extra revenue to be raised from the rate increase imposed for the current financial year.

The report further highlighted the problems within the Engineering and Water Supply Department, and on page 14, conclusion 2.7, we stated:

Extensions to the Ottoway workshops, approved by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works (P.W.S.C.) on 21 April 1975, at an estimated cost of \$3.8m based on November 1974 prices, have proceeded with \$5.4m being spent to 30 June 1980. The reduction in the metropolitan workshops work force from 920 in May 1977 to a maximum requirement in 1980-1981 of 425 (280 if work transferred to contract) has resulted in under utilisation of the facilities recently provided.

Back in 1977 the then Labor Government started to wind down the work force in the Engineering and Water Supply Department. In fact, that Government in 1977 had started a programme of cutting budgets and a programme of attrition within more than one Government department.

Now, in 1981, we have the A.L.P. convention endorsing a policy matter that would not allow any retrenchments within the public sector or the transfer of Government employees to any place of employment more than 30 minutes from their present employment. The people who worked out this policy have not really thought through the whole issue because the Labor Party, the Opposition, is, by this resolution, tying people employed in the Public Service or in a statutory authority to a situation where it may affect transfers or promotions for officers in country areas or even outer-metropolitan areas. The wording of the motion is 'shall be retrenched or suffer a drop in salary or be forced to transfer to a place of employment more than 30 minutes from their present place of employment'.

Such a situation would not apply even in the State Bank. Its implementation is physically impossible. Surely, any person who joins the Public Service or any statutory authority, whether it be the State Bank, the Electricity Trust, the Police Force or whatever, does so knowing that he could be transferred anywhere within the State, to any branch of that organisation within the State or the metropolitan area. Here we have a political Party claiming that it is an alternative Government yet coming up with such a proposition. What future is there in this State and country if we are going to get such hamstringing of Governments? It would be interesting to know what Clyde Cameron thought of that issue. His remarks have been well documented in articles in the *Bulletin* dealing with fat cats and the growth in the Commonwealth Public Service. He has virtually challenged the Federal Government to do something about it and to start cutting down on the Public Service. You cannot introduce efficiency in Government or introduce these great dreams that the Opposition puts forward if such a huge Public Service, as we have had in this State, has to be maintained. When over three-quarters of the taxes and Government charges collected in this State go to meet salary and wages, there is little room to manoeuvre.

As members know, 90 per cent of all money spent on education goes on wages and salaries. It leaves little for maintenance and little indeed for necessary equipment in our education system. A further wonderful policy has been spelt out neatly for us for the first time. This is the first time it has been documented, and I refer to the motion moved by Blevins and McCormack at the recent convention, as follows:

Convention calls on the next Federal Labor Government to take urgent steps to implement a wealth tax in Australia (as per 7, D5 page 43 of the Federal platform), which states:

A Labor Government will . . . enhance the equity of the tax system by taxing large accumulations of personal capital above a floor level that is reviewed regularly and takes into account the special circumstances of farmers, small businessmen and aged people, and excludes the normal holdings assembled over a lifetime by persons and family units.

Further, we urge the Party as a whole to institute a public education programme, commencing immediately, to explain and popularise the equity of such a tax system—

That is a nice way of suggesting a propaganda campaign—This section of our Party's platform be a major part of the next, and future, Federal election campaigns.

I thank the Hon. Frank Blevins and his cohort K. McCormack, because they have just ensured that the Federal Liberal Government will be returned to office with an even greater majority than it presently enjoys. A wealth tax in this country is just not on—a wealth tax in this country will not achieve what the A.L.P. believes it will achieve.

Several years ago we had the Premier of the State (Hon. Don Dunstan) issue a circular to unions and supporters of the Opposition stating that he planned to tax the tall poppies in this State. He was going to get to the 3 per cent to 5 per cent of the community who could really afford to pay and was going to tax them for all that he could. He had to admit that he could not do it. He did not achieve it: he did not get anywhere.

If any Government thinks that it can tax the so-called tall poppies (and you can have a crack at your fat cats if you want to) it will never succeed; as I have said previously, if you believe that there is a certain elitist rich in this country, find out where they get their money and how they make it. If you put the squeeze on them for taxes, all they will do is increase profits and take more profits out of the companies to feed themselves and to keep the standard of living to which they are accustomed.

The workers will suffer again. There will be fewer jobs for the workers, because the tall poppies whom you want to tax will not go without. That is universal throughout the world. In socialist countries and everywhere else there is the situation where there is an extremely rich class, and no Government has been able to bring them down, because they can increase profits and sack the workers.

For goodness sake, let us get around to the facts of life. Let us help these companies. Help people to make the money and increase productivity and create jobs for the people who desperately need the opportunity to work to improve their position in life. I believe that it is high time all political Parties, if they want to come up with airy-fairy propositions, sat down and did their homework.

We should look at a system such as they have in America, where any legislative programme, any proposal, or any system mooted is properly vetted and costed out before it goes to Parliament. It is no good for Oppositions to jump up time after time and day after day, saying that they want this and they want that. No-one has any idea of what those things are going to cost.

The same situation should now apply here and we ought to look at the Constitution of this State on the basis that, if the Government of the day wants to bring in a certain programme, the House does not consider that programme until it knows exactly how much it will cost for the remainder of that financial year and for future financial years. Unless we do that, we do not know where we are heading. Unless we use the principle of corporate planning, how will we ever know whether the charges being made for that Government's service are the right charges?

I found it amazing during my study trip that in America (it applied in all States of America) the Governor of the State, or the President of the country in the case of President Reagan, brought down the Government's Budget for, say, the 1980-81 financial year on the first working day in January, so the Legislature had until 15 June to deal with the Budget and every section and programme of it. One of the two things that I liked was that it was put to a Government analysis committee. It was analysed out for the politicians because, let us face it, they could not read the document or even handle it.

Secondly, the committee of the House then considered each section and each programme, and the Legislature

could amend the Budget. This is where the real input was made by the politicians, because they were aware of the need of the community and approved the programmes they wanted to preserve and axed the programmes that they thought were not in the best interests of the country. By 15 June or thereabouts, the Budget had to be dealt with and finally voted on, so on 1 July 1981, or the commencement of the next financial year, every department, programme and organisation in the Government knew exactly what its budget was. It knew exactly where it was heading and how far it could go. It knew that, if it ran out of money, it had to come back to the Legislature to justify further funds, and the warning was that it would not get them.

That is the way to run it. I do not know any company in Australia from B.H.P. down that considers its budget one-third of the way into the financial year. Here we are in July and it will be September before we find out what the Federal and State Budgets are. That is not good enough. It is an incompetent and inefficient system and it is time we reviewed that part of our Legislature. If we want to bring about the efficiencies and economies that we are talking about, that is the area where we must start.

That is why my Government has had the very agonising decisions to wind up programmes and projects that were implemented by the previous Government without any thought. It is quite clear that the Wardang Island project was never thought out in more than an airy-fairy way, as was the case with Monarto. We could go on and on. They were good public relations matters. Good publicity was obtained and then someone had to work them out. As the Government developed the programmes over the years the cost mounted and there was not any check on any phase of those programmes. That is not good enough. The continual waste of taxpayers' money and the continual inefficiency and incompetence by Governments must cease. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment and Planning): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr SLATER (Gilles): I am rather disappointed that the Minister of Recreation and Sport, who was in the House earlier, is not here now, because the matter that I wish to bring to the attention of the House refers specifically to him as Minister of Recreation and Sport. That matter is the decision of the Government to allocate the major portion of money received from soccer pools and paid to the Recreation and Sport Fund for the development of an aquatic centre in South Australia. Let me say first that I am not opposed to the concept of an aquatic centre. I believe that there is a need, a priority, for an indoor all-weather swimming pool of Olympic size in this State. However, I question the manner and methods of the Minister of Recreation and Sport in relation to this decision to provide the bulk of the money from soccer pools revenue in regard to this particular project.

We should consider the brief history of the proposal for the aquatic centre. An announcement was made in October last year by the then Minister for Home Affairs, Mr Ellicott, that the Commonwealth Government would provide \$3 750 000 and that the State would need to provide a similar sum on a 50/50 subsidy basis to enable the project to proceed. That announcement was made, quite conveniently, just prior to the last Federal election. During the

previous session of this Parliament, I put a Question on Notice to the Minister of Recreation and Sport, as follows:

Following the announcement by the Federal Minister for Home Affairs, Mr Ellicott, that Federal funds will be available to provide an indoor aquatic centre in Adelaide at an estimated cost of \$7 500 000 on a dollar-for-dollar subsidy basis with the State, can the Minister give an assurance that the State Government will be able to provide its share of the funds?

The Minister did not reply to my question: I never received an answer to that question. I believe that the question was straightforward and worthy of an answer in the public interest, but the Minister did not extend the courtesy of providing an answer to that question. However, he later publicly announced that \$65 000 of the revenue from soccer pools and paid into the fund would be used annually to fund the State's share of the funds for the aquatic centre. This funding would proceed for some four or five years.

The decision and the way in which it was arrived at has caused serious disquiet, concern and even anger among some people in sporting circles. Prior to the soccer pools matter, the Minister and the Premier made great play of the fact that the revenue obtained from soccer pools would be of significant assistance to sporting organisations and sports funding generally in South Australia. Members may also recall receiving letters from sporting bodies requesting them to support the soccer pools legislation in the interests of sports funding in this State. Some people are now sadly disillusioned by the Government, and in particular by the Minister of Recreation and Sport, because of the decision to allocate the major portion of soccer pools moneys to one particular project, which will be funded over four or five years.

During the debate on the soccer pools legislation, I made the point and I put forward an amendment to the Bill to the effect that a committee should be set up to advise the Minister in regard to the distribution of the fund. The Minister did not accept my amendment, but made the point that he had a Sports Advisory Council and a Recreation Advisory Council to assist him in the distribution of the fund. In reply to my amendment, the Minister stated:

I have already been advised on this Bill by my Recreation Advisory Council and my Sports Advisory Council. I will also receive advice on some priorities from the 1986 sesqui-centenary sporting committee.

To set up another committee would be to cut across the already considerable work that has been done by the recreation and sports advisory councils, which have considered what should happen to money should this Bill be passed. Those committees have considered how the money should be allocated, and I would not like to cut across the work that they have done.

Those were the Minister's words during the soccer pools debate, but I am now to understand that the decision to allocate moneys for the aquatic centre was not referred to the Sports Advisory Council. In fact, the council was advised what would happen to the fund. The Minister, during that debate, made a promise that certain action would be taken and that has not occurred. Some anger is felt by people involved in sport and recreation, and in particular by members of the Sports Advisory Council. I believe that some members are so angry that quite a number of them have threatened to resign. I can best explain the situation by way of a comment made by a sporting writer in the press, who stated:

At its meeting on 22 May, the Sports Advisory Council by a 10-1 majority, passed the following motion: That the Sports Advisory Council views with grave concern that no consultation took place with the council before a priority for the aquatic centre was proposed by the Federal Government. As a consequence, members of the council dissociate themselves from such a decision.

The dissenting vote came from the Government representative on the council, Mr Stan Evans. Mr Wilson knows, in fact, that the swimming pool priority was established by a senior member of his department without consultation with any sporting bodies.

The Sports Advisory Council was not asked for its advice: it was told how the distribution of the fund would take place. As I have said, the members are so concerned that I understand that many of them intend to resign from the Sports Advisory Council, and I cannot blame them for contemplating that action. I think it is justifiable, because the Minister has misled the sports people of South Australia regarding soccer pools. This is instanced by a letter, of which I think all members have received a copy, written to the Premier from the President of the South Australian Volleyball Association, the final paragraph of which states:

Your department will tell you, Mr Tonkin, that there are some 500 000 active sportsmen and sportswomen in South Australia. Most of them have no desire to swim around in a pool. Yet most of them are eligible to cast their democratic vote at election time. I sincerely hope that you will reconsider the decision and give this State its proper priorities formulated by competent administrators on the basis of need and not political expedience.

I believe that the expression of views by the President of the Volleyball Association is entirely correct. A decision was made by the Minister, supported by his Cabinet. It was a political decision, made not in the interests of sport and recreation in South Australia, but as a matter of political expediency, and it is to be deplored.

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): The House may recall that I had some remarks to make during the last adjournment debate in relation to the anomalies arising from the ridiculous posture presently adopted in the policy of the Labor Party in its attitude to radioactive substances and the use of the energy that naturally emanates from those substances. However, on this occasion I propose to speak about another matter, that of the third party premiums charged to primary producers, and what appears to be a very anomalous and ridiculously unjust situation arising as a consequence of recent decisions by the Third Party Premiums Committee.

Members may be aware—and for their benefit, in case they are not, I shall point it out—that the Chairman of the Third Party Premiums Committee is Mr Justice Sangster. As that honourable gentleman is often inclined to point out, that committee has the powers of a Royal Commission. Accordingly, it investigates from time to time the premiums charged by the State Government Insurance Commission and any other insurance company that wishes to participate in that sector of the insurance market for the cover which must compulsorily, by Statute, be taken by the owner of every motor vehicle in South Australia.

The categories of vehicle are determined by registration. That is a Government responsibility. However, it is not the cost of registration that I am speaking about—not in the least. I am talking about the third party bodily injury premiums that must be paid by the owners of those vehicles at the time the vehicle is registered. The categories of vehicle so determined by registration then provide the committee with the basis on which it decides those premiums, or so I am told.

During the last sitting of the committee, in its deliberations it decided to increase the zone of the metropolitan area in what I consider to be a rather ridiculous, insensitive, and arbitrary fashion. It increased the zone from a 32 kilometre radius from the General Post Office to a 40 kilometre radius from the GPO and drew an imaginary line at that point on the circumference of a circle described by that arc on that radius.

Presumably, everybody who has a farm within that radius must pay a higher third party premium for a primary producer's vehicle. Everybody who lives outside the circumference of an arc on a radius of 40 kilometres has a lower third party premium to pay than have those inside it. It is here that the anomalies begin. It takes no account whatever of what other means of income the owner of the vehicle

has, or of the purpose for or extent to which that vehicle is needed on the farm. Some farm vehicles are used wholly on the farm for farm purposes only, and may do only a few thousand kilometres, but, nonetheless essential kilometres, a year. Others might be required to do several thousand kilometres a year and to travel a good deal more on the road network than those in the earlier category to which I referred. Of course, this need not necessarily exercise the minds of the members of the Third Party Premiums Committee. However, I see no reference to that, or to any other yardstick. I do not understand on what yardstick the committee made its judgments.

Why should a primary producer (and here is another anomaly) who is a primary producer in his own right, and who lives on one side of that line, pay a higher premium than a person pays who lives on the other side of the line on his farm? If, however, the farm is within the 40-kilometre radius, but the residence is outside, say, in a town like Victor Harbor, that primary producer, because he is living in Victor Harbor, does not have to pay the higher premium. On the other hand, if the primary producer is a primary producer per medium of a proprietary company or companies which he and his family own, then the statement as to where that vehicle is to be housed determines what the premium shall be, so that even though the office is registered in Adelaide somewhere the place at which the vehicle is used determines what the premium shall be.

That is not the case for a citizen who is a primary producer in his own right. If he lives in a place like Ashton or Wistow, as is the case in my district, and his farm is at Langhorne Creek, or further afield, because his place of residence and his address are inside the 40-kilometre radius he has to pay the higher premium. If ever there was a ridiculous situation, that must be it. It discriminates against the small business man presumably, since it is only those people who are in business on a larger scale who can derive any administrative or accounting benefits from registering and trading as a proprietary company limited, as most primary producers these days are required to give some kind of guarantee in addition to the extent of their liability established in law where they are primary producers per medium of a proprietary company limited.

I wonder why the Third Party Premiums Committee did not analyse the statistics that could have been obtained, given that it has the powers of a Royal Commission, of the number of claims made against primary producers' vehicles as a complete category, and compared those figures with the number and value of claims made against other categories of vehicle as complete categories.

Why was no consideration given to that aspect in determining whether there was any relationship between the distance from the G.P.O. and the number of claims made against that category of vehicle? I did not see any evidence of that matter ever having been considered. It seems to me that a rule of thumb was used in saying that because the traffic is denser nearer the city primary producers' vehicles will, of course, be involved in a greater number of claims, simply because other categories of vehicle registered at addresses within the metropolitan area of Adelaide are involved in a higher proportion of claims than are those registered at addresses outside of Adelaide.

If what I have suggested should have been done had been done, I am quite sure that the present outcry from primary producers and their organisations that I suspect may have been heard today (or it will certainly be heard tomorrow if it was not heard today) at the presently conducted annual convention of the United Farmers and Stock-owners Association would not have occurred.

The outcry will not abate until justice is done, until some analysis of the kind I suggest is made, and a determination

based upon that analysis is given. I do not know either why the premiums of all categories of vehicle according to the proportional cost of claim pay-outs for those categories are not used to determine exactly what should be paid as a premium. If it is not related to the cost per category, then what is it related to? It is either related to all vehicles in general, or, indeed, it is possible to make an analysis on the basis of the category, and that analysis and that judgment ought not to be based on anything other than the literal facts of the situation. We did not all pay 20c for a bag of sweets when we went into the deli, if members cast their minds back to when they were children, but one pays for what one selects and chooses.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): Tonight I wish to address the House on the matter of a book titled *The Struggle for Power* by John Grover, which I believe has been recently circulated to all members of the House. I am addressing the House not because of the circulation of the book to members of this place but rather because it was sent to all school librarians within this State, the purpose being for them to display that book on their library shelves to assist students in high schools in their learning and understanding about the entire nuclear debate. I am not going to oppose the placing on school library bookshelves of material that is of a pro-uranium or pro-nuclear bias or point of view in order that students may more ably make their opinions and decisions. Nobody could be opposed to that. Indeed, I would strongly recommend to all school librarians that they seriously consider buying the volume *The International Fuel Cycle Evaluation Study, Summary Volume* for the role it plays in putting the pro-nuclear point of view. I do not agree with much of what is said in that volume, and indeed I have spoken in this House on that matter. However, I cannot fault that it attempts to be an objective study of the situation from the pro-nuclear viewpoint. Anybody, either pro-nuclear or anti-nuclear, must study that volume along with volumes against the nuclear fuel cycle proposition.

What I am arguing against is the Grover volume *The Struggle for Power*. Indeed, I am calling on the Minister now for him to ask the School Libraries Branch to ascertain and investigate that book to determine whether or not a memo needs to go out to school librarians to indicate that that volume should be used in school libraries with caution, even to the extent of possibly withdrawing from the students access to the book. That is a very strong call to make. I do not think that one would lightly make a call to withdraw material from school libraries. However, I believe that, unless the book is accompanied by a warning note about some of its contents, it can do untold damage to true objective debate.

The book makes a great many contentions. In the author's preface it is stated that the book is designed to assist in gaining of truth. The author says, 'Only those who fear an educated public would deny that truth has its place. Knowing the facts makes for strength, and they can't manipulate us easily.' He goes on to say, 'Free speech demands dialogue.' He finishes up by saying, 'This book was written to inform, to help bridge the gap between the scientific and political facts and ourselves.' He finishes by saying, 'It is contentious because of its facts', and 'I have no other weapon'. If, in fact, those words led into a book that lived up to those words, I would have no argument. The book has much hyperbole in it, but what disturbs me is that in many cases it is quite blatantly wrong.

As examples of the hyperbole that the book applies to at various stages, such quotes as these come out from various pages. They are just a small sample of what is repeated page after page. It states:

It is by now a truism that the nuclear power controversy resembles guerilla warfare.

That is quite hard stuff! It also states:

Violence is part of the anti-nuclear programme when argument fails.

It also states, 'The anti-nuclear environmentalists cannot be genuine'. Quite often in this volume he does not suggest that there is the possibility that something may be so—he is quite dogmatic. He is also fond of demeaning any people who take a stand against the nuclear debate by attempting to discredit their character references. He says of Barry Commoner, a well-known person in the anti-nuclear debate:

Barry Commoner who preaches Marxism in the *New Yorker* whose impoverished readers are also offered African safaris and \$6 000 ivory chess sets . . .

That is an incredible non-sequitur. He also says of Professor Henry Kendall of M.I.T., 'He is undoubtedly wealthy in his own right.' What has that got to do with the nuclear debate? They are apparently the facts he is talking about. To indicate that I am not being unfair on this book, I thought that I had better quote from some of the pieces it states about various aspects and what the INFCE document states. In other words, I am opposing two pro-nuclear books against each other. Grover would have us believe in one part, in regard to the matter of nuclear wastes, the following:

The *Time* article stated that all nuclear wastes would total 190 000 tons by the year 2000. This was untrue—an exaggeration by a factor of more than 10.

Let us see what INFCE says about it, as follows:

Countries participating in INFCE were sent a questionnaire relating to their national spent fuel management programmes. The data provided by the countries indicated that the spent fuel arising up to the year 2000 [the same year] are estimated to be somewhat above 300 000 t.HM (heavy metal).

In other words, Grover was entirely wrong. He was suggesting that the correct figure should only be something of the order of 19 000. INFCE gives us the figure of 300 000. When it comes to the matter of dealing with wastes and whether there is a problem in dealing with them, Grover becomes quite sweeping: 'None of them [that is, people in Britain involved with the treatment of waste] can identify any insurmountable barrier suggesting a real problem.' The author says, 'Nor can I. There isn't one'. He is quite dogmatic. INFCE is not quite so dogmatic; it states:

Some of the assumptions [about underground waste disposal] would be validated only if repositories of the kind considered were actually to be constructed and operated. Furthermore, safeguard measures, to the extent they would be necessary, have not yet been applied to repositories in practice . . .

It goes on to say:

Safety analyses and calculations of future doses are limited by the accuracy of available models to describe natural phenomena. However, the uncertainty is not such as to affect the conclusion that disposal can be carried out without undue risk [and that is the proposition it takes] to man or the environment. Nevertheless, additional work is needed to ensure that all potential release mechanisms at specific sites are considered.

So much for Grover saying, 'There is not a problem.' Grover would have us believe the following:

The typical nuclear reactor accident is a relatively innocuous affair which probably harms no-one.

INFCE states:

The complex issues that nuclear power raises in many countries include fears about the safety of nuclear installations and concern about radio-active waste disposal, on which the public is reluctant to leave technical options open to be decided in the future. These questions are highly emotive, but nevertheless they are real and in all countries they are necessarily taken very seriously.

That is right, too. I refer to tailings and to the damage that they may cause. Grover would have us believe:

. . . we can see that, assuming the very worst case, there could be one cancer death from tailings in every 40 years—compared to

60 000 deaths in 40 years among those affected by radon emanations from inside buildings.

INFCE poses against that:

Since the tailings contain not only the balance of these elements (uranium, thorium) but also almost all the products of natural radioactive decay, they have to be managed carefully.

It goes on in many other areas, one of which is nuclear proliferation. In this respect, Grover says:

...the use of uranium for nuclear electricity generation does not mean the proliferation of nuclear weapons—a subject that must be dealt with on its own merits.

He then goes on to say that to try to link the two is like suggesting that chocolate and T.N.T. are linked because they both have a similar molecular structure. That is quite a ludicrous argument, and INFCE takes a different position on that. It states:

Effective international safeguards are an essential feature of the nuclear power industry. The additional effort involved in safeguards should be regarded as of similar importance to that for safety and physical protection.

That clearly indicates that point after point in this volume is nothing more than hyperbole and exaggeration and a misuse and distortion of data, and, if libraries want to present a pro-nuclear point of view (with which I do not

disagree; I think that that is right), I hope that they will not choose that to be the volume that does it.

In fact, the matter becomes more serious than that, because in the first chapters the book suggests that anyone who is opposed to the nuclear proposition and who takes a stand against it is subversive, conspiratorial and self-interested. Its language ranks along with that which one reads in the document called *The Protocols of Zion*, which has also been much discredited. It says, for example, that those who are opposed to the nuclear debate are the penthouse proletariat. They resent the ballot box as an obstacle to power. They do not believe any more in democracy, but in coercive Government—dangerous arrogance. They are good communicators who have reached across the lower middle class to form an alliance with the poor. To do this, they use the alliances and the rhetoric of Liberalism and Marxism.

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

Motion carried.

At 10.27 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 22 July at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 21 July 1981

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**MEMBERS OVERSEAS TRIPS**

4. Mr MILLHOUSE (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. How many members of Parliament (apart from Ministers) have taken trips abroad either wholly or in part (and what part) paid from Government funds during the present Parliament, who are they and in the case of each, what has been—

- (a) the expenditure of Government funds; and
- (b) the benefit to the State,

of such trips?

2. Is it now proposed that there should be any curtailment in—

- (a) the number of such trips; and
- (b) the length and cost, respectively, of each trip by a member previously proposed during the rest of this Parliament,

and if so, how much money will be saved thereby and, if not, why not and how much are those trips still proposed estimated to cost the Government?

1.2 Mr Bannon. For further information it is suggested that the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association and Mr Bannon be asked.

2. No.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The replies are as follows:

1. 1.1. Members as approved by the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association.

JOHN MARTIN

17. Mr MILLHOUSE (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. How many shares did the Government hold in John Martin and Company Limited 12 months ago and what was then their estimated market value?

2. Has the Government sold any such shares and, if so, why, to whom and at what price?

3. Has the Government bought any more shares in this company in the last 12 months and, if so, when, why and at what price?

4. How many shares does it now hold in this company and what is their estimated market value?

5. Does it propose to increase or reduce (and which) this share holding and, if so, why and when?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The replies are as follows:

- 1. None.
- 2. Not applicable.
- 3. No.
- 4. None.
- 5. Not applicable.