

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 4 August 1981

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

## PETITION: BUS ROUTE

A petition signed by 944 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to amend the existing regulations governing the picking up and setting down of passengers within South Australia on the present South-East/interstate bus route was presented by the Hon. M. M. Wilson.

Petition received.

## PETITION: EMPLOYMENT

A petition signed by 287 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to implement policies that will increase the number of citizens in employment in South Australia was presented by Mr O'Neill.

Petition received.

## PETITION: PORNOGRAPHY

A petition signed by 83 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to tighten restrictions on pornography and establish clear classification standards under the Classification of Publications Act was presented by Mr Langley.

Petition received.

## PETITION: MURDER CASE

A petition signed by 81 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: INTEREST RATES

A petition signed by 629 residents of South Australia praying that the House request the State Government to 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.

## PETITIONS: BEVERAGE CONTAINERS

Petitions signed by 2 094 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. D. C.

Wotton and Messrs Crafter, Evans, Millhouse, Oswald, Peterson, and Trainer.

Petitions 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*: Questions on the Notice Paper Nos. 1, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16, 21, 22, 25, 27 and 28.

## SHOP TRADING HOURS

In reply to Mr **BLACKER** (22 July).

The Hon. D. C. **BROWN**: The sale of red meats outside normal shop trading hours was extensively canvassed before the Royal Commission into Shop Trading Hours in 1977. In his report, the Royal Commissioner recommended to the Government that red meat should not be sold on the late shopping night.

During the course of recent considerations of amendments to the Shop Trading Hours Act, representations were made to the Minister of Industrial Affairs on this matter. On the one hand, the Meat and Allied Trades Federation of Australia, representing the employers within the retail meat industry, supported the retention of restrictions on the sale of red meat. This view was also adopted by the Australian Meat Industry Employees Union representing employees within the small butcher shops. On the other hand, representatives of certain larger meat retailers and major supermarket chains, together with the United Farmers and Stockowners Association, supported an extension in the hours during which red meat can be sold.

Whilst it is considered in some quarters that the present restrictions are not satisfactory from a consumer's point of view, it must also be recognised that, during the course of the Government's considerations of amendments to the Act last year, petitions were presented to Parliament containing the signatures of over 48 000 consumers opposing any extension to the trading hours for meat.

In the event, no changes were made to the restrictions on the sale of red meat beyond normal trading hours. This decision reflects the view of Parliament that butchers' shops should be trading differently from general food retailing stores and supermarkets because of the peculiar nature of the merchandise which they sell.

The Government's policy on this matter is kept under continual review and would most certainly be changed should it be demonstrated that a majority of interested parties support an extension in the hours. However, until such time as this indication is forthcoming the Government has no intention of amending its position.

## GUMERACHA PRIMARY SCHOOL

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Gumeracha Primary School Redevelopment.

Ordered that report be printed.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: PLANNING  
LEGISLATION

The Hon. D. C. **WOTTON** (Minister of Environment and Planning): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** Honourable members will be aware that the period of public consultation on the Government's proposed new planning legislation, foreshadowed in the introduction in the last session of Parliament of the Planning Bill, 1981, and the Real Property Act Amendment Bill, 1981, is drawing to a close. In fact, the last of the advertised public meetings on the proposed legislation was held this morning at Goolwa.

For the next two or three weeks, officers of the Department of Environment and Planning will be collating the submissions received on the Bills. The recommendations from the various submissions will then be examined by the Government and assessed in terms of their acceptability within the policy objectives of the Government. Of course, as a result of the consultative process I would expect that there will need to be a number of amendments to the proposed legislation.

It is an appropriate time, before this collation process commences, to bring to Parliament's attention some of the principal issues that have arisen in the course of consultations about the legislation. One issue which has arisen concerns the manner in which responsibilities will be shared between State and local governments. A partnership with State and local government is clearly desirable, indeed, essential, in the preparation and implementation of comprehensive plans and other measures required for the proper management of the State's natural resources.

The Planning Bill, 1981, proposes a more appropriate sharing of responsibilities between the State and local government than is currently the case. The underlying concept of the Bill is that it will be local government which gives a decision on development applications in all matters of local significance. The Government anticipates that this will mean that, in the majority of cases, local government will be the sole authority responsible for processing, considering and deciding applications.

In a small number of cases, local government will make decisions after consultation with the South Australian Planning Commission. It will be the commission's role to undertake the administrative work involved in securing a response to the applications from State Government agencies, not local government as has been suggested by some critics. It will still, however, be local government which makes the decision, and it will be up to local government to decide what weight, if any, it will give to the commission's report.

I find it difficult to give credence therefore to the claim, which I have seen expressed, that local government will be doing the administrative work involved in the Bill without having the opportunity to make decisions. In a very limited number of areas, the Planning Bill will enable the State Government to impose conditions on development, but only a development which councils have decided to approve. This important power facilitates the provision of services in a co-ordinated way across areas managed by several local government authorities. In a limited number of areas, matters of particular significance to the State will be determined by the commission.

Some comment has also been made about the Government's ability to withdraw controls from councils in cases involving developments of major significance to the State. Such developments will involve significant infra-structure provision by the State, and it is only proper that the State have adequate management input into such projects. It should be noted, however, that the provision is a more efficient means of securing that input than the preparation of an indenture or special Act of Parliament which is presently required.

In order for a development to be made subject to determination by the Governor, it must in the first instance be

of genuinely major importance. The decision as to whether this is the case is to be taken by the Governor, on the advice of Cabinet, and notice of a declaration must then be gazetted. Both the formal procedures established before a declaration can be made and the fact that Cabinet rather than an individual Minister must determine the importance of a development are guarantees that the provisions of this section of the Bill will not be invoked lightly. The other principal concern which I believe has been expressed about the Planning Bill is based on an incorrect assumption.

It has been claimed that the Bill 'exempts' State Government agencies from planning controls. As members will be aware, it is not the case that the Crown is 'exempted' from statutory provisions, rather, that unless the Crown expresses its desire to be bound, the Crown is automatically not bound.

Under the present legislation the Crown is bound to abide by certain provisions of regulations, but this applies to only 30-odd of the State's 120-plus councils. In all other council areas, the State is quite free to do whatever it wishes in terms of development. The proposed Planning Bill improves the situation for local government in terms of the accountability of State Government agencies. First, agencies which are prescribed under clause 7 of the Bill will be required to give notice of proposed developments to both the Planning Commission and the relevant council. Secondly, councils are entitled, under clause 7, to make a report to the Minister on such a proposal. Thirdly, the proposal will be assessed in the light of the provisions of the development plan, many of which will have been drafted by councils. I propose to have clause 7 expanded in a manner which will consolidate both the accountability of State Government agencies and the entitlement of local government to become involved with a proposal from a State Government agency.

Finally, let me indicate the next steps in the Government's consultative process. Many people have said that it is not possible to consider these Bills without associated regulations. The making of regulations must, of course, follow the passage of the legislation and, until such time as the Bills are in a final form, it is not possible to draft definitive regulations. However, to assist the consultative process, my department has proposed and distributed a set of discussion papers about those matters which would be the subject of regulations. It is the Government's intention that, following reintroduction of the reviewed Bills later this session, and the preparation of draft regulations, the regulations will be the subject of further full and detailed consultation before being gazetted. The Government is satisfied that the consultative process has enabled there to be a clearer understanding about the intentions of this legislation and that the continuing dialogue with local government will result in legislation which streamlines decision making and provides means for protecting and enhancing our environment.

#### PAPERS TABLED

By the Treasurer (Hon. D. O. Tonkin):

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Stamp Duties Act, 1923-1980—Regulations—Threshold Rate.
- ii. Valuation of Land Act, 1971-1981—Regulations—Fees.

By the Minister of Education (Hon. H. Allison):

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Supreme Court Act, 1935-1981—Rules of the Supreme Court (Criminal Jurisdiction)—Pre-trial Conferences.

By the Chief Secretary (Hon. W. A. Rodda):

*Pursuant to Statute—*

1. Prisons Act, 1936-1981—Regulations—Sentences and Parole.
  11. Second-Hand Dealers Act, 1919-1971—Batteries.
- By the Minister of Fisheries (Hon. W. A. Rodda):
- Pursuant to Statute—*
1. Fisheries Act, 1971-1980—Regulations—Spearguns.
- By the Minister of Marine (Hon. W. A. Rodda):
- Pursuant to Statute—*
1. Marine Act, 1936-1976—Regulations—Examination for Certificates of Competency and Safety Manning.
- By the Minister of Transport (Hon. M. M. Wilson) for the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. W. E. Chapman):
- Pursuant to Statute—*
1. South Australian Timber Corporation—Report, 1979-1980.
- By the Minister of Environment and Planning (Hon. D. C. Wotton):
- Pursuant to Statute—*
1. City of Adelaide—By-law No. 11—Newsboys.
- By the Minister of Transport (Hon. M. M. Wilson):
- Pursuant to Statute—*
1. Highways Act, 1926-1979—Approvals to lease Highways Department Properties, 1980-1981.
  11. Motor Vehicles Act, 1959-1981—Regulations—Disabled Persons Parking Permit.
- By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. M. M. Wilson):
- Pursuant to Statute—*
1. Racing Act, 1976-1980—Betting Control Board Rules—Bookmakers' Rise.
- By the Minister of Health (Hon. Jennifer Adamson):
- Pursuant to Statute—*
1. Mental Health Services, Director of—Report for the period 1 October 1979 to 30 June 1980.
  11. South Australian Health Commission Act, 1975-1980—Flinders Medical Centre—By-laws—Control of Grounds.
- Trade Standards Act, 1979—Regulations.
  111. Candles.
  - IV. Car Seat Covers.
- By the Minister of Lands (Hon. P. B. Arnold):
- Pursuant to Statute—*
1. Surveyors Act, 1975—Regulations—Registration Qualifications.

## QUESTION TIME

### INFORMATION LEAKS

**Mr BANNON:** Will the Premier say who ordered Treasury officers to supply handwriting specimens; who is analysing these; and will these tests extend to all levels of Treasury, the Premier's Office, and to Liberal back-benchers and officials? On 23 July I asked what action the Government would take to restore Public Service morale. In replying to the question, the Premier placed on record, and I quote, 'implicit and complete trust in the honesty and integrity of the South Australian Public Service'. However, today it has been confirmed by a spokesman for the Premier that an investigation is being undertaken by the Government Investigation Office into the spate of leaked Government reports and documents. Further, it is reported that handwriting tests are being made on public servants (not on members of the Premier's staff), which I am informed represent flimsy evidence, as the person leaking the document may not be the same person whose handwriting appears on that document.

I am informed that some officers have been questioned, and that at least one group of officers was advised that charges would be laid if evidence could be found of their leaking of documents. I have been informed that the present action has further demoralised a Treasury Department that

is working against the clock to sort out the Government's budgetary mess.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Is the Leader of the Opposition seriously suggesting that there should not be an investigation into the matter of leaked documents? I am quite sure that, if there had been no investigation, he would have been on his feet in this House demanding that one be instituted, and castigating the Government for not doing so. He wants it both ways. I must say that, as he is the chief beneficiary of the exercise and the exploiter of it, I am not at all surprised by the attitude he has demonstrated this afternoon of condoning what is going on.

An investigation is being undertaken by Government investigators. There has been some suggestion that the Government Investigation Office has been set up as something new. If the Leader had been in Government a little longer than he was, he would know that the small section of two Government investigators was set up some 20 years ago to look at various matters in relation to litigation as it might affect the Government, and other matters that required the gathering together and collating of material.

I repeat the support that I gave the other day for the members of the Public Service of South Australia. I believe that they are being very severely maligned by what is obviously the work of one or two individuals. I repeat that. I believe that it does the Leader of the Opposition and his Party no credit at all to continue on with this same course of action. Not only are the documents which have been used in the past few weeks either working documents or incomplete, but quite inaccurate conclusions have been drawn from them, conclusions that could be shown quite conclusively to be inaccurate when the full information becomes available.

**The Hon. Peter Duncan:** Why didn't you make it known—

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I think the member for Elizabeth has been here long enough to know that details of the Budget are not given out before time. I make the very strong point that there are matters which have been canvassed by the Opposition, touching supposedly confidential information which has been contained in those documents, and which reflects upon the ability of South Australia to support the degree of potential investment and development that we are seeking. There is no truth in the conclusions that were widely trumpeted by the Opposition, but the unfortunate part about that is that people in other States and overseas, who are not to know exactly what the Opposition is pleased to indulge in and the levels to which it has sunk, could seriously be affected in making decisions as to whether or not to invest in South Australia. I resent that bitterly, and I believe that, again, it is a clear indication to the people of South Australia that they cannot trust the Australian Labor Party with the government and development of this State.

### RIGHT TO WORK

**Mr MATHWIN:** Will the Minister of Industrial Affairs consider amending the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act to allow workers the right to work?

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr MATHWIN:** I know that it will upset members of the Opposition; nevertheless, they should know. When workers are directed to go on strike by their union bosses, many of them do not want to go on strike, because of the obvious consequences of loss of pay and other matters. The Minister will know that this is forced upon them in many cases, and he would be well aware of the hardship to the wives and

families of the strikers and the wide effects on the public generally.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The member has raised the point of the right to work. I draw to honourable members' attention—

**The Hon. Peter Duncan:** Why don't you change the Constitution? That would be a better proposition. The whole 40 000 unemployed could be given the right to work.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Interjections from either side of the House are not desired by the Chair. The honourable Minister of Industrial Affairs.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** I draw the attention of the member for Glenelg (and I know he is already aware of this) to the review of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act currently being performed in this State. The person carrying out that review is Mr Frank Cawthorne. I have announced that the entire Act will be reviewed. I will refer the honourable member's question to Mr Cawthorne for consideration as part of that review. I suggest to the member that he raises the point in a personal or private submission to Mr Cawthorne, who he has called for public submissions as part of that review. If the member feels strongly about this (as no doubt he does, because he has raised the matter here) then I think it appropriate that he take the matter up.

I would certainly like to comment on a point raised, namely, that during the recent T.W.U. dispute many people were upset at being asked to go out on strike. Several of those people telephoned me and discussed that matter with me.

**Mr O'Neill:** How many?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** Well, the point is quite clear. There were people who were asked to go out on strike and who wanted to work. This raises the far more important question as to where industrial relations in Australia are currently heading. Last Friday there was the abolition of wage indexation. We can look at the reasons why wage indexation had finally to be destroyed and put to rest by the Industrial Commission: it was because the whole system was being abused.

The New South Wales Government was a classic example of a Government that set out to largely destroy the guidelines, and, in destroying the guidelines, destroyed wage indexation. How could the Federal Industrial Commission uphold the principles of wage indexation when the New South Wales Commission, with the full support of the New South Wales Government, had decided to grant a \$20 a week increase to the transport workers? Of course, that put the Federal Commission in an impossible position in terms of trying to uphold the principles. The claim for \$20 a week by the Transport Workers Union was not compatible with the principles of wage indexation, because that \$20 a week, or 10.4 per cent increase in salary, represented a move to gain all those things that the Federal Commission had ruled were not valid under wage indexation. Therefore, if \$20 was gained, as it was in New South Wales, obviously the principles of wage indexation no longer applied.

*Members interjecting:*

It is interesting that honourable members opposite should be interjecting on this point, because at their State annual conference they adopted a motion which directly slapped at the decision of the Federal Commission and at the principles of wage indexation. They decided that, irrespective of what decision the Federal or State Commission came down with, the Party opposite would legislate for full wage indexation in South Australia under State awards.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** They say, 'That's right', which clearly indicates that as an Opposition, or an alternative Government in this State (which they hope to be seen as

but will not be seen as), members opposite were prepared to slap the Industrial Commission in the face as an independent body. They were prepared to tell it that the principles laid down for wage indexation throughout Australia should not apply in this State. It is because of actions like that that we no longer have wage indexation. My concern is that we have gone from orderly wage increases under wage indexation to what I see as the law of the jungle. We are certainly back in the same position as we were in prior to 1975. I draw to the attention of members what existed in 1974, or prior to wage indexation. In 1974 we had record industrial disputation in Australia. We had wage claims that caused tremendous uncertainty, particularly when it came to any new industrial venture or existing manufacturing venture. There were actual wage increases across the board of 32 per cent in one year.

As a direct result of that Australia ended up with a record increase in unemployment. The Australian economy has only just recovered from that devastating period. Now that there is a little bit of heat back on the economy and there is a demand for jobs again, certain trade unions are reverting to the same actions that destroyed the Australian economy in 1973 and 1974.

My concern, which is shared by the President of the A.C.T.U., is that Australia is on the brink of a devastating wage push. If the \$20 claim by the T.W.U. is granted and if that should flow across to the rest of the community, along with other wage increases, and along with the claim for a 35-hour week, Australia would have a real increase in wages similar to what we saw in 1974.

As a classic example, in this State the South Australian Institute of Teachers has a wage claim for 20 per cent over and above what teachers have received under wage indexation. The consequences of that and of other similar wage claims are obvious; where the money is not available to pay the wages, people simply employ fewer people. That is the consequence, and unemployment will again rise in South Australia and federally.

During the tremendous wage push that I am fearful we are about to experience, there will be the other obvious associated factor of significant industrial disputation. The two tend to go hand-in-hand when there is no orderly wage-fixing mechanism.

I have one plea to make, certainly to the South Australian workforce, and that is: please consider the consequences of any wage demands being placed on employers at present and consider especially the effects that they will have on creating job opportunities and on the level of unemployment we have in this State.

## CLEAN AIR LEGISLATION

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** When does the Minister of Environment and Planning intend to introduce a Bill for an Act to minimise and control air pollution and for other related purposes? I seek leave to explain my question by imparting four matters of fact to the Assembly.

The first matter of fact is that there was a strong commitment by the Liberal Party, as far back as the last State election, to introduce such legislation. The second is that a Bill was prepared by Parliamentary Counsel on 24 June 1980 and given considerable circulation by the Minister, because I have a copy. The third matter is that the Minister gave certain undertakings to people earlier this year that a Bill would be introduced later this year. The final matter is that, although I have searched His Excellency's remarks in his Speech at the opening of this Parliament, I can find no reference to any such legislative venture.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The legislation will be introduced in due course. A discussion paper was presented to form the basis for initial discussions. These preliminary discussions are presently taking place and after widespread discussion with the community generally, industry and with everyone else interested, an appropriate Bill will be prepared and at an appropriate time it will be introduced in the House.

Before we bring any legislation into the House we are determined that we have proper consultation, which is more than the previous Government did. The previous Government made a lot of noise about bringing in legislation but it did not do it. It did not even carry out the consultation that was necessary. We are now doing that and, when we are ready, we will bring in a Bill relating to clean air.

### PULP MILL ELECTRICITY

**Mr LEWIS:** Has the Premier seen the lead article in the *South-Eastern Times* newspaper, circulated by Mr Bob Chewings around Millicent, which is, in part, in Mallee, dated 20 July? Did he note that it related directly and specifically to the provision of electricity for a new pulp mill in the South-East, and, indirectly, to the use by the Leader of the Opposition of stolen documents? I will quote from the article in the *South-Eastern Times*, one of 15 newspapers that circulate in parts of Mallee and published locally.

Councillor Telfer said that he told Mr Bannon that the South Australian Government had large interests in this South-East forest industry and the allied industries in this area. The Mayor, Ern Altschwager, commented that Mr Bannon's criticism was a serious thing for the region. The councillor continued his remarks by saying 'While we hope to have a new mill, Mr Bannon is going the other way.' It is notable that the article's headline was 'Bannon told to hush it'.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Yes, I did see that report. It was—

**The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:** What a coincidence.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** It is not a coincidence at all. It was widely circulated through the South-East and is a journal of some repute, as the member for Hartley would know. Also, it enjoys very great readership.

**The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:** It makes the *Advertiser* look like the *Peking Daily*.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I find the temptation almost more than I can resist, but one has two lines of thought to go on. First, what is the standard of the *Peking Daily*? We will not develop that theme, because the member's question is very serious and has serious implications. I have not, I think, ever before seen anything in any journal, certainly not in a journal of this repute, a headline that says—

**The Hon. Peter Duncan:** Did you say 'disrepute'?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** It is absolutely typical and worthy of note that, as soon as there is any criticism of anything the Opposition does, it is a journal of ill repute. That is what the honourable member for Elizabeth said. It is a very serious matter indeed. The report is headed, 'Bannon told to hush it'. It is obviously a report of a great deal of concern expressed by the Millicent council. A motion was moved that the Leader of the Opposition be told of council's concern that it appears he has tried to stop local industry expansion. There is no way that the Leader of the Opposition, or Opposition members, can dissociate themselves from what has been said and from the conclusions drawn not only by Millicent council members but also by the South Australian community.

*Mr Bannon interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I do not think that the Leader of the Opposition knows what he is talking about. This shows, yet again, the danger of using documents that came to the Leader of the Opposition. We will not go into how they did come, but they were out of date and part of working papers, and corrective action has been taken and there will be power—

*Mr Bannon interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I do not really believe that the Leader of the Opposition was silly enough to believe that the pulp mill was already there. It is not after the event. The pulp mill is not there yet. It will have adequate power supplies when it is there. I do not think it is worth bothering with him any more. The Opposition is heavily sabotaging our attempts to develop this State, promote industrial development, and get worthwhile projects off the ground.

If, in fact, the Opposition persists in what it is doing and saying and if it continues to knock this State and cast doubts, not on this Government's ability, but on South Australia's ability to deliver the goods and to sustain the sort of development that we believe is necessary, he is literally attacking South Australia. There is no question whatever but that the attitude being displayed by the Opposition members at present is one of no development at any cost. If we had anything to do with it, they say, there would be no development at all, because it does not suit the Australian Labor Party.

I do not think the people of South Australia want that situation. In fact, I am sure they do not want it. South Australians want to see us move on, develop as much as we can and use the resources that we have, to the benefit of all South Australians. They do not want to see a whining, whingeing Jonah of an Opposition going on and on and on, which is the effect that the Opposition is having on development on this State at present.

### WATER FILTRATION

**Mr KENEALLY:** Will the Minister of Water Resources give an unequivocal undertaking as to construction times stated for the Northern towns water supply filtration works? Will the work commence in 1983, 1984, or 1985, and what is the programme of completion dates? In February this year, whilst in Port Pirie, the Minister of Health announced that the Government would spend \$3 000 000 on the construction of the Northern towns water supply filtration works. I immediately wrote a letter to the Minister of Water Resources requesting information about the construction details and the time table involved.

Four months later I received a letter from the Minister, who provided me with the details that I was seeking, but he also included in the letter the following remarks:

The Government is currently reviewing its financial position and will programme the construction of the water filtration plants to serve the Northern towns and also the remaining plants for metropolitan Adelaide as early as funds permit.

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** I think the member for Stuart has answered his own question by referring to the reply that I gave to him in writing. The member would recall that on 23 June this year I made an announcement that a contract had been let to Camp, Scott, Furphy Pty Ltd to prepare conceptional and detailed design plans for the first of the two water filtration plants for the Northern towns which is to be constructed at Morgan. It is anticipated that the consultants will have finished their detailed design plans and specifications by November next year. At that time the Government will call tenders for that plant and the tenders will be considered by Cabinet after the closing date.

Also, it is anticipated that in the very near future consultants will be asked to register their interest in preparing the detailed specifications and plans for the second water filtration plant, which will be established on the Swan Reach to Stockwell main and which will then complete the water filtration plant programme required to filter the whole of the water supply of the Northern towns.

The plan is in progress. It was announced on 23 June this year. The consultants will report by November next year and the matter will then involve a Cabinet decision after consideration.

**Mr Keneally:** So we have no programme at this juncture?

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** A programme has been specifically made out, but there is no way of giving specific details and dates because the consultants have to complete their specifications and plans.

On completion of those specifications and plans, the Engineering and Water Supply Department will put the job out to contract. On receipt of the submissions from the public sector for construction, the matter will be considered by Cabinet and a tender will be let. It is quite impossible to state what days and dates will be involved.

**Mr Keneally:** Will it be 1983?

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** I anticipate that it will be some time during 1983. It is quite clear, and the dates have been set. A tender has been let, and I hope the honourable member has absorbed that Camp, Scott, Furphy Pty Ltd was the successful tenderer. That firm will complete its task by approximately November of next year, which will then enable the Government, on those plans and specifications, to put the job out to tender. On receipt of the tenders, following the closing date the Government will be in a position to allocate a contract.

When we speak of the total water filtration programme, we must recognise that a percentage of that programme is not in the metropolitan area. Financial assistance has been sought from the Federal Government for the Northern towns programme. We are not sure of the position at this stage, because we have not had any verification from the Federal Government about what assistance will be forthcoming from that source. Therefore, it is quite impossible to give a completion date for the Northern towns water filtration programme. However, I can state that the design specifications for the Morgan water filtration plant will be completed by November next year. As companies will be registering for the purpose within the next two or three months, we can anticipate that for both projects we will have design detail towards the end of next year and, for the second one, probably early in 1983. On the availability of Federal funds, we would be in a much better position to give a final completion date for the Northern towns water filtration plant. It is expected that we will be in a position to call tenders later in 1972, and it is anticipated—

**Mr Keneally:** In 1972?

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** In 1982; I think the honourable member was probably aware of what I meant. We will then be in a position to have 1983 as the commencement date, all things being equal, depending purely on the finance available from Federal sources. The Government anticipates that construction of the Morgan-Whyalla water filtration plant will commence early in 1983.

## INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

**Mr ASHENDEN:** Is the Premier concerned that the present extreme left-wing stance adopted by the South Australian Labor Party could hamper industrial development prospects in this State?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The matter put forward as a question would seem to be not within the competence of this House, and I seek your ruling.

**The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy:** Are you a bit sensitive?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I was listening to the question, and my first impressions were as the honourable member has suggested. However, I noted that the question asked about the effect on State development and, on that basis, I rule that it is pertinent to the House.

**Mr ASHENDEN:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. At the recent Federal Conference of the Australian Labor Party it was the South Australian delegates who pressed for the adoption of a policy of nationalisation of industry.

The Leader of the Opposition obviously finds this funny; I do not. It is recognised that South Australia's development in the 1970s was most adversely affected by similar policies of the previous Labor Government, and that we are still having to overcome the long-term effects. Concern has been expressed to me that there are indications from the business community of damage that the Labor Party's attitudes are causing among potential investors, both interstate and overseas.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The Leader and his colleagues may consider this matter to be a joke. If they do believe that it is a joke, I can only say God help South Australia if they ever get in charge of it in any way. Yes, I have seen the reports of that conference. I noted a report at the weekend that the Opposition Leader felt that the ALP in South Australia was in good shape. That is a matter of opinion. It is not an opinion shared by the majority of South Australians.

The effect of policies such as those espoused by the Australian Labor Party in this State is of no great concern to the business people of this State. They know perfectly well that, as long as the Australian Labor Party in this State continues to espouse such policies as nationalisation, a wealth tax and other such matters, it has no chance at all of being returned to Government, in either the coming election or subsequent elections. I am concerned, however, that the performance of the South Australian delegates to the recent National Labor Party Conference in Melbourne could worry potential national and international business investors.

It is becoming plainly evident that the Labor Opposition in this State has adopted what could be termed an extreme left-wing stance. I would recommend that honourable members read the detailed article which appeared in the *National Times*, because it quite clearly shows how isolated the South Australian Branch of the Labor Party has become compared to other States.

It was rather disappointing and disheartening to read that the South Australian delegation apparently made no protest at the reduction of its influence in the affairs of the national conference. However, when it is the South Australian delegation which moved a motion to bring about nationalisation of industry as ALP policy, then I become upset and concerned indeed. I understand from the *National Times* article that the Federal Opposition Leader, Mr Hayden, was forced to convene a lunchtime meeting in his hotel suite to ensure that the South Australian motion, which would have committed the Party to a programme of nationalisation of industry, could be defeated. According to reports, South Australian delegates were not invited to that meeting.

I repeat that the motion was eventually defeated, but the business community has noted full well the active role that was played in promoting this policy, this suggestion, by the South Australian delegates. I repeat that, in the eyes of local business people, this simply confirms their view that

the ALP will not be returned at the next election or subsequent elections. However, the effects could be significant so far as potential investors from interstate and overseas are concerned. This Government is doing everything possible to attract investment and development to this State after the 1970s, a decade of absolute neglect under the Labor Party. There is no doubt that potential investors could become wary and concerned about putting their money into South Australia while we have a Labor Party here which persists with its present anti-business and anti-development policies.

Just because that motion was not successful at the Federal A.L.P. Conference, that does not mean that it was not espoused strongly by the South Australian delegates and that it will not be applied in South Australia. If the Leader believes that the South Australian Labor Party is in such good shape as he is reported as saying at the weekend, then he clearly believes there is no need for industrial advancement in this State, and that is not the view of the responsible majority of South Australians.

I repeat, the A.L.P. will not be returned at the next election, but that is no reason for it to be continuing to try and denigrate and sabotage South Australia's development prospects for the future, because in adopting that course it is adversely affecting the future security of every South Australian.

#### ALDGATE PRIMARY SCHOOL

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** Will the Minister of Education state what developments have taken place regarding the proposal to convert facilities at Aldgate Primary School presently used by the Department of Further Education to a religiously-based primary school? Does the Minister support this proposal and the subsequent curtailing of Department of Further Education courses that will ensue?

I understand that in the next few days the Minister will be meeting with organisers of a proposal for a religiously-based primary school to be established in what are presently Department of Further Education facilities at Aldgate Primary School. I also understand that an application for such a proposal has already been forwarded to the Minister and that that proposal by-passed normal departmental channels. I am advised that the proposal is for a religiously-based primary school that is to be completely funded by the Education Department. Furthermore, it is proposed that retired teachers be employed at that school.

I understand that the buildings this proposed school will occupy are presently used by the Mount Barker Department of Further Education for adult education purposes which include transition education programmes and courses for the unemployed. I am also informed that the Aldgate Primary School site is used by the Department of Further Education, first, because it can better serve the Aldgate community than the facility at Mount Barker can do and, secondly, because there is insufficient space at Mount Barker in any event. It has been put to me that the change of use of the Aldgate site would therefore result in a curtailing of all or some of those Further Education programmes currently being offered by the Mount Barker Department of Further Education at Aldgate.

It has also been put to me that, while it is proposed that teachers employed at this new school will be funded by the Education Department, they will be immune from transfer arrangements applying to other teachers in the Education Department.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The honourable member has made a lot of statements, claims and allegations. The pro-

posal has not got beyond the proposal stage. I did discuss the matter briefly—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister of Education has the call.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** Don't be so bumptious!

**Mr KENEALLY:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker. I distinctly heard the Minister of Education address the Chair in the terms 'Don't be so bumptious.' I do not know, Sir, whether you heard the interjection or the statement, but, if you did not, I draw it to your attention.

**The SPEAKER:** I do not uphold the point of order. I certainly heard the expression, but I believe it was directed to another member of the Chamber, and I do not intend to indicate to which member I thought it was addressed.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** Your belief was quite correct, and the member for Salisbury did express some concern when I used that expression. The small group which has put the proposition forward still has it in the initial stage, and it has not progressed any further. I understand that for several months this group has been corresponding with the Education Department, but not directly through the Minister. I simply asked that they would come forward with some much firmer proposals before I gave the matter any serious consideration. For the time being I do not think the honourable member need worry very much about the use of Aldgate Primary School because, as I said, the proposal is still in the early stages, and I have not given it serious consideration so far.

#### CHLOROPICRIN

**Mr RANDALL:** Will the Minister of Health advise the House when regulations controlling the use of chloropicrin will be upgraded? Approximately 12 months ago I raised this issue in my Address in Reply speech, drawing the Minister's attention and that of honourable members to problems concerning chloropicrin in my electorate and indicating that there was a need for the regulations to be upgraded. The member for my area in the previous Government drew up those regulations, but they are now in need of upgrading. Since then, residents have contacted me and asked me what has been done.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The member for Henley Beach has certainly been most vigorous in making representations on behalf of his constituents regarding possible health risks associated with the use of chloropicrin, which is a chemical substance used for soil fumigation in market garden areas, particularly for tomato growing. Since market garden areas in his electorate have been encroached upon by suburban development, what was formerly not a problem, because chloropicrin use was conducted in open spaces, has now become something of a problem.

As a result of the honourable member's recommendations, the Central Board of Health has examined the matter and drawn up draft regulations, which I understand will require notification by operators of their intention to use chloropicrin so that the appropriate local health authorities can be made aware that its use is impending and can ensure that appropriate precautions are taken. Presently, discussions are being held and an assessment of the regulations and their effect is being undertaken by various groups, including pesticides manufacturers, local boards of health, the Department of Agriculture and the Market Gardeners Association. I expect that the regulations will go before the Central Board of Health at its September meeting for approval and recommendation to me. I hope that by the end of the year new regulations may be proclaimed, if there



is no difficulty in the Central Board of Health's approving those regulations.

### FOOD PLUS STORES

**Mr CRAFTER:** Can the Minister of Industrial Affairs and Employment explain the serious discrepancies which appear in his answer to a question from the member for Brighton on 16 July regarding BP Food Plus Stores and answers he has given in correspondence to the South Australian Mixed Business Association on the same subject? Can he explain why he misled the House on this matter? *Hansard* of 16 July indicates that the Minister said:

It has been clearly indicated by my Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment to the oil companies involved that an allowance would be made for the area where petrol would be served, including the area needed to get to that area and the area in which to drive away from the pump area. If one sits down and looks at the traditional small petrol outlet and the area involved, one can quickly assess that such an area would be at least 100 to 150 square metres.

I then said, 'That is not what the department is saying.' The Minister replied:

It is exactly what my department is saying. My department has been involved and is still involved in negotiation with one of the companies which put forward a firm proposal to the Government.

In a letter that the Minister wrote to Mr Paddick, Executive Director of the South Australian Mixed Business Association, dated 30 April 1981, he said:

In regard to the floor area of the shop, it has been decided that the area around the pumps, to the extent of a hoseslength, which will be approximately six square metres per pump, will be included in the floor area of the shop. Thus, the area of the food shop would be 200 square metres, less the floor area around the pumps.

Further, in his reply the Minister said:

Any such shop cannot have a storage area greater than 50 per cent of the trading area of the shop. The Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment will require that the surface of the area occupied by the tanks, which of course are underground, is to be classed as part of the storage area, together with any other appropriate fittings that go with the storage tank.

I again interposed and said, 'When did you decide that?' The Minister said, 'That has been the case right through.' In the same letter to Mr Paddick the Minister said:

In regard to the storage of petrol, the Shop Trading Hours Act, 1977-1980, provides that the storage of goods adjoining or adjacent to exempt shops is only taken into account if the storage is in a building. Therefore, underground storage will not be taken into account in determining the size of the storage area.

Ironically, the Minister in his answer to the question from the member for Brighton also said of me that he was surprised 'that a lawyer and a member of this House was completely unaware and ignorant of what was included in the Shop Trading Hours Act last year', and he went on to say, 'There is ignorance at best, and perhaps some malice, by some members of this House.'

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** There is no discrepancy in what I have indicated in this House or in any correspondence. I point out to the honourable member, as I indicated in this House some two or three weeks ago, that negotiation is proceeding with BP and the other companies. In fact, I think I will be seeing them later this afternoon or tomorrow, as the companies have asked to have discussions concerning what I see as the final episode of these negotiations which have been proceeding between my department and the companies involved, particularly BP. At this stage I point out that none of the discussion is particularly relevant, because under planning legislation and under the authority of the councils all three or four requests have so far been knocked back. To my knowledge, no proposed Food Plus stores or BP petrol outlet type supermarkets have gone

through the necessary planning procedures required within this State.

**Mr Crafter:** That is not what you told the House the other day. You said that four had been started already in quite a few areas.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** I said there were others already in existence. There are no BP Food Plus stores, but there are certainly shops in both the inner and outer metropolitan areas which have acted as small supermarkets and have also operated as outlets for petrol. I will name only a few: there is one at Upper Sturt and one at Belair, and there are others down south. In relation to the BP store, which the honourable member raised in his question, it is not relevant because there is no planning approval for any Food Plus store.

**Mr Crafter:** You've changed your mind on the whole thing, haven't you?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The Government has not changed its mind about the whole thing. If the honourable member reads the legislation passed in this House in November last year he will see that provision was clearly laid down to provide for these Food Plus types of stores. Previous legislation introduced by a previous Government had been negligent on the matter. However, the Government saw the possibility arising and saw the need for a clear definition of the basis on which such stores could operate, and that is why the Government included the provision in the legislation last year. It is interesting to note that, in discussions I had two weeks ago with Ministers at a Ministerial conference, I learned that this State was the only State which specifically provided for this type of store within its legislation. I think other States have acted in somewhat of an *ad hoc* sort of basis.

**Mr Crafter:** Why is BP going ahead—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Norwood was given the call to ask a question; that did not include the opportunity to ask supplementaries.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** I am surprised that the honourable member should come out with such an interjection, namely, 'Why is BP being given a chance to proceed?' The point is that it has a legal right to proceed. We have laid down the ground rules under which it can proceed. We used the legislation as the basis for that. I suggest that the honourable member simply goes back, as I advised him some three weeks ago to do, and carefully reads the legislation, where he will find the full details. If, after that, he is still unsure or has any doubts, he can come and see me and I will supply a small diagram, work through the areas with him, and tell him what will be included and what will not be included in those areas.

### MARINE MANNING REGULATIONS

**Mr BLACKER:** Can the Minister of Marine say whether the regulations, as amended at a special meeting of Executive Council yesterday, adequately cover the anomalies apparent in the new Examination for Certificates of Competency and Safety Manning Regulations? Do the revised regulations correct the problem associated with insurance cover, and what action is being taken to improve the training facilities to ensure that all fishermen have the opportunity to undertake the appropriate training so that both now and in the future they can skipper their own vessels?

Members of the House would be aware of some controversy that has occurred since 1 July, when new manning regulations came into effect. Because there are very few, if any, vessels in this State that would have the properly qualified personnel aboard, it has been stated that insurance cover could be negated as a result of inadequate manning.



Further, no facilities are available in this State to train such a large number of skippers and engineers at relatively short notice. At present, with the training facilities available in South Australia, it would take 10 years to train members of our existing fishing fleet. This matter is of some concern to the industry, and I would be grateful if the Minister could explain the situation that now applies as a result of the regulations amended yesterday.

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** The honourable member is quite correct when he says that a good deal of concern has been expressed throughout the fishing industry after the bringing down of these regulations, which became effective as from 1 July. The Government looked at the matter after I, together with senior officers from the Department of Marine and Harbors, had quite considerable discussions with the industry. These discussions went on for some weeks. As a result of a final meeting last Thursday, the officers from the Department of Marine and Harbors met with senior officers from the industry and with officers from the Australian Fishing Industries Council, South Australian Division, and looked at the question of manning. Where the regulations require certain people to be carried on vessels, a regulation has been drawn up which covers the requirements, and in that area some of the regulations also give exemptions. With regard to vessels under 10 metres or 25 feet (I think that covers some 500 fishermen in this State), the regulations do not require—

**Mr Keneally:** Did you say 10 metres or 25 feet?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** It is 10.5 metres or 25 feet—that type of vessel. I take the honourable member's very mathematical point. The regulations deal quite correctly with the point that is causing the honourable member so much mirth. For that scale of vessel (and there are many operating in the gulf), which involves some 500 people, the regulations proclaimed yesterday enable the industry to go to sea.

The point that the honourable member raised concerns the steps being taken to provide the facilities to train these fishermen adequately. The honourable member will remember, as will most members of this House, that there have been discussions, which were instigated by the Marine and Ports Council of Australia, concerning the upgrading not only of fishing vessels but also of fishing vessels which were brought within the ambit of the requirements for vessels to be properly manned, and manned by people who were skilled and had passed examinations that met with marine law.

This will be a big job, and there must be a phasing in. That is what we have done with the regulations; we have phased them in. My colleague the Minister of Education, through his Department of Further Education, has set up courses which will be available to fishermen, especially young fishermen.

It has become abundantly clear that there are quite competent people who have been serving in this industry for many years, and it would be extremely difficult for people who have not had secondary education to understand the requirements of the quite exacting examinations that they will have to pass. The regulations are for a period of 12 months, with a requirement that they can be extended, and there is discretionary power in the Minister. I hope that that explanation satisfies the honourable member.

#### BRIGHTON COLLEGE OF FURTHER EDUCATION

**Mr TRAINER:** Will the Minister of Education explain why concession students at the Brighton College of Further Education are being requested to bear the burden of the Government's budgetary problems? Information has come

to me from a constituent who studies at the Brighton College of Further Education and who is a concession student. She has advised me that a circular was issued recently to students regarding third-term enrolments. That circular read, in part:

Another aspect of the financial budget is the percentage of concessional enrolments allowed for as compared to enrolments. The budget allocation is 23 per cent whereas our current enrolment contains 31.5 per cent concessional students. While we do not wish to restrict the number of concessional enrolments, the Minister of Education has now stated 'if a person who would be entitled to a concession elects to enrol as a fee paying student their enrolment can be accepted as such'.

The circular went on to read:

Clearly any assistance in this regard would assist the college in our efforts to offer as wide a programme of classes to as many people as possible.

This constituent has suggested that the wording of the circular clearly indicates that concession students who insist on their rights will be to blame for the college's inability to offer as wide a programme of classes as possible.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** If the honourable member will let me have a copy of the circular, I shall bring down a report. I am not familiar with the precise details he has presented, but I shall get a report.

#### VICTORIA HOLDINGS

**Mr OLSEN:** Will the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General, say whether Victoria Holdings, the company taking over the Grosvenor Hotel, consulted the Corporate Affairs Commission or sought advice from that body prior to rejecting some shareholders' acceptance of the take-over bid, and, if so, what was that advice? I am informed that the offer closed on 20 June 1981 but that, due to the postal strike at that time, a number of acceptances did not arrive in Melbourne until after the due date, whereupon they were rejected. It has been reported to me that some 7½ per cent of shares from South Australia fell into this category and, further, that the price of the shares has fallen considerably since then. In the view of the shareholders, this is a disadvantage that they should not have had to incur as a result of union irresponsibility.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I thank the honourable member for his interesting question, and I shall obtain for him a report from the Attorney-General.

#### MOUNT BARKER BAKERY

**Mr O'NEILL:** Has the Minister of Industrial Affairs received any complaint regarding the alleged under-payment by a Mount Barker bakery to juniors employed therein; if so, what action has been taken to have the allegations investigated and the complaints redressed, if necessary?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** Yes, I am aware of the case, which has been before the Government for some months. The Government is concerned. We have looked up the practice of the previous Government on this matter. I would say that the department has acted on the same basis as it did on previous occasions. We are in the process of seeking legal advice from the Attorney-General's Department, because there are certain matters in relation to this bakery which we believe are against the law.

Whether or not a prosecution will be launched will depend on legal advice. I am sure the honourable member will realise that, if we cannot find suitable grounds on which to prosecute the person involved, there is no point in our proceeding. I am aware of the details. The matter

concerns me, and my Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment will be acting to make sure, through the inspectors, that similar practices are not permitted.

*At 3.15 p.m., the bells having been rung:*

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

### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.  
(Continued from 23 July. Page 190.)

**Mr HEMMINGS (Napier)**: As we grind our way through the Address in Reply debate, I suppose I must make my contribution. I intend to talk about unemployment, because it is an aspect of the problems facing this State and this country to which the Government does not seem to have an answer. In preparing my speech, I had reason to contact the Commonwealth Employment Service office at Elizabeth for figures relating to unemployment in my area. I was told by that department that, on the orders of the Federal Government, no figures would be issued any more to any member of the public or any member of Parliament.

I then contacted the city office, in Adelaide, and I was given the information that unemployment figures were obtainable only from the Bureau of Statistics. On approaching that bureau, I was told that unemployment figures are obtained only through a household survey, which is undertaken by 2 per cent of the homes throughout the State being interviewed. A multiplication exercise is then done to come up with certain figures which the Federal Government and the State Government can manipulate to suit themselves.

When we talk of unemployment, if only 2 per cent of homes are interviewed we cannot reach any definite figure of how many people are unemployed in this State or in Australia. The figures I was given contradict those recently put out by the Government. I found out that, as at June 1981, in South Australia, in adults 20 years of age and more, 29 200 people were unemployed, so that 7.9 per cent of the labour force was seeking full-time work. The figure of 7.9 per cent in South Australia must be compared with 5.1 per cent, which is the national average. The number in the labour force seeking part-time work was 5 100, or 4.8 per cent. The resulting figure shows that 44 300, representing 17.3 per cent of the labour force, were seeking work in this State.

In the under 20 age group, 31 000, or 8.6 of the labour force, were seeking full-time work, and 4 400, or 5.8 per cent of the labour force, were seeking part-time work, giving a total of 35 400. We have heard statements in this House and we have seen full-page advertisements about the number of jobs being created in South Australia. A full-page advertisement inserted in the *Advertiser* by this Government stated that 21 000 jobs had been created.

However, according to my figures, which are suspect, because I do not think they reflect the true number of unemployed, 54 300 people are out of work. If we are really concerned about unemployment and what it does to the people of this State, the contribution we have seen so far from the Government benches should have been a little more in line with what I will talk about today.

Recently, it has been my privilege to undertake a study tour on behalf of this Parliament. I think that all members will agree that at present there is frustration and despair in the Western world among those unfortunate people (mainly

young people) who have either never had a job or have experienced long periods of unemployment. They see elected Governments pursuing policies which have little effect on alleviating their plight. They see Governments that are uncaring as the number of unemployed grows to record figures. I have found that nowhere is this more apparent than in this country, the United Kingdom and the United States of America. In fact, Fraser, Thatcher and Reagan have gone on record congratulating each other on their policies of hard-line restraint and cuts in public spending. I do not wish to be seen as an alarmist or a prophet of gloom, but the anger which erupted recently on the streets of Britain is not peculiar to that country alone. I remind those smug people in this country who say it could not happen here that 10 years ago the people in Great Britain were saying the same thing about the riots in western Europe. I was dismayed when in Britain to find that, when unemployment figures were released showing that 2 800 000 people were unemployed, the front page headline in the local press was not about 2 800 000 people being unemployed but about the fact that there was a shortage of silk worms to produce the wedding dress for Lady Diana. That, Sir, is the way the Thatcher Government and the press treat unemployment in Britain.

When riots erupted in Liverpool, what did Prime Minister Thatcher say? She just lectured the parents of those poor kids who could not get a job, telling those parents that they should keep their children in at night or that otherwise they would be fined by the Tory Government. The frustration and anger of those unemployed people is universal, and it is going to come to this State. It is going to come to this country unless responsible Governments take the correct attitude, put more money into the public sector, and make an effort to employ more people. This State Liberal Government endorses the Fraser Government's policies: not one member of Cabinet has stood and said that he or she disagrees with what Fraser is doing to the economy.

The gap between the haves and the have-nots is widening, and it is widening at a far greater rate today than ever before. As the unemployed and disadvantaged can see what is being denied them, one can understand that frustration turning into violence in this country. Unless the Fraser and Tonkin Governments can come to grips with this problem, the resultant chaos and breakdown of this society will be their fault and their fault alone.

We have seen a fashionable term created to describe the have-nots of this world; that term is 'the socially disadvantaged'. Socially disadvantaged persons are those individuals who, because of some economic, physical, mental, emotional or cultural reason, lack equal opportunity to engage in the pleasures of society. In its 1980 report the South Australian Housing Trust has this to say about the socially disadvantaged:

The trust has more than 18 600 applicants for rental accommodation in its files and virtually all these are from people experiencing some form of financial or social disadvantage. More than half of them had no form of employment at the time of application. Lone parents were 28 per cent of applicants, 11 per cent were aged pensioners, 11 per cent were unemployed and 4 per cent were invalid pensioners.

What has this Government done to help this increasing number of unemployed people?

**Mr Lewis**: Restored confidence in the people.

**Mr HEMMINGS**: The member for Mallee says 'restored confidence in the people'. From what I have found out, the abolition of the wealth tax did not have the people in my electorate dancing in the streets. The people of my electorate quite rightly see the results of that abolition as being the reason for a series of crippling increases in State charges, which have served only to place a burden on those who can least afford it—the working class of this State. Let

us look at the list. Bus and train fares have gone up—that affects my electorate, because there is no work in Elizabeth. There is a strong rumour that one factory is due to close, resulting in 250 retrenchments. We cannot find out which factory, because no-one wants to tell us, and the Government does not want to tell us which factory it is. Water and sewerage rates have gone up; electricity charges have gone up; and motor vehicle registration fees have gone up. One thing which has affected literally thousands of low-income earners is that Housing Trust rents have gone up three times over the past 18 months—that by a Government which criticised a Labor Government when it put up rents once in two years.

As a result of this, there now exists in South Australia a second-class citizenry, those people whose lifestyles bear no resemblance to the great Australian dream so often espoused by Liberal politicians like the member for Mallee. Not for them the luxury of a new motor vehicle every second year. Not for them the holiday interstate. Not for them the caravan in the front driveway. All they are concerned about is a battle to survive in a society that the Frasers and Tonkins have created.

A survey was carried out recently in Elizabeth which I think reflects this imbalance. Whilst the figures are for Elizabeth, they would be indicative of most other working class suburbs. I will quote from a document published by the Department for Community Welfare. In Elizabeth there are 5 377 rental trust homes, of which 1 455 are occupied by lone parents—that represents 27 per cent of the people. Turning to the unemployed, the figures I quote are from January 1981: there are 3 960 unemployed people in Elizabeth, of whom 1 909 are under 21 years of age. Of those 1 909 people, most have never had a job at all. The estimated work force is in the vicinity of 30 000, which gives a 13 per cent unemployed figure. Of those unemployed, 57 per cent are classified as being unskilled. In comparison, the overall figure for South Australia for unemployed is 8.8 per cent. In 1976, as a result of cut-backs in Federal expenditure, the Department for Community Welfare carried out a social indicators programme, which was looking not at the community wellbeing but rather at measuring the need for existing services.

When one looks at those figures, one should feel ashamed that there is in Canberra a Federal Government that denies to working-class people in this State any chance to get ahead at all. On the need for income, which highlighted those areas where there are concentrations of people who, for various reasons, are more likely to need income support, or who are experiencing some financial pressures, Elizabeth ranked 22, bearing in mind that 23 was the major figure.

On the need for health services, 0-17 years, the figure was 14, and when one looks at the need for health services for the age group 18-59, which identifies those areas where there are concentrations of adults who for various reasons are considered to have potential health problems or are known to require more health services than the average, the figure was 22. Despite this, we have been told by the Minister of Health that, because of economic cuts, the Para Districts Hospital for Elizabeth will not be built.

On the need for educational services for 0-17 years the ranking was 22 and for 18 years and over the figure was 20. On the need for counselling services, the figures were 22 and 21 respectively. It is perhaps apparent that members opposite, from the fact that they are looking at their newspapers, are not really worried about the problems I have highlighted here today.

**The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy:** We are bored stiff.

**Mr HEMMINGS:** The Deputy Premier says that he is bored stiff. Of course he does not worry, because he represents a safe country electorate and the more affluent

people of this State. The working-class people would not even bother to go to the member for Kavel. In fact, it is well known that most people who live in the country areas north of the Adelaide metropolitan area go to Labor members of Parliament for assistance when they need it, because they know they cannot get it from Liberal members of Parliament.

I am not reflecting on you, Sir, but all that I have said is known to those people in responsible positions. I believe this Government is aware of the situation. I ask it, as it reaches the half-way mark of its first and only term of Government since 1970, what it has to offer the 55 000 jobless people in this State, the 7.3 per cent unemployed, bearing in mind that the national average is 5.1 per cent. What has this Government to offer those unemployed people regarding some hope that would signal some light in the tunnel?

There was precious little in the Governor's Speech, and many of my colleagues have already spoken about the Speech. It was an embarrassing Speech and I remember that, when I sat in the other place and looked at the member for Rocky River, I saw that he was embarrassed when we had a weather forecast. This must have come from the Minister of Agriculture and the member for Rocky River obviously remembers that, because he gave me an embarrassed smile at that time. Paragraph 8 of page 2 of His Excellency's Speech states:

Patchy and variable rains over much of the agricultural areas of the State set the season off to a late and uncertain start by the third week of May. The situation was consolidated by good general rains at the end of May and the seasonal outlook is now promising for all crops.

That is what we had from the Governor. The Governor's Speech just highlighted the fact that this State Liberal Government is devoid of any incentives. It did not have much to offer in the first place, except for that great confidence trick that the public was gullible enough to swallow. It is now tired and completely destitute of any policies or any initiatives.

**The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy:** What about the legislative programme?

**Mr HEMMINGS:** What about it? We are all waiting for the legislative programme. We were given a week off so that we could watch the Royal wedding. The Premier thought he would get an invitation.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr HEMMINGS:** Mr Fraser was not invited to the reception, and that must really have hurt him. I would like to make some mention of the contribution by the member for Todd. He was given the honour of moving the motion.

**Mr Trainer:** He gave us a school-kid's essay on 'What I did in the holidays'.

**Mr HEMMINGS:** That's right. The member for Todd made some outlandish statements about employment, the economy and retail sales in South Australia. I do not wish to be derogatory about the member for Todd but I think that speech was written for him. It was based on the paid advertisement in the *Advertiser* which was prepared by the Liberal Party office.

**The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy:** Rubbish!

**Mr HEMMINGS:** It was rubbish; it was a load of rubbish. We all agree with that! The member for Todd talked about 21 000 new jobs, and that is what I am talking about. There is unemployment and, when those unemployed people heard the member for Todd talk about 21 000 new jobs, they must have looked upon that as being a cynical remark from a person who represents an electorate that includes many unemployed people. He does not deserve to represent that electorate.

I invite the member for Todd to come up to my electorate and tell the unemployed people there exactly where those 21 000 new jobs are. They would be only too keen to apply for those jobs. I would also ask the member for Todd to go up to the deserted shopping centres in my electorate, in fact in the whole of the northern metropolitan region, and talk to shop owners about retail sales confidence. I think that the answer the member for Todd would receive would not be what his mentors in the Liberal Party are telling him.

The member for Todd then went on to criticise the trade union movement. That is a typical line. It is always guaranteed to fill in 15 minutes by bashing the trade unions. The member for Glenelg is usually quite good at bashing the unions, as is the member for Hanson. The member for Todd took that typically blinkered attitude of the Liberal Party in saying that the blame for the industrial strife that we have in this country and in this State can be placed fairly and squarely on the trade union movement. I would like to mention another view, which is from someone perhaps a little more objective and a little more knowledgeable, a person whose views outside this Chamber may be accepted more readily than are the views of the member for Todd.

In the *Advertiser* dated 7 July 1981, there was an article by none other than the British High Commissioner in Australia, Sir John Mason, who was in Melbourne. If I were a man in the street and listened to the member for Todd and then to the British High Commissioner, I would think that the High Commissioner might have a little more background than would the member for Todd, who was just an office boy in Chryslers before he came here. Sir John Mason said:

Poor industrial relations were the fault of management, not workers, the British High Commissioner in Australia, Sir John Mason, said yesterday. If there is constant strife between the workforce and management, this must mean that management are failing in their duty to manage.

He continued:

The workforce are not naturally bloody-minded—they want to get on with earning their living and earning quite rightly as much as they can. If they are constantly at loggerheads with management then one must look at the responsibilities of management.

He also said:

I think the basic fault must lie with management. There used to be a very patronising saying in the Army: There are no bad men only bad officers.

The member for Glenelg would know what that means. The article continues:

'When management is dedicated to doing this—except in exceptional circumstances—then we shall see comparative industrial peace,' he said.

That is a view of a person who obviously knows something about industrial relations. The member for Todd said otherwise. I ask the House at least to accept the view of someone with more experience than the honourable member.

The subject of Proposition 13 in California has already been canvassed in this House by previous speakers. My colleague, the member for Playford, highlighted the confidence trick that it was and how it made wealthy Californians even wealthier and reduced a once proud State almost to bankruptcy. The member for Hanson rebounded and obviously delved into the Californian State Government's propaganda, attempting to justify Proposition 13. After seeing results of that proposition, I tend to agree with the member for Playford. It would be interesting to see how much Proposition 13 influenced this Government, when it was in Opposition, in its election strategy in 1979. Perhaps now we can chart and predict the reduction of services within this State under this Government.

Let us look at what the Premier said on 7 August 1979 about Proposition 13, as reported in *Hansard* at page 397. He went quite overboard, and he may live to regret what he said then, as follows:

Apart from this, it is the events occurring in other countries that are now capturing the public imagination at home—events which show clearly that Labor's collectivist doctrine cannot lead to the land of milk and honey; events which show that big and excessive government can be called to heel by the taxpayers themselves. I am referring, of course, to the tax revolt that began 12 months ago in California in the form of Proposition 13, and the vigour with which many American States are now embracing the concept not only set down in Proposition 13 but of sunset legislation.

As members may be aware, Proposition 13 cut savagely into the revenue collected at county, or local government, level in the State of California. Before Proposition 13, the revenue collected in property taxes in California was \$10 billion a year. In the year after Proposition 13, this figure was reduced to \$3 billion, a massive reduction of 70 per cent.

On a State-wide basis . . . revenue collections before Proposition 13 were \$24 billion. After Proposition 13, they were reduced to \$17 billion—an overall reduction of 30 per cent.

Dealing with those intelligent people in the Californian Legislature who were opposed to Proposition 13 (and remember that Governor Brown was then in office—Reagan had gone out), the Premier said:

They claimed that, if taxes were cut, the State would virtually wither on the vine: schools, libraries, police services, firefighting departments, parks and gardens would all close; local welfare programmes would cease; and thousands of jobs would be lost.

What else did he say in his quite lengthy speech?

**Mr McRae:** It has all been proved false.

**Mr HEMMINGS:** Yes, as the member for Playford says. The Premier said this:

It has created employment, and nothing members opposite can say can refute that South Australia is lacking in spirit and community pride.

What has happened in California? When I was there, free-ways were being closed, freeway building was being abandoned, all Government building had stopped, and redevelopment of the waterside was abandoned, all as a result of Proposition 13.

I went to Boston, which experienced another kind of proposition, called Proposition 2.5, and which resulted in a 2.5 per cent cut in taxation. When I arrived there I found that every police precinct in East Boston had been closed, every fire station had been closed, and the citizens had retaliated by blocking every bridge and tunnel. After the Easter recess, the schools could not function, because they had no more money to pay teachers. Yet, we had the Premier, when he was Leader of the Opposition, saying that Proposition 13 was a great thing. We had the member for Hanson, Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, who is supposed to know something about the finances of this State, standing up in this House telling us it was a good thing.

**Mr Becker:** Read the speech, you fool.

**Mr HEMMINGS:** I read it. The Premier obviously got himself into a state of euphoria over Proposition 13 and, as I said, it has had some considerable influence. The decision to abolish gift and succession duties and land tax resulted, I am sure, from reading about that proposition. Perhaps at some time the Premier might outline what services he intends to cut, because services are being cut. It is perhaps important that no member of the Government is saying anything about services not being cut. I think that members of the Government accept that, as a result of the abolition of the wealth tax in this State, services to the people will be cut.

I turn now to the question of housing and in particular to the problem of the homeless youth in this State. For some years there has been a growing number of homeless young people unable to find accommodation in South Aus-

tralia. The number of these people has been put between 4 500 and 6 000. It is important to point out that today on the A.B.C. news it was reported that the Victorian Government recognised that homeless youth is one of the most serious problems that it faces, and that Government placed the problem fairly and squarely with the Federal Government. In February 1980 a working party was set up to look at the problem of homeless youth in South Australia. The terms of reference were very clear and I think that, in view of the Government's tardiness in acting on that report, it is important that I should read the terms of reference. They were as follows:

1. Investigate the extent and causes of youth homelessness in South Australia.
2. Ascertain and document the range of services currently available to assist homeless youth.
3. Ascertain and document the gaps and deficiencies in current service provision.
4. Examine existing Commonwealth and State Government programmes which could be relevant to the provision of accommodation for young people.
5. That the report be referred to the Family Research Unit, Department for Community Welfare, for assessment in the form of a family impact statement before submission to Cabinet.
6. Report on the potential role of Commonwealth, State, local government, voluntary agencies and the private sector in the provision of accommodation for youth.
7. Recommend means by which present gaps and deficiencies can be filled.
8. Recommend what action the South Australian Government should take to assist homeless youth.

Before the working party delivered its report to the Government, it was patently obvious to certain organisations, such as the South Australian Council of Social Services and Shelter (S.A.) Incorporated, that youth housing problems occur. Before the report was issued they had this to say:

Youth housing problems (including youth homelessness) occur when there is a breakdown in the transition from family to independent living. Unemployment, low incomes, high rental costs, shortage of rental accommodation, and the low social status of young people are major contributing factors to that breakdown.

It was also stated:

The young unemployed are often seen as a financial liability as tenants and must be able to average rents of \$45 to \$50 a week. However, how can they pay that level of rent when 16-17 year olds receive a benefit of \$36 a week and those over 18 years of age receive a benefit of \$53.45? If one looks at the contributing factors for young people seeking housing assistance one finds certain reasons. I shall list the problems and then seek leave to have the figures incorporated. There were family problems, alcohol-drug problems, financial problems, high rent/eviction, newly arrived in Adelaide, age restriction on obtaining rental accommodation, and many others. I seek leave to have the table inserted in *Hansard*.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Russack):** Can the honourable member assure the House that it is purely statistical?

**Mr HEMMINGS:** Of course, Mr Acting Speaker.

Leave granted.

Contributory Factors to Youth Housing Crisis Prepared and Published by SACOSS

	Male per cent	Female per cent
Family Problems .....	33.5	53.7
Alcohol-Drug Problems .....	4.2	1.8
Financial Problems .....	16.2	7.9
High Rent/Eviction .....	5.8	7.3
Newly arrived in Adelaide .....	11.5	6.7
Age restriction on obtaining rental accommodation .....	1.0	0.6
More than one of the above .....	19.9	10.4
Other .....	7.9	11.6

**Mr HEMMINGS:** Many reasons contribute to young people being forced to leave home. It is rather interesting that when the present Government was in opposition it always talked about the family unit and said that the Labor Government contributed to the breaking up of the family unit. May I remind members of the House that the same conditions are still relevant, even though the present Government has been in office for 18 months. Some of the reasons given are:

Parent-child disputes.

*De facto* relationships, where the children cannot cope with the other person coming into the family.

Young people are unable to cope with authoritarian fathers or mothers.

Young women often face disapproval for their desired lifestyles.

Financial problems that account for many family disputes.

The article also provides information about tenancies sought. There are figures relating to young people seeking accommodation for one night only, up to seven nights, one or two weeks, more than two weeks, or permanently. I seek leave to insert in *Hansard* the table providing this information.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Again, it is purely statistical?

**Mr HEMMINGS:** Yes.

Leave granted.

Tenancy Sought

	Males Per Cent	Females Per Cent
One night only .....	10.6	2.4
Up to seven nights .....	22.6	9.8
One to two weeks .....	6.3	4.3
More than two weeks (temporary) .....	18.8	27.4
Permanent long-term .....	38.8	53.7
Not known .....	2.9	2.4

Extract from Youth Housing, prepared and published by SACOSS, 8 June 1980.

**Mr HEMMINGS:** With all these facts before us, in July 1980 the working party released its report to the Government. However, it was not until November of that year that we received any reaction from the Minister of Industrial Affairs. The working party revealed what all concerned people had known for some time, namely, family problems, unemployment and financial difficulties.

Among its 24 recommendations the Working Party suggested that the State Government approach the Commonwealth to see if more money could be made available through the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement for pilot projects for housing young people; that measures be taken to improve the incomes of young people through higher unemployment benefits and supplementary assistance to young unemployed people living by themselves and that the Department of Social Security review the administration of unemployment benefit guidelines to make it easier for young people to get and retain accommodation.

The Working Party also recommended that the State Government expand the functions of the Emergency Housing Office to incorporate a responsibility for young people; that the South Australian Housing Trust be given the responsibility and power to compile a register of unused and under-used publicly owned property which could be used for accommodation for young people and that the State Government adopt the principle of using all or some of the money made from the sale of public property for public housing projects. If the homeless youth in this State expected any quick action after this fourth-month delay by the Government, they were to be disappointed, because the Minister of Industrial Affairs was quick to add:

Because of the complexity of the report and the large number of recommendations the Government has set up a high level inter-

departmental committee to advise Cabinet on the individual recommendations.

It took a series of conferences set up by Shelter (S.A.) and the South Australian Council of Social Services, a sympathetic media campaign, and the erection of tent city in Victoria Square to get any further response from the Government. Tent city became an embarrassment to the Government and the Adelaide City Council. It was a continual reminder to the people of Adelaide and this State that there existed in the community a youth housing problem that would not go away, despite the Government's inaction.

However, the tent city was doomed: It was burnt down, in extremely suspicious circumstances, at the time of the visit of Prince Charles. Perhaps one day the Government might attempt to find out who burnt it down, and whether it was a member of the Police Force or a member of the Army, because that rumour is going around at the moment.

In April of this year the Minister of Housing announced the results of that high-level committee—and what a damp squib that turned out to be! He said, among other things, that 50 Housing Trust homes would be set aside for the homeless youth, to be run on a minimal-supervision basis. He said, too, that he would be seeking additional funds for South Australia through the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement for housing young people. What has happened since April? To put it bluntly, nothing has happened; not one of those 50 houses has been allocated to homeless youths. The Minister, despite strong words in his press statement, has not made one attempt to get the Federal Government to give additional funds to this State.

On page 4 of his Speech, His Excellency the Governor made this comment:

16. My Government will continue to give high priority to its commitments through the Housing Trust to provide quality welfare housing, particularly on a rental basis for low and moderate income earners and pensioners. Additional support has been provided for the Emergency Housing Office and plans are under way to establish 50 dwellings that will provide minimally supervised housing for homeless young people.

That was an admission by the Government, at the opening of this session, that nothing had been done to provide housing for those young people. In April, the Minister of Housing had said that 50 houses would be made available to them, yet now we have it as a new initiative from this Government. Despite the fact of the setting up of this high-level committee by the Minister of Industrial Affairs, on which the Minister of Community Welfare had a senior officer, it has been admitted by the Minister of Housing that no money is available from the Department for Community Welfare to provide the minimal supervision.

Even if the Housing Trust were able tomorrow to make those 50 houses available to young people, no money would be available from the Department for Community Welfare to provide minimal supervision. We have two Government departments, and two Ministers with representatives on the committee, not knowing what is going on. But that is not the worst aspect of the whole shoddy affair of dealing with the problems of homeless youth. That can be sheeted home fairly and squarely to the Minister's apathetic and lazy attitude in relation to requests for increased funding.

I remind the House that the Minister said, in his press statement on 8 April, that he would be seeking additional funds for South Australia, through the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, for housing young people, and that these funds would be in addition to State moneys used for the 50 homes planned. However, on 3 June, two months later, in Federal Parliament the member for Hindmarsh received a reply to a question he had placed on notice for the Minister for Social Security. The question was as follows:

(3) Has the Government been approached by the South Australian Government for an increase in funding under the Homeless Persons Assistance Act?

The reply was this:

There is no record of an approach by the South Australian Government for an increase in funding under the Homeless Persons Assistance Act.

The Minister went on record, in a press statement, to the effect that he would be seeking additional finance, but up until now he has made not one attempt to get increased funding. At a time when every other State Government has been making demands on the Federal Government for further funding for welfare housing, this Minister has been so lazy that he has not bothered to write, although he said in his press release that he would be writing to the Federal Minister, seeking further funding.

Mr Lewis: You will probably eat those words.

Mr HEMMINGS: I would dearly love to eat those words if the Minister of Housing could tell me tomorrow that there is increased funding, that he has written, and that he can show me the letter. My colleague, the shadow Minister of Community Welfare, has asked the Minister to give that evidence, and there has been nothing forthcoming, because the Minister and this Government do not worry about homeless youths. They have created a working party which has brought down recommendations, but they have not acted on those recommendations. Let us see what else this hypocritical Minister of Housing said in this press statement. He stated:

The Government has approached the whole question of youth homelessness with a very serious and concerned attitude and the measures adopted by Cabinet will aim at both preventing the numbers climbing any higher and helping the young people already affected.

He went on to say:

The humanitarian aspect has been uppermost in our minds. The Government recognises that the welfare of our young people in their adolescent years is vital for the future of the State.

In the light of what the Minister has done as a result of the working party recommendations, of what he has done as a result of the high-level committee that was set up, and in the light of Cabinet consideration of that report and of the report of the high-level committee, those words are hollow. Of course, words are easy to say, and this Government is good at just talking.

I agree that there is no simple, immediate and complete solution to the problem, but a sight more could have been done in the 12 months since the report was released to the Government. Highways Department houses could have been utilised and made available to ease the immediate situation. Money from the sale of Government property could have been channelled into the purchase of houses by the South Australian Housing Trust. More money could have been provided to the Department for Community Welfare in an effort to give some practical assistance to families which are having problems, perhaps preventing the breakdown of family relationships.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, we could have carried out a more vigorous campaign to get money from the Federal Government, because it seems, in the light of the Victorian report today, that we will miss the boat, and that money will be made available to the Eastern States, but not to South Australia.

There exists, as a result of the report on youth homelessness, a high degree of expectancy from those directly affected and from those organisations which were sufficiently concerned to make submissions to the Government and to the working party. I suggest that the Minister of Industrial Affairs should reconvene his high-level committee, so that we could have a guarantee that more money will be available. Then perhaps we might have a more



honest approach, resulting in the provision of accommodation for young people.

**Dr BILLARD (Newland):** As I rise to support the motion, I want at the outset to pay a tribute and to pay homage to the memory of Sir Thomas Playford, who we all recognise was a great South Australian—perhaps the greatest. I think that I can bring a different light to bear on our consideration of this matter, because I was born and bred in Queensland, which is in many ways a rival State to South Australia. I can remember in my early days how we in Queensland looked with a jealous eye at South Australia, what South Australia had been able to do, the industry it had been able to generate, and the greener pastures that had been sown and were being tended in South Australia.

I came from that viewpoint to South Australia at a time since the retirement of that man. I now appreciate, living in South Australia, the very great benefits that he brought to this State. I certainly have no hesitation in acknowledging the very great debt that everyone in this State owes to the work of that man and to the integrity he displayed in the way in which he worked for his State.

As the starting point for my speech, I want to refer back to one of the items of announced Liberal Party policy at the time of the most recent election. I refer particularly to the policy on Treasury, where the following was stated:

The Government must ensure that its administration and spending is always directed at achieving the best possible in terms of results and value for the taxpayers' dollar... We do believe in efficient Government and careful spending, and, as well as instituting legislation for the periodic review of statutory bodies, will undertake major reforms in the system of Budget planning and accounting in Government departments.

This line of thought was expanded further when the Premier introduced the Budget for the financial year just ended. In introducing that Budget, he delineated three specific ways that the Government was operating to follow through on that promise. In his speech he said the following:

First, we believe that the Government, the Parliament and interested members of the public should have access, and timely access, to better information on the overall operations of the public sector. Secondly, we need information on expenditure programmes which enables us better to evaluate those programmes in terms of overall benefits and costs to the community and to determine priorities between them. The third level at which we are seeking improvement relates to financial management and control within departments and authorities.

He announced those three ways and then went on to discuss programme and performance budgeting, which plays quite a substantial part in the way in which this Government is seeking to follow through on those promises.

Of course, those sorts of promises, and those sorts of statements, do not arise out of nowhere; they arise as a result of public pressure and public demand. There had been, for some time, an increasing public knowledge of instances of wasted spending in areas such as Monarto, the frozen food factory, the Flinders Medical Centre computers, and a range of other areas. There had been public knowledge of instances of inconsistency in spending, of money which was flowing freely in some areas but not in others. Public frustration in dealings with government, duplication of efforts, and unresponsiveness in some instances to logic were put on the part of constituents.

In some instances there was public resentment of specific work conditions which were alleged to be unobtainable in private industry. Overriding all that was a public resentment at the increasing tax burden. All of these feelings within the public I have seen to be confirmed in my dealings with the public as a member of Parliament. They can be summed up by a demand from the public for reduced taxation and an increased scrutiny of Government operations; that is, increased accountability. The question that

this leads to is, 'Has the bureaucracy outgrown its usefulness? Is it too large for the work it has to perform?'. This is the position we face now, where we have to institute accountability and controls and try to give the public the value for its dollar that it deserves.

What I intend to do, therefore, is examine how these demands can be met in a specific area, namely, through the intelligent application of data processing systems within government. I take as my starting point a paper which does not deal with data processing at all but is entitled *The Annual Reports of Government Organisations*, by Mr D. A. Shand. This paper was presented to the New South Wales division of the Government accountants group in July 1980.

In this paper Mr Shand examines the accountability of government agencies. He considered that accountability in three specific areas: first, accountability as to the efficiency of operation of Government departments; secondly, the accountability as to the effectiveness of the organisation in carrying out its charter; and, thirdly, the accountability as to the degree of financial control maintained within the operations of that agency. I know that Mr Shand was examining these arguments from the point of view of the annual reports that those agencies gave to Parliament (and not only the South Australian Parliament). He was considering Parliaments generally within Australia.

I think that the arguments he put and the questions he raised had applicability at all levels within the Government, not simply the reporting to Parliament, but the reporting that goes on within agencies to each manager at each level. On the first question, efficiency, we must recognise that the Public Service Board has responsibility for the efficiency of operation of Government departments. Efficiency is, in fact, quite difficult to measure, but there can be productivity measures that can give us a guide to the efficiency of an agency.

I cite by way of example one of the common efficiency measures which is used in hospitals, the cost per occupied bed-day, which is one measure. But, as Mr Shand points out in his paper, one cannot measure the efficiency of an organisation simply by one measure: there must be a variety of measures, and they must be measures that are used internally.

If we simply used as the measure of efficiency of a hospital the cost per occupied bed-day, we could find that administrators could distort that figure by holding people in hospital longer than required so that all beds were full at all times. Obviously, that is not desirable from a health care point of view. Therefore, we need to look at more measures than simply one measure for each agency. As was stressed by Mr Shand, the measures, to be meaningful, must not simply be worked out at the end of the year but must be the measures that are used on a continuous basis.

The result of this is that, if one were to calculate these measures, one would find that they require the gathering of information from a wide variety of sources on a continuous basis. If we then address ourselves to effectiveness, which was the second consideration, we see (and Mr Shand points this out) that there must be defined objectives within an agency more detailed than those simply laid down in the Act.

This leads straight into the implementation by this Government of programme performance budgeting. I refer again to the speech made by the Premier during the introduction of the 1980-81 Budget in this House, when he said:

Heavy demands have been placed upon all departments to define corporate goals and functions, to provide details of specific programmes undertaken, and to relate departmental activities to Government policy.



This work is being done now, and by implication it had not been done previously, and therefore I believe that, if nothing else results from programme performance budgeting, the efforts by the departments to define their objectives in a more detailed fashion must be of benefit.

How do we assess the effectiveness of a department? Different departments obviously have different purposes and therefore they must be assessed in different ways.

The Electricity Trust of South Australia, for example, supplies power, the Engineering and Water Supply Department supplies water and sewerage facilities. Their effectiveness and that of, say, the Health Commission can be measured in different ways. It is difficult to measure the effectiveness of the Department for Community Welfare. The effectiveness of the Education Department is often questioned but I doubt that we have exact measures of its success. Nevertheless, there can be some assessment, no matter how subjective, of these departments through periodic surveys of users, and I note an inquiry was conducted last year, soon after this Government came into office, which examined the effectiveness of the operations of the Department of Community Welfare, specifically by questioning the users of that system.

The third area which was mentioned was financial control. Obviously, if this is to be done effectively, it also requires the gathering of information from a wide variety of sources. I note that in his article Mr Shand stated that very few organisations gave a breakdown of costs and revenues according to activity or function. Government departments may not pay rent, may have their buildings paid for out of another department vote, and may in some cases not pay for printing, cleaning and building maintenance, etc., not to mention superannuation charges.

If we are to have financial control and a report on efficiency and effectiveness in this way, as is implied by programme performance budgeting, obviously information has to be gathered not simply from wide sources within the department but from wide sources right across the whole sphere of Government, and that information has to be supplied on an almost continuous basis. Otherwise, those who have the responsibility of management cannot possibly hope to react to that information and to use it in their managing role.

The final point to which I wish to refer from that article is the timeliness of reports. Obviously, late reporting does not allow for managers and Parliament to be properly effective in accounting for those areas that they control. By way of example, I refer to the Index to Papers and Bills for the 1980-81 second session of the Forty-fourth Parliament, where several reports which related to the 1978-79 year were listed, which means that they were at least 12 months or up to two years late in their presentation to the Parliament.

Included in the list was the Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board Report, 1978-79, the West Beach Trust Report, 1978-79, the Coast Protection Board Report, 1978-79, and the 1978 Report of the Kingston College of Advanced Education. Obviously, if a large number of Government agencies are going to report between 12 and 24 months after the completion of a year, there is little opportunity for Parliament to scrutinise their operations critically and to have a positive role in helping those organisations to function more effectively.

The result of all this is that good accountability and good management requires speedy and continuous access to a wide variety of information. In addition, we have the problem of gathering that information. Those agencies have to devote effort to the information gathering process, and this is also costly. We do not want to do to government what various sectors of private industry and in particular small

business have complained that government was doing to them; that is, over-regulation. There comes a point of diminishing returns and there must come a point in all reporting and information gathering exercises where the cost of gathering the information is of negative benefit. That is, the benefit in improved management techniques is not there.

I note in this respect the Minister of Education, Harold Allison, when addressing a public meeting at the Ardtornish School at Tea Tree Gully about a month ago, indicated that he could not see programme and performance budgeting being extended to the school level. He cited this argument as an explanation, because he said that the extra load this information gathering would impose on schools could not possibly be returned in benefits. That is an example of what I am saying, namely, that without assistance in gathering this information, the law of diminishing returns operates and we cannot gain the effective control that we would desire.

In addition, with respect to comments about the timeliness of reporting and communication, I believe that the difficulty with communicating within the Public Service, simply because of its size, lies at the basis of most of the complaints of unresponsiveness that I referred to near the beginning of my speech. It is a fact that bureaucracy runs on paper. If something is not written on paper, it does not exist. At least it does not have official status. But if everything is written on paper, it must be communicated by hand. There are no possible means of instant communication of pieces of paper, quite apart from any consideration of the number of forests that have to be cut down each year to supply the paper on which the Public Service runs.

Let me cite by way of example of these difficulties, some of the problems that I face as a member of Parliament. Each year I receive about 300 to 500 communications from constituents referring to different sorts of problems. Each may require a different type of action. Quite a lot of them require action that involves writing to a Minister. At any one time, 40 to 60 of those actions may be active; that is, they may be awaiting a response from a Minister or from some other source. To follow up a constituent's complaint I have to write a letter to a Minister, which then has to be conveyed by hand to the Minister or to his office. The letter is sorted and acknowledged and it becomes one of the great number of letters that the Minister would receive every day.

I have made inquiries of two Ministers. In one office I was told that the Minister received about 100 such letters a day. Another Minister indicated that his office received about 100 such letters a week. But, in any case, quite a considerable load is placed on the Minister's office by having to respond to those letters. The letter is then sent to the department, where a response is prepared. Several officers may be involved in that preparation. If more than one point is made affecting different areas, and as a result the response has to be vetted and vouched for and passed back through the chain of command to the Minister. That may be the first time that the Minister has seen the original letter. He then has the opportunity to assess it, plus the draft reply. If he thinks that all is in order, he may sign it and forward it to the member of Parliament, who then may forward it to the constituent. However, at each stage the letter may be referred back.

My experience is (and discussion with other members indicates that it is the same for them) that the mean time to wait is six weeks, which is a terribly long time to wait for a matter that, to a constituent, may be quite urgent. Nevertheless, I suggest that the great majority of that time is wasted by having that letter and its response passed by

hand from one officer to another within the Government bureaucracy.

Another area which places great demands upon the bureaucracy is Questions on Notice. We have already heard comments here on the increasing load that is placed upon the Government. But, in all cases, time is wasted in communication, which means that the quality of information is lost. If a matter is urgent, it is less useful to have the answer when it is too late for it to do any good. Time degrades the quality of information that may be supplied.

As the bureaucracy gets larger, lines of communication become more difficult and longer, and it is inevitable that errors increase. So, we have two problems: the introduction of errors and the time that we have to wait. This difficulty is not necessarily restricted to Government bureaucracies. Although I have not been employed by a large private industry bureaucracy, I am told that certain large companies are almost like the Public Service in respect of the time that one has to wait for a response and the difficulty in getting changes. I suggest that this is a feature of any large organisation.

I suggested earlier that I would talk about how data processing could assist in this area and assist the Government to make the bureaucracies work for the people. I cite Modbury Hospital as a specific example. It is a fairly propitious example, because the health area has specifically been subjected to a number of critical reports in recent years—the P.A.C. Report, the Molloy Report on the Flinders Medical Centre computer fiasco and, more recently, the Jamison Report, all of which have been critical of management aspects within the health sphere.

Secondly, it is important to consider this area because the consequences of bad management and bad control within the health area are far more serious than in other areas. It may be said by some that to have a free flowing purse within a health area should cure all problems, but that is not the case. To have good health you must have good management control. A *laissez faire* attitude within health management will not maintain good or uniform standards. The encouragement of overuse within specific areas must by implication encourage a laxity in other areas, which can be positively dangerous to the community.

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** Bad for the taxpayer and bad for the health of the nation.

**Dr BILLARD:** Right. I think it is propitious that I should consider the Modbury situation for a number of reasons: first, the Modbury Hospital serves my electorate; secondly, it was subjected to a great deal of debate and public pressure last year; and, thirdly, the board of management at that hospital had the courage to initiate a programme of its own volition, which placed its own management and activities under the most severe scrutiny. It initiated this during 1979, and the results of that examination became part of the public debate on that hospital last year. I had the pleasure of visiting Modbury Hospital several times recently, once early this year and once more recently, where I was able to examine what has been done in the application of data processing. In three specific areas computers have been applied in the past, and are being applied now. The first is the A.T.S. (admissions, transfers and separations) system, introduced in 1974 and 1975 at the behest of the then Hospitals Department. This system is designed to cover the administrative areas of admission of inpatients, transfers, bed swaps of inpatients within the hospital, separation of inpatients, and associated clerical functions and management reports for administration of inpatients. This system was tied to the Flinders Medical Centre computer system, the subject of the Malloy Report.

The costs of this system are estimated to be hundreds of thousands of dollars to the Modbury Hospital. In its latter

days, it cost that hospital between \$50 000 and \$60 000 a year. But let us look at the results of a survey of the usefulness of the system conducted at the hospital, I believe, in January 1980. That survey revealed that 21 staff were involved in using the A.T.S. system, and that 19 of the 21 advised that they could do the job without it. The other two said that the system was only a small part of their duties. In other words, the hospital was paying between \$50 000 and \$60 000 a year for a system which it was admitted was of next to no use. Consequently, the hospital abandoned it in March 1980.

Another system the hospital has been using is the C.P.A. (central processing of accounts) system, which is basically an accounts payable system designed to meet very basic cash accounting needs. It was found that it was not able to produce the type of reporting essential for responsible financial management of the hospital, and it was abandoned in June 1981. The third system was the so-called CHOP (common hospital payroll) system, introduced in October 1978.

This, as the name implies, was a pay-roll system which had quite a long history. It was originally derived from a Victorian personnel pay-roll system, but that had been modified through successive stages, and the CHOP system itself was a derivative of a pay system operating at the Adelaide Children's Hospital. This system was discontinued in May 1980. So all the changes that have happened in the hospital have occurred during the last 12 months. What has the hospital done during that time? In May 1980 it adopted a Victorian personnel pay-roll system, which utilised existing software in Victoria and which gave the hospital access to a system to enable it to compare its operations with the Victorian operations. In June 1981 it adopted the Victorian general ledger and creditors system to replace the C.P.A. system, and I understand that that still runs on the Victorian computers. In May 1981 it developed its own patient reporting system, which it says has similar objectives to those of the defunct A.T.S. system, but in addition it gives sophisticated management reports on patient activity and a full patient billing component. The hospital acquired the system on which the P.R.S. (patient reporting system) runs, which is a Burroughs 1726 computer, from the Lands Department, at minimal cost. Their personnel pay-roll system runs on the T.A.B. computer and, as I said, the replacement of the C.P.A. system runs on Victorian computers. This was achieved at very little cost to the hospital, which has not stuck its neck out so far as computing is concerned. It has adopted a conservative and quiet approach, and has adopted what is essentially a management approach, which demands that systems that are adopted are proven, working systems and are essential to the management operation. Now, because of the reporting that is available on the general ledger and creditor system, the hospital is able to obtain sophisticated management reporting on a wide range of subjects and is able to do inter-hospital comparisons, which in previous years would have required interstate trips. This information is available on a continuous basis.

In addition, the hospital now has the ability to budget accurately. When it budgets for the coming year it knows that that budget will be accurate. I think it is a salutary reminder to us that in the last Budget debate the Minister of Health indicated that the Royal Adelaide Hospital was just then looking to define cost centres within the hospital. The implication of that is that there were not such defined cost structures prior to that time, and I am left wondering how on earth that hospital could have predicted its budget a year ahead. It must have been by guesstimates—by the seat of the pants, the Minister says; those words have been used by other people involved in that area. The introduction of these computers within the Modbury Hospital is there-

fore seen to be quite a substantial advance on what has been able to be done before. Now we have accountability to a degree which has not been available before. It has been done at minimal cost. Accountability does not necessarily require us to pay the earth for huge systems; it can be done at minimal cost, but such systems require an intelligent, conservative and cautious approach to the application of data processing.

I note that in a report made in July 1981 that the Modbury Hospital has made concerning its computer applications it is stated that in June 1981 a stocktake was effected for the first time in the history of the hospital. The implication of that is quite staggering. It means that prior to that time if one wanted to walk out of the hospital with a chair, for example, unless someone was sitting on it or unless it was someone's favourite chair, nobody would know that a chair was missing because nobody knew what the hospital had in terms of equipment. Now, in June 1981, the hospital has had its first ever stocktake.

**Mr Slater:** How many chairs are missing?

**Dr BILLARD:** Of course, that cannot be answered, because the hospital does not know how many it had before. These are some of the quite startling ramifications of the introduction of these sorts of control. Quite apart from giving control over areas which are known to be lacking, it allows also the institution of a management rigor which will allow greater control than may have been conceived possible.

The progress during the last 12 months at the Modbury Hospital is something for which it ought to be congratulated. For a hospital that came under quite severe criticism over 12 months ago, quite frankly I think it has done wonders during the past 12 months. To its credit, it has done it on a shoestring budget.

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** A sufficient budget, shall we say.

**Mr Keneally:** Despite the local member and the Minister—is that what you are saying?

**Dr BILLARD:** Well, when I have visited that hospital I have given it every encouragement because I could see the benefit that could result from that sort of work, and I know that it has been only too happy to show me what it has been doing, because the hospital is convinced that not only has it reaped great benefits but also that it has but scratched the surface in terms of the benefits that await it through the cautious and proper exploitation of computers. I also say that it would also recognise that it is not at the technological forefront of any computer revolution. There are things in that system that the hospital would see as being not perfect. No system is perfect. It would recognise itself that there are many things that would be nice if they were better. As far as the hospital's future pathway is concerned, I can see that at some time in the near future it may have to start spending money on computers (on hardware), simply because the hardware that it has at the moment is being used almost to capacity, and the hospital is coming to the stage where it must make further decisions about where it progresses from now on. In terms of our overall look at how data processing can be used constructively within Government, the Modbury Hospital provides us with a salutary lesson on what can be done with intelligence.

One of the future areas that I foresee in which computers will be applied—not simply can be applied but will be applied—is in the use of computing systems for communications. I have already mentioned that bureaucracy is run on paper and that the great delays are introduced into the bureaucracy simply through the time it takes to communicate pieces of paper. At the moment, we do not accept that things have legal or binding status unless they are

written on some form of paper and have the appropriate marks. However, I believe that the time will come when we will accept that messages switched through computers from one office to another, messages that can be switched instantaneously, with authority, and with security, will have the stamp of authority and will be accepted.

I cite by way of example some starting work done in this area. Just over 18 months ago, I had an opportunity to inspect the Queensland Computer Centre, in Brisbane. I know that that centre was starting then to set up a sub-system of the computer system which operated as a message collector and distributor for the Police Force, so that police officers in one part of the State could enter a message with a security level to be sent to another officer in another part of the State. That message would be waiting within the computer system for the officer to log on and to read. Within that sort of system there can be security through the use of pass words.

In addition, an example was cited some time ago when the Ripper suspect was arrested in the United Kingdom. I am not sure how many people picked up the point that the suspect was arrested because the man on the beat was able to check instantly a number plate. That system required rapid communication and access to a data base; in other words, the computer is being used not simply as a data processor but as a communications system. It interfaces not with the computer professional but with the man on the beat. That is the way computers must go in future.

I believe that the application of computers throughout the bureaucracy means that the Public Service need not run on paper. The basic technical requirements of hardware in particular and of software have been met, and we can guarantee secure and fast communication. How, then, do we avail ourselves of these possibilities? It may be trite, but I think it is nevertheless true to say that the first rule must be to avoid the mistakes of the previous Government. The Flinders Medical Centre computer cost the taxpayers \$2 000 000, and we had the Molloy Report which examined that area. I suggest that that was but the tip of the iceberg, and that the sort of woolly thinking that went on with the acquisition of those computers for the Flinders Medical Centre was characteristic of many of the A.D.P. activities throughout the Government sphere over a considerable number of years.

It is inevitable, therefore, that past mistakes will dictate to a certain extent what we can do in future. In particular, we must recognise that, because of past mistakes, there is limited experience within the South Australian Government of sophisticated commercial computing systems. Before we decide how we should approach this problem, we must decide on our philosophy of the role of computing. There has been released within the last few weeks a statement of computer policy by the Data Processing Board set up by this Government. That statement of policy makes some important points which are worth making again here. In addition, by implication they highlight the mistakes of the past. I quote:

Computer systems are tools which may help to meet or sustain the defined objectives of the agency.

It requires the direct commitment and involvement of senior management.

Government computing is not unique.

The corollary, of course, is this:

Increased usage on economic grounds and other grounds of prepared software packages.

An increasing proportion of the total data processing budget will be consumed by software costs.

There was a recognition of the spread of computing outside traditional data processing areas, so it was not simply the technocrats who would have their hands on computers, but managers, clerks, and others. Again, I quote:

The Government is not a single integrated entity, but an aggregate of co-operating but diverse organisations.

Finally:

User management should be free to decide on sound business grounds between identified alternatives for achieving cost effective computing.

That is a brief summary of what I believe to be the main points of that definition of computer policy. It may be summarised by saying that there is an emphasis, first, on decentralised management control; that is, those who are responsible for the results of computing must be the ones who make the decisions. We cannot, therefore, have a central body which dictates to all Government agencies. Secondly, it must be recognised that computers are management tools. They are not play things in their own right, not simply for technocrats to use, but must be seen as tools of management. Thirdly, the criterion in the assessment of the value of data processing must be whether it assists in achieving the objectives of an agency; that is, does it enhance the productivity of the public servant as he goes about his duties?

I would go further than that statement in some areas. I note, in going further, that some of the areas in which I would go further in the statement of computing policy have in fact been included within the request for information for the A.D.P. Centre. However, let me cite the areas, first, where I believe more needs to be said.

We need to recognise that, among many people, there is an unreal fear of computers. Therefore, we have a responsibility in Government not simply to passively accept computers, but to actively encourage the proper exploitation of computers and computing technology. That means, first, that there must be sensitivity in their introduction, and their introduction must be gradual and non-threatening. It also means that, if non-technical people are using computers, there is a great responsibility to make sure that the systems are reliable.

Secondly, there must also be an extensive education programme. This will in fact be a two-way education programme, first to educate those potential users as to what computers are and what they can do for them, and to hear from potential users what their demands on the system might be and what they might require from a computing system.

Thirdly, I believe that in applying computers within Government areas there must be an emphasis on systems which are suited to use by non-professionals. The times when computers were rooms full of hardware surrounded by professional technocrats and where only the technocrats could lay their hands on a computer have well passed.

The times are coming when the people who will use computers are the ordinary, non-professional, run-of-the-mill workers. The technocrats' role will be to maintain the system and ensure that it continues to work, and to develop new applications. The system itself will be used by the ordinary managers, clerks and workers within the bureaucracy. I see that there is a need for emphasis on education. I note that within the statement of computing policy it states that it requires a significant programme of management and data processing specialist staff, support and development. I think that that may imply education, but I think perhaps it is drawing a long bow and that it would be beneficial if the need for education, and two-way education at that, were expressed. Everyone needs to be exposed to these systems before the air of mystery surrounding them is dispersed.

Another area where I think the statement of policy could be expanded is that I believe it appropriate for such a document to give greater recognition to the peculiarities of the computing industry; that is, specifically, the rapid

change that is going on in that industry. In other words, there is an advantage in adopting a technical strategy which recognises that rapid change, recognises, for example what has been stated earlier regarding increasing software costs as a proportion of total costs, recognises the proliferation of computer terminals amongst non-computing professionals, and recognises, finally, the need to learn from the past.

The most important philosophy in this respect, I would suggest, is what I would call a mainstream philosophy; that is, a need to maintain flexibility. I note in the request for information for the A.D.P. Centre that they imply such a philosophy. I quote from that document, which states:

... the A.D.P. Centre's business philosophy is to minimise risk by using hardware and software of demonstrable capability and reliability, ...

Then, further on, it states:

... and by maintaining flexibility ...

So, the mainstream philosophy, to my mind, can be summed up by a need to maintain flexibility; that is, you do not cut off future options, you play it safe. You do not try to stay with the leading edge of computer knowledge: you try to stay behind that leading edge so that any difficulties associated with that leading edge are avoided. However, you do not stay so far behind that leading edge that you are using out-of-date systems, because no manufacturer in his right mind will spend great quantities of money to support and maintain an out-of-date system.

The philosophy, therefore, is to maintain flexibility, to be conservative, and to ensure that systems are thoroughly proven and reliable. That also requires looking ahead to foresee future trends. When I was overseas recently I was able to speak to people within the Civil Service in the United Kingdom and to discuss with them their current practice. They have recently embarked upon a new exercise in which they have said to their agencies that, if they require a micro-computer, they will guarantee three weeks delivery provided it is one of three brands that have been selected in each of three different price categories. Those brands were selected by tender. If those agencies wanted to select another brand they could, but they had to go through the normal approval process, which took nine months or more.

The indications are that departments that are being heavily pressured by funding cuts are jumping at this, because they can see the ways in which these micro-computers can be utilised in individual offices scattered across the Civil Service. That process has some benefits in that it introduces computing in a non-threatening way to a wide variety of people. However, it also has the potential danger that it may subsequently be difficult to install communications systems between those offices. So it is one thing to have a computer doing your work in your office, but it is another to then have to write the results down on a piece of paper and send them through the mailing system to another office, where they are again typed into somebody's micro-computer, and so on. In that respect, there are advantages in having systems which are linked together in a larger network.

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** Do you think computers are going to be competition for Australia Post?

**Dr BILLARD:** I think they promise great benefits for communications. I think the time will inevitably come when they will be a standard form of inter-departmental or intra-departmental communication, at least, and perhaps intra-governmental communication.

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** You can't leak a computer.

**Dr BILLARD:** That is true. A message can be sent from the Premier, if necessary, to specific officers within the bureaucracy, and he can know that absolutely no-one else apart from those officers will see that message, because of

the security of the system. The big benefit I see, so far as the public is concerned, is that it overcomes a lot of the gripes that the public presently has with an over-large bureaucracy; that is, everyone recognises that, if you get a small department that is in a locality that has a well recognised objective, nine times out of ten it will work well.

**Mr Keneally:** The same thing applies to B.H.P., C.R.A. and B.H.A.S.

**Dr BILLARD:** I have referred to that earlier and have said that this problem is not confined to Government organisations, but that in any large organisation the same problem is faced simply because of the size of the organisation, the length of the lines of communication, and the fact that errors creep in when you have long lines of communication. I foresee that, if we can overcome our hang-ups about computers and introduce them sensitively and in a way that is not threatening to public servants, they themselves will welcome their application. I can see great benefits coming to the grass roots worker, because, if he sees that he can gather information from right across his department, the size of the organisation is not apparent to him. It appears to him as though the whole organisation is working on his behalf.

I summarise my remarks by saying that the intelligent application of the latest computing technology by this Government has the potential to make a decisive impact in several important areas of public concern regarding the operation of Government organisations. It is an area that is not all smooth sailing. It has plenty of expensive pitfalls, as the former Government found out to its cost. However, it does have the potential to greatly improve efficiency.

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

**Mr SLATER (Gilles):** In accordance with the tradition of the House, I support the motion. Like other speakers, I pay my condolences to the relatives and friends of the late Sir Thomas Playford. While I respected Sir Thomas Playford as a person and as the Premier of this State for 27 years, I must mention, of course, that he and I, in our own political philosophies, were poles apart. In his reference to the passing of Sir Thomas, the Premier said that Sir Thomas was the architect of industrial development in this State. The Premier said:

Over the period of 27 years in which Sir Thomas was Premier the State's population increased by 66 per cent;—

I do not think he could claim to be directly responsible for that increase in the State's population—

the number of factories grew by nearly 200 per cent; water storage capacity more than doubled; power generation capacity increased eight-fold; completed house construction doubled; and grain production doubled.

They may be wonderful achievements for a person who was a Premier of a State for 27 years.

**Mr Lewis:** He was given a good write-up in the Labor Party *Herald*.

**Mr SLATER:** Yes, we are fair minded people and we do respect a person's abilities in certain regards. We did give Sir Thomas Playford a write-up in the Labor *Herald*. I often think that, if it were not for the production of the Labor Party *Herald*, many of the members of the Government would not be able to prepare a speech, because they refer to that newspaper frequently in their addresses to this House. We must not forget that in the early period of Sir Thomas Playford's 27-year Premiership of this State, Australia had two Labor Governments, led by Mr Curtin and Mr Chifley, that also made a substantial contribution to the industrial development of this State.

It may be that it was a question of both convenience and geography that South Australia was chosen to have many munition factories during that particular time. I recall that

even the South Australian railway workshops at Islington (where I was employed for a short time during the Second World War) also produced munitions and other articles of war during that time. Other factories at Hendon and other places in metropolitan Adelaide also were established and became the real base of South Australian industrial development in the post-war years.

Unfortunately, in many instances, that industrial base has been eroded and, before I refer to that, I want to pay some attention to comments made on the opening day in regard to the speeches of condolence to the family of the late Sir Thomas Playford. Contributions were made by the Premier, my own Leader, the member for Mitcham, and the Chief Secretary. Both the member for Mitcham and the Chief Secretary claimed Sir Thomas Playford as being their mentor. It amazed me, particularly in the case of the member for Mitcham—

**Mr Keneally:** I think that could be regarded as slander.

**Mr SLATER:** I do not think Sir Thomas Playford regarded the Chief Secretary or the member for Mitcham as being a great protege, but, nevertheless, they claimed that he was their mentor. It is interesting to note rather ironically that the member for Mitcham, not long after Sir Thomas retired from politics, broke away from the Liberal and Country League, along with Mr Steele Hall, who was a former Premier, to form a separate Party called the Liberal Movement.

I will give the member for Mitcham credit in this regard: he is still outside the Liberal Party and he was the only one who stuck to his guns over that time. Most of the other members have gone back to the Liberal Party fold. The member for Mitcham is still outside the Liberal Party, but he still claims Sir Thomas Playford was his mentor. I was amazed to hear him make those remarks that day.

The Chief Secretary also made some comments to which I also wish to refer. The Chief Secretary said:

I join with the expressions already made. Sir Thomas Playford, as the member for Mitcham has said, had a way with people who did something he did not like. The first division in which I took part in this House was on a motion by the then member for Port Pirie, Mr McKee, in relation to the introduction of dog racing in this State. I believed that, in that day and age, that should be done, so I crossed the floor and voted with the then Government.

I remember this great man just looking at me—never saying anything, and never commenting. He looked at me for about three weeks—

**Mr Max Brown:** He could not work him out.

**Mr SLATER:** Well, this is what the Chief Secretary was on about. The Chief Secretary continued:

I found myself in all sorts of trouble about that . . . He did speak to me about it in later years . . . That was after certain things had happened. He was a wonderful friend and a wonderful mentor. About that erring vote from my Party, he said that it spelt out that democracy still lives.

Sir Thomas Playford had his own brand of democracy.

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** What would happen to you if you crossed the floor? You would be out on your ear.

**Mr SLATER:** No doubt we would look at each other, too, but I was rather amazed to find that Sir Thomas Playford looked at the Chief Secretary for three weeks. In this debate, other remarks have been made about Sir Thomas Playford by other members but I want to refer to the comments made by the member for Henley Beach on the same matter. That member said:

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... 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.

There is no doubt that Sir Thomas Playford had a wonderful quality in regard to people within the Liberal Party at that time. It is a wonderful quality that makes men like the Chief Secretary quiver in their boots and men like the member for Henley Beach express the comments that he did in this debate. The comments that were made demonstrated to me that the philosophy of that time to some degree still exists in the minds of Liberal Party members, and this is proved quite conclusively on occasions in debates regarding progressive social legislation that comes before this House.

That old holier-than-thou non-progressive, patronising sort of attitude still pervades the thinking of the Liberal Party in this State. It is opposed to any social change; it is a Party that has demonstrated, over the years, its opposition to social change. That attitude is why the Liberal Movement came into being. It did not believe it could exist because of those philosophies. All the people in the Liberal Movement, except the member for Mitcham and a few others, have now gone back into the fold and that attitude still prevails. Although some credit may be given to Sir Thomas Playford regarding industrialisation, people in South Australia were definitely denied any progressive social legislation for many years. I will give some examples. It took the Walsh and Dunstan Governments to bring this State into the 20th century, if one remembers only 20 years ago the type of licensing laws we had, with the six o'clock swill. Some of us may forget that that existed, but it did. That was the attitude that prevailed, regarding changes in this State. We were still in the 19th century.

We were refused any type of legal gambling. There was no State lottery, no minor lotteries, and no T.A.B. One of Sir Thomas Playford's famous comments for which he may be remembered was 'It is like putting poison in the hands of children.' That was the type of attitude that prevailed in those days, and I suggest that in some instances, not all, it still prevails in Government members' minds. To summarise that philosophy, they are opposed to any type of social change.

**Mr Max Brown:** They participate in it.

**Mr SLATER:** They claim that they are progressive people, but the proof of the pudding is always in the eating.

**An honourable member:** We have seven more than you on the back benches.

**Mr SLATER:** You are not demonstrating much capability in that regard, because any time any legislation comes before the House which members opposite claim they can have a conscience vote on, they will vote against any progressive social change legislation. I will not give examples.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr SLATER:** That would be a conscience vote, of course. It is a good indication of your attitude. It would be a conscience vote on both sides of the House when the matter comes before us. If it were not for the Walsh and Dunstan Labor Governments from 1965 to 1968 and 1970 to 1979 we would still be back in the 19th century as far as social legislation is concerned. Whilst I pay respects to Sir Thomas Playford for the contribution he may have made to South Australia, in one regard he did hold the State back, and that was on social legislation.

I turn now to the Governor's Speech, which was symptomatic of the Tonkin Administration, plenty of promise

but no performance. I was intrigued on opening day in the other place, as the Governor read this Speech, to see the antics of the Executive Assistant to the Premier, Mr Ross Story, who stationed himself in the public gallery and kept peering around the pillar at members of the Opposition. I caught his eye on several occasions and wondered what it was all about. He was looking at us and trying, I believe, to assess our reactions to the Speech. It was quite unusual. I do not know whether he acts as a sort of—

**Mr Keneally:** A Svenghali for the Government.

**Mr SLATER:** Yes. I know he has a powerful influence on Government thinking, and a particularly powerful influence on members of the back-bench in the Government. I understand that he is described in some quarters as the Minister without portfolio. He attends all the Cabinet meetings, which is particularly unusual. I think it is a famous first for a person who is not a Cabinet Minister. I do not know whether he is entitled to vote in Cabinet, but he certainly influences a great many decisions.

Of course, he is a product of the Playford era, one of those progressives from that time. It was rather unusual to see him peering around the pillar trying to assess the Opposition's reaction to the Governor's Speech. He need not have worried about it because, as far as I am concerned, it was probably one of the worst Speeches that I have ever had the bloody misfortune to hear in this place. I do not pass any comment on the Governor. I had a real feeling of sorrow for him for having to read such an innocuous document and a feeling of sorrow that we must have an hour to reply to that document.

**Mr Becker:** That's even worse.

**Mr SLATER:** In some cases, that is so. I listened for an hour to your speech. You made some important comments and I will compliment you on them soon. As I have said, I felt some sorrow for the Governor. Some members, in particular, the member for Todd, who is not here at the moment, have commented on what the Government believes is the most important aspect of its performance, namely, industrial development, which I think is more of a myth than a reality, as I shall prove.

**Mr Max Brown:** Are you going to explain the 17 000 jobs?

**Mr SLATER:** Yes, I will. The Premier is very fond of frequently announcing manufacturing initiatives in this State, although there have not been any recently. He claims that wonderful employment opportunities are produced, yet what he does not really say is that manufacturing industry here is in a crisis state. The 17 000 jobs so wildly promised by him have not come to fruition, and I doubt that they will. Unemployment has also risen during his term of office.

**Mr Becker:** Give us the figures.

**Mr SLATER:** I do not fiddle with figures as do members opposite (the Premier and Minister of Industrial Development) to try to tell the public that they are performing in that field. They are not, which I will prove. Production in many manufacturing industries has stagnated; many companies have been taken over and, in many instances, have ceased operation. I will refer to some of those companies concerned since the Government took office. We have Alaska Foods: Industrial Equity of New South Wales owns 45 per cent of D. J. Fowler, which in turn owns 15.5 per cent of Alaska Foods: Lemaire Corporation of Victoria took control of Allied Rubber Mills Limited. The South Australian Government sold its 28 per cent interest in South Australian Rubber Mills to Lemaire Corporation. Australian International and British Limited, Roe Gold and Mines Limited of Western Australia and Overnight Nominees Pty Limited took over Mintaro Slate and Flagstone Limited.

The Bank of Adelaide was taken over by the ANZ Bank Limited. Beneficial Finance Corporation Limited had 38.6



per cent of its shares purchased by the Bank of Tokyo. The International Bank of Detroit has a further 15.8 per cent of its shares. C.S.R. Limited has increased its shareholding in Bradford Insulation Holdings (S.A.) Limited to 47.5 per cent. We all know the saga of Elder Smith Goldsbrough Mort Limited: we do not know whether it is completed, but Mr Holmes a Court purchased a large quantity of shares in that company; then there was a move in that regard and someone else acquired the majority of the shares.

There was an attempted takeover of F. H. Faulding by the multi-national Glaxo Australia Pty Ltd and by Kiwi International. The Federal Government rejected the Glaxo bid. Kiwi has built up its equity to 20.9 per cent in F. H. Faulding, and takeover discussions are still proceeding.

With regard to D. & J. Fowler, Industrial Equity Ltd has emerged as a larger shareholder. The Grosvenor Hotel, about which a question was asked by the member for Rocky River this afternoon, has been taken over by Victorian Holdings Limited of Melbourne. With regard to Horwood Bagshaw Ltd, F.A.I. Insurances of Sydney is the largest shareholder with 35 per cent. With regard to Lensworth Finance Ltd, Elder Smith Goldsbrough Mort has a 60 per cent shareholding. As I indicated earlier, other factors were involved with Elder Smith Goldsbrough Mort. John Martin and Company Limited was taken over. Mintaro Slate and Flagstone Limited was taken over. Industrial Equity Ltd purchased 20 per cent of the shares of T. O'Connor Holdings Ltd in September 1980, and TASM Nominees Pty Ltd of Victoria acquired 10.7 per cent of the capital of Onkaparinga Textiles Pty Ltd. General Investments Australia Limited of New South Wales has 10.5 per cent and is seeking to increase its holding to 20 per cent. Industrial Equity also has an interest in the company. With regard to Quarry Industries Limited, Boral Limited gained control of the company in January 1981. With regard to the South Australian Gas Company, Industrial Equity Limited attempted to take over the company in August 1980, and S.G.I.C. was instructed to purchase Gas Company shares.

With regard to Softwood Holdings Limited, Alstergren Pty Ltd of Melbourne and its subsidiaries increased its holding to 1 300 000 shares in 1980. With regard to G. & R. Wills Holdings Limited, the Industrial Equity Limited stake in the company is around 7 per cent, and another unnamed buyer acquired 8.3 per cent in October 1980. With regard to Metro Meat Limited, a parcel of 1 000 000 convertible notes changed hands, raising speculation of a takeover bid.

With regard to Reid Bros Holdings Ltd, 8 per cent of capital was traded, prompting speculation of a move that the company would be sold. With regard to John Shearer Holdings Limited, significant share trading was reported on the Stock Exchange. The company was and still is believed to be vulnerable. The other companies are Blacks Shoes, Scott Bonnar, Tolley, Scott and Tolley, John Mack Cameras, Macks Shoe Stores, and, last but not least, a company which is the largest shipbuilding company in South Australia and which came to the Industries Development Committee for assistance has been taken over by a New South Wales firm. I refer to a press report which stated:

Kali Shipyards of Port Adelaide, the largest builder of big fishing boats in Australia, has been taken over by a Sydney company. Colan Industries Pty Ltd has acquired the business of Kali Boat Building & Repairs Pty Ltd in a deal believed to be worth around \$1.5 million.

This is endless. The Government claims, of course, that it is doing a great job on behalf of manufacturing industry and business in South Australia. These facts prove that it is not doing exactly that. What has been happening, of course, is that gradually all these companies are being taken over by either the multi-nationals or by companies located

outside South Australia. It means that the decisions being made on behalf of South Australians for South Australians are no longer being made in this State. They are being made in the board rooms of New York, Tokyo and Sydney—all around the world, and we are subject to these sorts of situation where we have absolutely no control over our destiny.

The Premier gets up in this House and states publicly that South Australia is in great shape, at a time when all of our companies are being taken over by international and multi-national companies. We are in a state of crisis, and the real change affecting the manufacturing industry is the inevitable result of a variety of factors. Most important is technological change. We heard about computers from the member for Newland this afternoon. In many instances the technological age may be beneficial to us, but in the long term it is beneficial only to the multi-national companies which control the computers and sell and manufacture them.

**Mr Randall:** What about all the jobs they create?

**Mr SLATER:** They do not create jobs; as a matter of fact, the very reverse applies—they put people out of work and replace people. However, I am not prepared to debate that subject at the moment, and I will pursue it on another occasion. Also, manufacturing industry, particularly multi-national industry chains, provide changes in the pattern of demand, and the major source accelerating these changes in demand are the trans-national corporations. In the last 10 years in the Western world, this trend has been greatly and significantly increased and has come to assume such critical importance in the capitalist world system. The multi-national companies are the most dynamic entities in the world today. They are involved in a broad spectrum of the economy influencing patterns of demand, lifestyles and attitudes in most countries of the world including Australia. The manufacturing industry in Australia has gradually been taken over. This has occurred not only in South Australia but in other parts of Australia. State Governments have been played off one against another by these companies, which pick off State Governments to obtain the best deal for location, opportunity for production, and so on. I refer to one particular instance mentioned by the member for Todd during his contribution to this debate. He referred to the American company called Raytheon, a large American company that has never produced outside the United States. It has had agents throughout the world, but it has always operated from Massachusetts in the United States. The member for Todd made some reference to its move to South Australia, as follows:

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.

That is true, but what happened, of course, is that the South Australian Government was able to offer, and attract Raytheon by providing a number of incentives. It provided a factory and offered a rent concession, and it also provided a number of other incentives which were attractive to this five-billion dollar company. The company manufactures word processors. I understand that one of the deals was that the South Australian Government would give an assurance that a great deal of the equipment produced in South Australia would be purchased by the South Australian Government. So, Raytheon, like many other multi-national companies, held the gun at the head of the South Australian Government, which was in competition with New South Wales. This happens on a variety of occasions. My experi-



ence on the Industries Development Committee confirms that view quite conclusively. Companies play off one State against another. Such companies are not particularly interested in the general result for South Australia; they are interested only in the profit motive for shareholders located outside Australia.

We are becoming technologically dependent on these corporations, and in post-war years there has been a worldwide relocation of manufacturing industry controlled by foreign capital producing for the world market. This shift to more labour-economic countries by transnational corporations has already had a profound effect on many Australian manufacturing industries, and unfortunately the trend will continue. The large corporations have found that, by relocating in low-wage countries, they are increasing profitability on a world basis.

The consequence of that development of local industries of which production, distribution and marketing are done on a world scale makes national and State control virtually impossible. It is not 'our State, mate', as the Premier would lead us to believe. The Australian and South Australian population is being bludgeoned into accepting a future which will see a further dismantling of manufacturing industry. Even in the press this evening we see the problem in the motor car industry, a classic example. The rationalisation of other industries and consequent loss of job opportunities for Australian workers will occur.

It is tragic that the Liberal Party of Australia, which claims to be free enterprise oriented, is not aware that the biggest dangers to free enterprise are the multi-national corporations. The most dynamic sector of the economy in South Australia in the future will be, unfortunately, the mineral industry. This is no doubt a major area of new investment, and it is the recipient of millions of dollars of Government support, notably infra-structure support; in fact, the development of the mineral industry has begun a process of reversing many of the gains achieved in terms of development of a broadly reliant affluent society, and we are seeing a process whereby the Australian community is supporting the export section, which is overwhelmingly foreign controlled.

Most of the mining has taken place in the politically reactionary States of Western Australia and Queensland, and this Government wishes to link South Australia into the mining of our resources. The result will be a further polarisation of Australian society. The more the manufacturing industry of Australia declines, the greater will be our reliance on imports, and the more we will need the energy based exports to be increased, thus providing an even greater distortion of the industrial and social structure of Australia. It is not 'our State, mate'; it is not 'our country, mate'; it belongs to the multi-national corporations.

**Mr Oswald:** Whether we like it or not, we use their capital, don't we?

**Mr SLATER:** We do not have to like it.

**Mr Mathwin:** Ask them whether we would develop without the money.

**Mr SLATER:** That is a question I do not wish to pursue at this stage, but there are opportunities. When it was tried previously, the Federal Labor Government wanted to insist on Australian equity in the multi-national companies, but the mining companies took action which led inevitably, as far as I am concerned, to the destruction of the Whitlam Government. They took that action because they wanted to ensure that they could continue to invest in a country such as Australia and that all we would be left with in the final analysis would be a hole in the ground. If members opposite want to sell off the country they can do so, but I am not of the opinion that we should do it. I believe that, at least

in mining ventures, there should be an Australian equity of 50 per cent or more.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr SLATER:** The opinions expressed by members opposite indicate that they aid and abet these companies in doing what I am complaining about.

**Mr Oswald:** You'd leave everything in the ground, wouldn't you?

**Mr SLATER:** No, I would not, but at least we should be looking at an opportunity for Australians to take part in their own development, not leaving it to the multi-nationals to rip us off. All we will have in the end will be a hole in the ground.

I come now to another matter in which I am sure the member for Morphett will be interested, as will the member for Hanson. The member for Glenelg has never been noted for any public comment on the subject I shall refer to: the Adelaide Airport. There appears to be a great deal of confusion in the minds of Government members on this question. I refer to a question asked of the Premier by the member for Morphett last week relating to the curfew at the airport.

**Mr Mathwin:** Has it been altered?

**Mr SLATER:** No, it has not been altered.

**Mr Oswald:** You are not going to push the rumour further, are you?

**Mr SLATER:** It is not a rumour—that is the point I want to make. The member for Morphett asked the following question of the Premier:

Is the Premier in a position to refute rumours circulating in the western suburbs that it is intended to lift the curfew hours at the Adelaide Airport to coincide with the introduction of new classes of jet traffic?

I shall disregard the comments about the Thebarton council, but the Premier's answer was this:

I am able to refute such rumours. I must congratulate the member for Morphett on the concern he has constantly shown about this matter.

I said, 'What about Heini?', referring to the member for Hanson, who did not believe that it was a rumour. I did not believe it, and shortly I shall say why I did not believe it. I said, 'And me', because I did not believe that it was a rumour. A press report indicating that the member for Hanson is particularly concerned about the Adelaide Airport appeared in *West Side*, under the heading 'M.P. slams move to lift airport curfew.' Similar comments appeared in the *News*. I have reason to know that—

**Mr Mathwin:**—they are going to put silencers on the aircraft!

**Mr SLATER:** The honourable member must be reasonable. The matter of noise at the airport is very important to people living in the western suburbs. The domestic airlines have initiated discussions with the Federal transport officials regarding the curfews at Sydney, Brisbane and Adelaide airports.

**Mr Oswald:** The State Government will not agree with it.

**Mr SLATER:** That may be the case.

**Mr Oswald:** The Premier has said that.

**Mr SLATER:** It is not a rumour. The Premier knew nothing about the subject. The member for Morphett asked a Dorothy Dixier and the Premier was wrongly advised or did not know the answer. There was some confusion and contradiction in the minds of Liberal Party members on this matter. Discussions have taken place between the two major airlines and the Department of Transport on this question.

**Mr Mathwin:** The answer is 'No'.

**Mr SLATER:** The answer at present is 'No', but that is not the end of the matter.

**Mr Oswald:** The end of the matter is that the Premier has said that they will not allow the aircraft in.

**Mr SLATER:** That may be the case, but there will be continued pressure put on the Governments, both Federal and State, to change the curfew hours.

**Mr Oswald:** We are not going to change it.

**Mr SLATER:** The honourable member says that, but continued pressure will be applied, and I will tell honourable members why. T.A.A. has a programme, at a cost of \$300 000 000, for the purchase of the Airbus. Ansett will purchase smaller Boeing aircraft. On order are 12 Boeing 737s, four long-range Boeing 727s, and five wide-bodied Boeing 767s, a new generation of aircraft in production but not available at this time.

The first of the Ansett fleet of the new aircraft, the Boeing 727 LR, has gone into service during the past two weeks. All this means is that competition will step up between the two airlines.

**Mr Mathwin:** That's good.

**Mr SLATER:** Wait on—and schedules will have to be rearranged. The competition will be to attract customers to the wide-bodied aircraft by T.A.A. or the smaller, the claimed quicker and more efficient service by Ansett. There is the airlines agreement which controls Australia's civil aviation. It allows T.A.A. and Ansett to offer the same number of seats on the routes they operate, but they may use whatever aircraft they wish to provide those seats. Now, the market share at present is split at about 50/50 between the two competitors. But, as I have already said, competition is going to toughen so far as Ansett and T.A.A. are concerned with respect to obtaining a greater patronage. The Ansett people are aware of the novelty value of the Airbus and, no doubt, its increased comfort. Historically, in Australia, new aircraft have always generated increased passenger traffic. Ansett will be trying to offset this before that situation becomes entrenched. In addition, I believe that both of the airlines are tinkering with the idea of transcontinental services.

**Mr Oswald:** Tinkering?

**Mr SLATER:** Tinkering—feeling their way with regard to that matter. All of these factors and enticements will not make domestic flights any cheaper. They might, in one way, deflate the prospect of higher charges in the future, but they will certainly create problems. They are already creating problems for Transport Australia, which provides the services to and regulates and controls the civil aviation industry. The airlines, no doubt, will place a heavy burden and pressure on Transport Australia to allow them to gain maximum returns from their huge investments. It is common logic that they are going to try to utilise those aircraft in the best way possible, and in accordance with traffic and scheduling this will mean (and this is not just a rumour, but a fact) that the first feeler has gone out about lifting or waiving the curfew times in Sydney, Brisbane and Adelaide. I do not think that there is any doubt about that, so the Premier was completely wrong in his answer to this House recently. The member for Hanson and I both know that that is the situation that applies in the aircraft industry.

**Mr Mathwin:** They are allowed to apply, but the answer is 'No', and you know that.

**Mr SLATER:** I know that the State Government has responsibilities in this matter, and I am glad that both the Minister of Transport and the Premier have said that there will be no lifting of the curfew.

**Mr Mathwin:** Don't worry about it, then.

**Mr SLATER:** If the honourable member is sensible enough to understand what I am saying—

**Mr Max Brown:** That's where you're making a mistake.

**Mr SLATER:** That is where the honourable member is making a mistake; he is not sensible enough to understand

the point I am getting at, that gradually pressure will be applied through the Federal Department of Transport to the Federal Minister and to State Ministers to encroach gradually on these times—it is happening now.

**Mr Mathwin:** There is no point—

**Mr SLATER:** The member for Hanson knows that on occasions the curfew is waived in certain circumstances.

**Mr Mathwin:** In emergencies.

**Mr SLATER:** In emergencies, yes, but what is going to happen is that gradually this is going to be encroached upon—the airlines are going to pressurise all persons involved, including the Federal and State Ministers.

**Mr Oswald:** We're not weak like you chaps.

**Mr SLATER:** Look—there was an offer at one of the multitudinous discussions which have taken place between the State and Federal Ministers that the Commonwealth wanted to sell us the airport. I have never heard anything so ridiculous in all my life—the Commonwealth wanted to sell us the airport. I do not know how a State Government at this particular time, particularly this State Government, could afford the economics of not only buying the airport but of administering it. First, the Minister of Transport knocked that on the head fairly quickly. He said that we were not interested in buying the airport. However, I noticed a report only a few days ago that he is now interested in running the airport. I do not think that that is a responsibility of State Government, anyway. All honourable members know my attitude to the Adelaide Airport. I believe that it has long outlived its usefulness so far as an airport for modern traffic is concerned.

**Mr Mathwin:** Where would you put it?

**Mr SLATER:** Virginia, Two Wells on the Northern Adelaide Plains. I base that comment on an unpublished report made in mid-1970 stating that the Virginia-Two Wells area was probably the most ideal location for any future airport in South Australia.

**Mr Mathwin:** That's 20 miles out.

**Mr SLATER:** What about Tullamarine in Melbourne? It is an ideal situation, because the trend in any progressive thinking country or State is to locate airports outside of the heavily populated areas, for three obvious reasons—noise, pollution and safety. Those reasons do not appear to be important to members opposite.

**Mr Mathwin:** What's the pollution?

**Mr SLATER:** Every time a plane takes off over Adelaide, tonnes of pollution fall over Adelaide.

*Mr Mathwin interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Russack):** Order! The honourable member for Gilles has the floor.

**Mr SLATER:** Every time an aeroplane takes off at the Adelaide Airport it pours tonnes of pollution over the city of Adelaide. Those are the three important factors in relocating the airport outside of Adelaide. I believe the best and most suitable spot, a fact which is substantiated by this report, is on the Adelaide Plains.

**Mr Evans:** Where would they grow the marihuana if they build an airport at Virginia?

**Mr SLATER:** That is a stupid and facetious question and does not deserve an answer—it just shows how members opposite treat this important question. No doubt the member for Fisher is not affected by the present location of the Adelaide Airport.

**Mr Evans:** They fly over all the time.

**Mr SLATER:** The honourable member may live in the flight path, but he is not so badly affected as are those persons in the Western suburbs. I repeat that the only long-term solution to the whole problem is to relocate the Adelaide Airport outside of the metropolitan area, on the Northern Adelaide Plains. We need to start planning now, because it will take 10 to 12 years, and there are other factors

involved that would benefit the State. First, it would create work for the building industry.

**Mr Mathwin:** You could rebuild Adelaide, I suppose; that would create work.

**Mr SLATER:** We do not need to do that, but we need an international airport for South Australia. Adelaide is the only capital city in Australia which does not have an international airport. We need to realise that, as time goes by, people who travel overseas from South Australia are going to be disadvantaged by having to pay an additional fare and by having to spend additional waiting time. One sometimes must catch a plane to Sydney or Melbourne from Adelaide at 10 to 7 in the morning to catch an international flight at 5 o'clock in the afternoon. That costs an extra day and an extra fare. For a number of reasons, we need an international airport.

**Mr Oswald:** At Manningham?

**Mr SLATER:** Not at Manningham; there is not enough vacant land. Virginia Two Wells is an ideal site. That is not my view, but the view of a committee set up some years ago to determine this matter. I mentioned for the benefit of honourable members opposite that their own State Minister of Transport has at last come around to that way of thinking.

**Mr Oswald:** That is not true.

**Mr SLATER:** It is true, either that or he has been misquoted.

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

**Mr SLATER:** Before the dinner adjournment I indicated that the State Minister of Transport had given his support to the relocation of the Adelaide Airport. That comment was disbelieved by the member for Morphett. For the benefit of the member for Morphett I refer to a press statement headed 'South Australian Government in talks to take over airport', which states:

While the Government was prepared to operate Adelaide Airport, the ultimate aim was for a new international terminal out of the metropolitan area, Mr Wilson said.

I think that confirms the view that I expressed earlier in the debate this evening. The Minister is in the House at the moment and has indicated that that is correct.

**Mr Oswald:** You know that I want an airport built out at Two Wells, and you know that I have wanted it within five years.

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** Why didn't he say so?

**Mr SLATER:** There seems to be some degree of confusion on this particular matter. In the time left available to me I wish to make some comment about tourism in general. The international airport is of extreme importance to the encouragement of international tourism in South Australia. Of course, tourism received a mention in the Governor's Speech. The Governor said:

Tourism is recognised as an important and growing industry in the State. My Government has acknowledged this growth by implementing various new initiatives recommended by a review into the Department of Tourism.

The review referred to was conducted by private consultants, Robert Tonge and Associates, in association with the Public Service Board. Following the report that was presented to the public after the review had taken place, some comments were made by various people in the community, including the Public Service Association and the then Director of Tourism. They were critical of the report and claimed that it had many distortions and inaccuracies. I understand that the report cost \$90 000. I believe it was a waste of the taxpayers' money by a Government that claimed that it would eliminate wasteful expenditure.

One important fact that came through was that the basis of the report was only a critique and a criticism of the Department of Tourism. It did not examine by far the largest section of the travel industry; that is, the private sector. It made little or no comment about the private sector of the travel industry. Had it closely examined the private sector, it may have recognised that that sector does not concentrate on selling tourism in South Australia: quite the contrary. In the main, it concentrates its efforts on the more lucrative aspects of travel overseas. There has been a slight change in that trend, I understand, and I believe we are promoting more holiday activities throughout Australia.

**Mr Mathwin:** You don't want them to advertise.

**Mr SLATER:** I do want them to advertise as far as this State is concerned. I want the private sector of the travel industry to pay greater attention to travel within South Australia. However, the emphasis, unfortunately, has been on international travel and, unfortunately, interstate travel. We want to change that particular emphasis.

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** That emphasis is changing.

**Mr SLATER:** I am glad that the Minister has indicated that that will be the case. However, at this particular time the figures still indicate that we are the Cinderella State as far as tourism is concerned. There are many factors which influence the decision of people to travel to a particular destination. I now refer to a press statement in the *Sunday Mail* of 5 April 1981 headed, 'Bottom of list rating for South Australia'. It states:

South Australia is bottom of the list for international visitors who want to return to Australia.

This is revealed in a survey of international visitors to Australia during 1979-80. The tourists were asked which cities and States they might visit on a return trip.

Of those questioned by the Australian Tourist Commission, only 11.3 per cent said they might come to South Australia. This was the lowest rating of any of the States or Territories.

The second lowest was Tasmania, chosen by 15.1 per cent of those who planned to return.

The top of the repeat parade is Queensland, which the survey says would attract a staggering 38 per cent of visitors who return.

The other States' ratings are New South Wales 14.3 per cent, Victoria 17.3 per cent, Western Australia 27.4 per cent, Northern Territory 19.6 per cent.

And this rejection of South Australia for future trips was in spite of the fact that more of the visitors came here compared to Tasmania and the Northern Territory.

Unfortunately, that is an indication, despite the comments by the Minister of Tourism, that we still have the lowest room occupancy rate of any State in Australia. According to the article I have just referred to, South Australia also has the lowest rate of people returning to this State.

There is no doubt that the tourist industry has potential for considerable expansion in South Australia and that it plays a critical part in any future economic development. Tourism is labour intensive and a means of diversifying the South Australian economy. It also provides a contribution to decentralisation and regional development. Over recent months projects of some importance to tourism have been lost to this State.

I refer particularly to the paddle steamer *Coonawarra*, which has made passenger cruises on the river for many years. I issued a statement in relation to that particular matter and indicated that it was important that we made every effort to ensure that an investigation was made and that we might consider financial assistance to keep the *Coonawarra* in South Australia. However, the Minister of Tourism stated that the Government did not use taxpayers' money to finance private profit-making ventures.

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** That's right.

**Mr SLATER:** I am rather amazed at that particular statement, because from time to time we hear from a Government that quite openly admits to being private

enterprise orientated, and we know from experience with the Industries Development Committee that we assist industry in South Australia from time to time. In the past we have also assisted certain tourist undertakings from time to time.

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** Would you have assisted the *Coonawarra*?

**Mr SLATER:** I do not know the background to the financial aspects of the *Coonawarra*, but I think it was certainly worthy of investigation. That view is shared not only by myself but also by many other people in the community. The Minister or the Government did not offer any particular assistance to the *Coonawarra*.

I believe that situation also applies in relation to another project that we recently lost, and I am referring to Spanish Andalusian horses at Kapunda. Once again, people in the community were disillusioned in relation to this particular project. It was believed that it had potential from a tourist point of view. Once again, I believe that financial assistance was sought but was not forthcoming.

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

**Mr GLAZBROOK (Brighton):** I join with members in supporting this motion for adoption of the Address in Reply. In my remarks this evening I wish to be sure that I explain that my speech on education is not about teachers *per se*, nor about education *per se*, but rather it is about individual instances to which I wish to address myself.

It has been said that what children read, see and hear will greatly influence the way they think and act, and ultimately influence the direction in which the world might progress. The purpose of education has been stated many times and in many ways. However, just recently we were told in the pamphlet *Our schools and their purposes into the eighties* that in South Australia schools aim to help students develop lively inquiring minds, a love of learning, and a willingness to apply effort to worthwhile tasks; the ability to think rationally; the use of the imagination; powers of creative self expression, powers of judgment physical and mental health; a coherent set of personal and social values and a commitment to them; self confidence, a sense of worth and respect and consideration for others; decision making and problem solving skills, an understanding of themselves and their world, competence in intellectual, social and physical skills; and knowledge of skills relevant to adult life and employment. On page 33 the statement continues:

Schools should consult and work with parents, community groups and other organisations in planning and carrying out educational programmes . . . Schools should acknowledge their accountability by consulting the community about their aims and programmes and by informing it about their subsequent decisions and their use of resources for those programmes.

Schools are accountable to their students, parents, the community and the Education Department.

Having this in mind, I wish to explore the impact of the two subjects of the eight areas of the curriculum as stated on pages 20 and 21 of this booklet. The first, 'Health and Personal Development', states:

Studies in health and personal development provide opportunities for students: to develop skills, attitudes and understandings which will promote physical, mental, social and emotional health for themselves; to develop a coherent set of values to which they commit themselves, including honesty, consideration for others, self discipline, acceptance of responsibility, self reliance and initiative . . .

I take this to be a meaning for the development of morals. In the rationale of that statement, we are told:

Education in our system seeks to give people the ability to understand and control their own lives, and the capacity to live a

rich and meaningful life. A sense of self worth, and a knowledge of the factors which contribute to mental and physical health . . .

I find myself asking where these ideals originated and just how they measured up to what was going on in some areas of education within South Australia. Last year a number of constituents came to see me and presented me with some samples of literature which they said appalled them and which they also said had been made available to their children by their schoolteachers. As their Parliamentary representative I saw a responsibility to investigate the complaints and look into this matter to determine the extent, if any, to which such literature may be generally available.

I had hoped to find that, in fact, these were isolated instances. However, after looking into the question for nine months, I found that such literature is more generally available than some people might think. At the same time, I want to stress from the outset that the extent of its availability does not suggest to me in any way that many teachers are involved in its distribution. However, the literature is of such a nature that, where it does exist, the community ought to know about it, and that is my purpose in raising this matter in the House this evening.

This literature expounds principles of health and human relationships that advocate dramatic change to the moral codes of existing and proven philosophies. When such literature is circulated to schoolchildren it becomes obvious that these children are being used as guinea pigs, particularly by those who wish to seek change to the moral codes of behaviour. As a result of information provided to me in the past nine months, I believe that there is a very small minority of so-called child behaviourists and child psychologists who are using children as pawns to further their own philosophies and, I believe, mistaken beliefs.

The situation I have found suggests to me that there are perhaps carefully laid plans deliberately set to trap unsuspecting parents into allowing the future of their children to be shaped into a new society somewhat devoid of traditionally accepted moral codes and where, under the guise of value-free systems, these children are encouraged to choose their own way to go without in fact being offered some other alternatives.

What has really happened is that in some of the instances drawn to my attention, the Judeo-Christian theistic (that is, the god-centred way of life) has been decried and removed, and another, secular humanism, has been put into its place. That is of relevance and reference to life that has been framed and centred on man, anti-Christ if you like. This is reflected in the availability of such courses as M.A.C.O.S. and S.E.M.P.; and reference to such groups as S.E.I.C.U.S., which is the Sex Education Information Council of the United States, which offers further advances on the so-called health subjects and social education.

Those involved in the advocacy of such courses and groups offer their individual beliefs and experiences and proffer their literature by attempting to work through teachers whose experience of life is perhaps somewhat limited. Such teachers are offered a Utopian dream of another world or another place, a better place, in which it is suggested that Christianity or the codes of life based upon the great religions and philosophies of the world are not needed.

Under headings of 'enrichment', 'human relations', 'health', 'social education', and so on, some children (again I stress that it is a small minority, but it is happening) are being subjected to the sex education of a nature which cannot but help to change values on the moral issues. I have been told that some of the so-called educational material being circulated comes from the Women's Educational Resource Centre in Adelaide.

**Mr Lynn Arnold:** Will you read some of it to the House?

**Mr GLAZBROOK:** I will, and I have samples of this material. It is very offensive to me, as I believe it would be offensive to others, including the vast majority of teachers who believe that this sort of thing has no place in the system and certainly not in the schools. Without wishing to be offensive, but because of the necessity to make the House fully aware of the sort of problem that is emerging, I point out that some of the material from which I will quote and which I have collected describes in vulgar terms how girls can be masturbated by boys, the pleasures of bestiality, incest and homosexuality, and how girls can obtain contraceptives and abortions at a very young age.

If honourable members doubt some of the vulgarity of this literature, I am quite prepared to show them examples I have collected, but let me quote but a few of them to demonstrate my concern. I refer first to a library book that I have been told is available in a number of schools, titled *Make it Happy*, written by Jane Cousins. On page 47, under the subtitle 'How you can make her come', the following is stated:

He can use his fingers to bring her to a climax by rubbing her clitoris or the area around it. Some girls like their clitoris to be stroked gently, others prefer hard pressure. But it varies from person to person and from time to time. The best way to find out is to ask or suggest she shows how she likes it.

This passage further states:

She may like a boy to give her a 'come' by stimulating the inside of her vagina—known as 'finger fucking'.

Page 50 of the book describes sex as 'to make love, to fuck, to lay, to screw, to have it off or away, to ball, to poke, to shaft, to sleep with, to go to bed with' and it continues 'a man fucks, a woman gets fucked. He screws, she gets screwed.'

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** I rise on a point of order. I ask you, Mr Speaker, to consider whether members on this side should be subjected by a member on the other side, while making a speech in the Address in Reply to the Governor's Speech, to the exhibitionism that is currently occurring.

**The SPEAKER:** I do not uphold the point of order. Members will be fully appreciative of the fact that any member is responsible for the conduct of a speech in his own manner. So long as it does not impute actions to members opposite or in another place, no action will be taken. Where a member is quoting specifically from a book, the opportunity has always been given to him in the past to do so, and honourable members other than the member for Brighton have viewed such material on other occasions, as the member for Mitcham will attest.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** A further point of order, Mr Speaker. I am sorry, I thought you said 'the member for Mitchell', and I was going to point out that I have never quoted from such material.

**Mr Millhouse:** I do not think I have, either.

**Mr GLAZBROOK:** I find the point of order surprising: the member for Salisbury asked me to give some examples. The same book, on page 64, suggests the following:

It isn't illegal to use or to get contraceptives if she's under age. However, some doctors will not prescribe the pill or the coil to under age girls without parental consent. If this happens, a girl should visit a family planning clinic which will usually prescribe contraceptives to a girl who is having sex no matter what her age.

The book then goes on, at page 86, to suggest what can be done in the case of pregnancy:

If you think your parents are really going to freak out, it might be possible to avoid telling them that you're pregnant. Most city abortion clinics will perform abortions on girls over 14 without parents' consent.

I now turn to a South Australian produced paper which is included in a sex kit called 'Empire times men on men.' On page 1, this paper states:

**Mr Lynn Arnold:** Is this in secondary schools?

**Mr GLAZBROOK:** It is in a sex kit available to teachers. It was stated:

It started out all right—in the scouts we used to take the opportunity of camping together by fucking each other.

On another page, the unnamed author states:

I found that being fucked up the arse was extremely pleasurable. Your arse is a terrifically exciting place for women and men.

As my last source of direct quotations, I refer to a book titled *Sexuality*, which begins with an acknowledgment indicating that this is a publication of an organisation called The Victorian A.U.S. Women's Collective. Page 8 of the publication, subtitled 'From Piglet to Pooh', states:

This was one image—cunts were incongruous, and cunts was a word you would be too embarrassed to use in front of a woman. On the other hand, cunts were so soft they made you gasp the first time your fingers explored one, and warm and moist so that you could not imagine a better place for your prick to be.

Much of the language in these books and other publications refers to boys and girls, to boy scouts and so on. It is obviously directed at those at a young and very vulnerable age. I refer now to a consideration of how this situation has emerged. In 1970, the freedom and authority directive of the then Director of Education handed to all school principals considerable freedom to vary courses, to choose their own resource material and how it would be used in schools. The directive did not say that those schools or the principals should consult and work with parents; neither did it acknowledge accountability. I believe, in fact, that this directive has created problems, particularly in the area of sex education and the curricula, where it has afforded the opportunity to select and use, without any outside control, a variety of resource material, so that individual schools have adopted individual approaches and we seldom find that two schools will teach the same thing. Some principals have delegated all their authority to teachers so that they teach, in effect, without any control or supervision at all in this subject.

While 99 per cent of our teachers are responsible people who do a good job and are to be commended, there are undoubtedly some people in the system who are abusing and exploiting the system, and it is about them that I complain. I believe that, for the same reason of lack of control, a proportion of the teaching materials used in some South Australian schools under the guise of sex education material is too crude and goes far too far. Individual teachers must not be allowed to usurp the role and responsibility of parents to make decisions in these most sensitive areas. The rights of parents to make their own decisions on the appropriateness of actions must be paramount at all times, especially in the area where sex and moral value issues are discussed or taught.

I believe action should be taken now before the murmurs of discontent turn into loud shouts of protest and before irreparable harm is done to our children, and that means the children of members opposite as well. The question that begs to be asked must surely be, 'Do parents have the right to decide whether or not they wish their child to be subjected to material of the type I have referred to and quoted from, or must they have the decision made for them by teachers who of necessity must make a blanket overall decision covering the whole class?'

If we acknowledge that each child is different and develops differently, who has the greater understanding of the individual—the parent or the teacher? If a teacher makes

an overall blanket decision on behalf of the class, what qualification does the teacher have in reference to each child? Usually none! Therefore, the parent can be the only rightful person to decide on issues of this type.

Some schools and teachers correctly uphold that right, and do everything possible to check with parents, and indeed even hold seminars to explain what is being offered in the education and instruction of the child. Regrettably, some of these exercises are not as successful as one would wish, because of either parent disinterest, fear of intimidation, parental trust of the teacher's decision or even blind ignorance of what these subjects mean and include.

If the child of any honourable member came home and said, 'We are doing an enrichment course or a human relations course or a social education course or a social science course,' would the member know what was meant by that terminology? Likewise, if the child said, 'We are studying M.A.C.O.S. or S.E.M.P. or subjects such as the Netsilik Eskimos would members care or know what they are? Would they care?

However, if we remove the veneer of these courses and titles and schools said, 'We are going to teach a new slant on morals, we are going to teach a sexual appreciation and knowledge, a new life experience on which to build a new world; we are questioning your system of morals, mum and dad, to work out our own,' then what would you do or say? So, I ask, why is it necessary to put this cloak of secrecy around these subjects, or is it to hide the real subject under a cloak of respect that will hide the truth from parents? I am reminded that an instrument for accomplishing horticulture might be called a spade. If it is, then why not call it what it is?

I recall to mind a complaint from one mother recently when she claimed that her 12-year-old son had been asked, along with the rest of the mixed class, to write an essay on what masturbation was like. Another claimed that her child was asked to write an essay on how you would kill your father. Recently a father telephoned me to tell me he had taken his son out of a health and human relations course because he felt that his son was far too immature at 13 to cope with the explicit material.

Another mother told me that she had withdrawn her 12-year-old child from a class because 'she still plays with her "Barbie dolls" and is very immature'. A mother related to me a story of how she found three drawings in her 12-year-old son's briefcase. One was of an ovary system, which seemed to be okay. The second was a drawing showing a vagina with two fingers separating the lips, and the third was of a penis inserted into a vagina depicting sexual intercourse.

What shocked this mother more than anything else was that it was so unexpected and, indeed, it was the first she had heard that her son was being taught sex at school. Upon inquiring of her son, she discovered that the lessons were included in a course called 'enrichment', which was in the syllabus at the school. She resolved to meet with the Principal the next morning. When she did she found that the Principal was away on holidays. However, the deputy stated that nothing could be done until the Principal returned in six weeks. The mother withdrew the child from the course.

Apparently the school had been teaching sex for year 8's for about four years, yet no-one seems to have told or asked the parents whether they approved. So much for that school's accountability.

**Mr Lynn Arnold:** What school was it?

**Mr GLAZBROOK:** It happened to be one in your electorate. In Victoria recently one form 1 class was told that those who had not already had sex were sick. There have,

I understand, been many other incidents in Victoria that have been reported as having occurred in the classrooms from boys being asked to demonstrate putting on a condom, intercourse being simulated and, in one case, of intercourse occurring in front of the class between a female teacher and a male student.

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** In Victoria?

**Mr GLAZBROOK:** In Victoria. Boys and girls have been requested to draw the various positions of intercourse, list as many gutter terms as they know for the male and female organs and intercourse, and, in one case, to discuss what sperm tastes like. Oral and anal sex have been included in some other courses. Thank goodness I have not heard of such instances in this State. However, I did hear that in Adelaide one year 8 mixed class had to put up hands who had had sexual relations. Those who did not were told that by next year they would all have their hands up. It is again isolated incidences of individual teachers.

Some members may have heard of the Danish experiment in sex education. Some may have read 'The true state of Denmark—a state of disruption' by Mr Svend Oge Laursen, who is also named as president of a group labelled L.I.B.E.R. (a group trying to fight the indoctrination of children in schools). It states in part:

(1) In 1971 an Act is passed making sex education compulsory—very few parents objected to this as it referred to particular lessons from which a child could be exempted, if desired. (2) Later on, the civil servants in the Ministry of Education conceived the idea of integrating sex education. That means that sex education is incorporated in a great many subjects. In practice it then became impossible for parents to have their children exempted from sex education in the schools, because to do so would have exempted them for the whole year. This gave rise to a spate of protests. Sex education in the schools in Denmark is started not later than the third school year, and is incorporated in the general subjects—mainly Danish, religious instruction, biology (hygiene), history and civics. (3) The Act on Integrated Sex Education was adopted in 1972—the Act banning pornography had been repealed and in the guidelines for sex education, published by the Ministry, the Co-ordinating Curriculum Board hesitatingly permits the use of vulgar terms and five years later we are faced with obscene text-books. Obviously this is a case of legalised, compulsory child pornography by stealth.

What does the Curriculum Development Centre in Canberra say about these human relations courses? I understand that C.D.C. does have some impact on education. In the core curriculum for Australian schools, the C.D.C. publication says:

This curriculum would impose health education and moral reasoning and values upon all students. It advocates that, rather than teach a body of knowledge or a separate course, the contentious areas should be integrated across the curriculum into a variety of subjects.

Quotations from 'Core Curriculum for Australian Schools' (Curriculum Development Centre, Canberra) says, about health education:

The core curriculum needs to give scope to physical, emotional, mental and community health studies, and to provide opportunity for practical applications. Health, in becoming a school subject, may run the risk of being perceived as yet another body of knowledge to be known rather than directly experienced. The health area needs to be approached through a wide range of studies ranging from the sciences of human biology and nutrition to programmes of physical relaxation.

On moral reasoning and action, value and belief systems, it says:

Transformation of moral action from the level of habitual and routine behaviour in childhood to a mature stage of critical analysis and reflective action, requires a systematic, continuing approach through the years of schooling. Whilst the teaching of morality and values, as such, readily lends itself to abuse through indoctrination, its neglect in the curriculum may be regarded as a serious deficiency in some schools. The teaching of morality and values need, and perhaps ought, not to depend on a separate course, but may be incorporated in other areas, and within established subjects and in a wide range of school relationships between students and teachers.



That is a similar line of thinking to the Danish experiment. Again, the individual and questionable sex educators should be given full credit for their inconsistencies, for on one hand they state that, in order to protect the children from learning sex behind the shelter shed, they must teach sex in the classroom. On the other hand, they defend gutter sex language, in recommended reading and discussion, by saying, 'We should not shield our children from reality.' Can parents really believe that sort of questioning? In tracing the story behind this so-called sex teaching revolution, it is necessary to explore certain information about sex education programmes in schools in other countries.

Perhaps I might now turn to the activities of the notorious Sex Information and Education Council of the United States (S.I.E.C.U.S.). Not only have these programmes not helped the problems of disease, illegitimacy and marital instability, but rather they have actually contributed to a worsening situation in these conditions, and have been the means of corrupting and disturbing children receiving too much information at too early an age and at too immature a level.

I shall now quote extracts from an article by Gary Allen which appeared in *American Opinion* in March 1969 and which was reprinted in the Congressional Record. It was entitled 'Who's Behind It'. He explains that the chief torch-bearer for S.I.E.C.U.S. is Dr Mary Calderone, the organisation's Executive Director—referred to by McCall's as the commander-in-chief of 'sex education' forces. Since the commander-in-chief's attitudes must of necessity be reflected in the choice of materials for the S.I.E.C.U.S. programme, we are all requested to subsidise her views, which have come under close scrutiny by concerned parents. Dr Calderone has, for example, often made clear her commitment to the 'new morality'—as old as Sodom and Gomorrah. In speaking to 320 boys at Blair Academy in New Jersey S.I.E.C.U.S. Director Calderone comments: 'What is sex for? It's for fun . . . for wonderful sensation . . . sex is not something you turn off like a faucet. If you do, it's unhealthy.' And, she continued, 'we need new values to establish when and how we should have sexual experiences'.

I wonder what sort of 'new values' she talks about. According to *Look* magazine, when a student asked, 'What is your opinion of pre-marital sex relations among teenagers?' Mrs Calderone snapped back, 'What's yours? No body from on high [presumably she meant God] determines this. You determine it . . . I don't believe . . . the old 'thou shalt nots' apply anymore.' She certainly does not, for in *Seventeen* magazine, the S.I.E.C.U.S. Executive Director claimed, 'sex is not the prerogative of christianity'. And in the *Saturday Evening Post* she was quoted as saying that sexual 'do's and don'ts' cannot be imposed on the young. 'The question goes far beyond "will I go to bed?" and it's one you must answer for yourselves,' she said. 'You boys may know a girl is physically ready, but you have to ask yourselves: "Am I ready to take the responsibility to say, yes, she is ready emotionally and psychologically?"'

Contrary to the views of most child psychoanalysts, Dr Calderone holds that sex education should start in the nursery, around the age of three, and that the child should assimilate such knowledge, along with the correct terminology such as, 'the penis of the father is made to carry the sperm into the mother through the vagina', and that kindergarten teachers should then impart additional clinical details. Dr Lester Kirkendall, Professor of Family Life at Oregon State University, and a member of the S.I.E.C.U.S. Board of Directors, is probably described as the S.I.E.C.U.S. piper. Dr Kirkendall, a prolific author of sex books and magazine articles about every conceivable sexual foible, says that he believes that 'if present trends continue, pre-marital intercourse will almost certainly increase'. What a

statement to make. An article in tonight's paper states, 'Boost needed for sex advice services. Each year more than 40 000 teenagers in Australia fall pregnant.' Such statements make one wonder.

Another founder of S.I.E.C.U.S.—and its longtime Treasurer—is Isadore Rubin. He, too, shares Dr Kirkendall's rejection of patriotism. In addition to his subversive work for S.I.E.C.U.S., Rubin now edits the notorious sexology magazine. Although S.I.E.C.U.S. proclaims that one of its purposes is to counter exploitation of sex, its own officers are involved in the wildest sort of sex exploitation. Rubin's pulpy sexology magazine dwells on sex sensationalism, with lurid pictures of men and women in the most intimate positions.

**Mr Lynn Arnold:** Are you saying that—

**Mr GLAZBROOK:** No, I did not say that was in schools. I am giving a history of some of the people involved in writing articles. In this magazine it presents crass articles dealing with the worst sorts of perversion: examples of features in recent issues include: 'Can humans breed with animals?' and 'Witchcraft and Sex' and 'The First Sadists' and 'Wife Swapping in Naples' *ad nauseam*. In addition, sexology also features film reviews of the latest 'adult movies'. Lester Kirkendall revealed that sexology is currently being revised with a different cover and titles so it can be used in the schools. If members wish to look at the book I quoted from earlier, called *Sexuality*, they would note striking similarities to the type of magazine to which I have just referred, because it deals with story-type sex information in the front and in the back, and in the middle it has inserted the clinical details. So, it adopts the same type of principle.

Dr Lester Kirkendall serves with Isadore Rubin as an editor of sexology magazine. Also on the staff of this pornographic sheet are S.I.E.C.U.S. Directors William Genne, John Money, and Wordell Pomeroy—the author of *Boys and Sex* and *Girls and Sex* and the same person who is reported to have said incest was an enriching and rewarding experience.

**Mr Lynn Arnold:** Is it recommended by the South Australian health education—

**Mr GLAZBROOK:** That book can be found in many school libraries and in many sex education kits. To burden a 'sex education' programme with falderal about morality would, in the opinion of S.I.E.C.U.S., simply muddy the water in teaching children to express their 'sexuality'. According to the S.I.E.C.U.S. study guide, 'sex education must be thought of as being education—not moral indoctrination.' In *Redbook* the qualifications for 'sex education' teachers, she emphatically noted: 'he must not be a moralist.' Though not tolerating moralists, the S.I.E.C.U.S. group of people naturally make no judgments on perversion or anything like that. We do, as I mentioned before, have a model at which we can look for a glimpse of the future. The Scandinavians have had compulsory 'sex education' of the type S.I.E.C.U.S. has advocated for the past two decades.

In fact, Professor Ira Reiss of S.I.E.C.U.S. maintains, 'Where Sweden is today is where we're going to be in 10 years. Sweden has a culture that accepts "permissiveness with affection" standards.' I believe that that was said a number of years ago. Perhaps local citizens in South Australia will want to look at real situations before we decide where we are going. We must look at the consequences of experiences of sex education in Scandinavia before embarking on a S.I.E.C.U.S.-type programme in this country. A third of the brides in Denmark used to go to the altar pregnant. In 20 years the number of brides there aged 15 to 17 had swelled by 400 per cent. One legal and four to five illegal abortions were performed for every 20 births.



In Sweden the increase in venereal disease was described by officials as 'catastrophic'. According to *U.S. News and World Report* of 7 February 1966:

Physicians say that gonorrhea and syphilis are more widespread in Sweden than in any other civilized country in the world. A recent inquiry revealed the startling fact that about half of all boys who had become infected with venereal disease admitted having sexual relations with at least 40 different girls—and 10 per cent said that they had had relations with as many as 200.

Some members may remember the articles in the Australian *National Times* in April of this year, called 'Sex and the Single Life', which rather gave one the impression that Australia was headed in that same direction, if it had not already arrived.

The Swedish education system had been accused by a highly respected group of 140 eminent Swedish doctors and teachers, including the King's physician, that it had produced sex obsession amongst adolescents because, as they had put it, it had bombarded children with sexual instruction for which their immaturity ill fits them, and the result has been an unnatural over-sexualisation of the rising generation. The young had confused instruction in method with encouragement to practice.

That reminds me of some stories that I had read from the United States, said to be the direct result of similar experiences in their programmes. I will quote some of those stories. One youngster hides in his parents' bedroom 'to see if it is true'. A 12-year-old, fresh from his sex instruction class, is caught just in time while attempting to practise on his 4-year-old sister. First-graders try their hand at sex; 20 male students assembled for their examination in sex education, and the 24-year-old teacher never got around to giving it. Two hours later she was found on the floor of her classroom, after each of the 20 had taken their 'exam' on her. Explained one of the rapists, 'We didn't think we did anything wrong. Didn't she spend the whole year telling us how to do it, when to do it, and how much fun it would be?'

What are the real fruits of sex education and the sexual revolution? Dr Melvin Anchell, a physician with 25 years experience in the areas of family practice and psychiatric related medicine, in his book *A second look at sex education* (published in 1972), says, on today's sex education, that it causes irreparable harm to the sexual and mental development of young people; comparing civilised sexuality with the sexuality proposed by sex education shows that each diametrically is opposed to each other. On page 5, he says:

The character and intellectual refinement of civilised communities completely depend upon the curtailment of raw sexual and aggressive energies.

On page 7, Dr Anchell says:

Only by placing restrictions on these inherited instincts have cultured societies emerged from primitive hordes.

Later, on page 15, he says:

The human ability to mate has been amply demonstrated long before the advent of school teachers. Yet, suddenly, in the late 1960s, educational intermeddlers set up classrooms for sex instruction through this nation.

I wonder whether this could be a description of our developing sex education in Australia.

**Mr Lewis:** God forbid!

**Mr GLAZBROOK:** As the honourable member says, 'God forbid.' However it is, we seem to be 10 years behind the United States. Let us look a little further on at what he says. At page 17, one sees the following:

Instead of enhancing the development of sexuality, these courses act to desensitise students to the intimate nature of sexual relationship.

On page 20, he continues:

Proper sexual growth is responsible for developing an individual's character. Analysis reveals that character largely develops during their youth years.

Aside from developing character, we find that suppression is partially responsible for holding in check perverse impulses. It may well be argued that perhaps we would not have so many rapes in our community if we paid attention to this point. On page 21, he says:

Yet, co-educational sex education courses, from kindergarten through to grade 12, are indoctrinations in how to avoid so-called hang-ups regarding all and any aspect of physical sex.

**Mr C. A. Domz** in an article headed 'Doctors Against Pornography', states:

Physicians are treating more and more sick girls, performing more abortions and coping with a pandemic of venereal disease...

From a medical standpoint, there is much to wonder about in a sexual revolution that precipitates so much physical and mental suffering. Dr Anchell also explains that the meddling interferences on the part of educators are the cause of psychological maladjustment, perversions and drug addiction. He says that the drugs L.S.D. and marihuana—

**Mr HEMMINGS:** I rise on a point of order. I understand that the speech which the honourable member is making is written. It has been circulated to the press already, and I understand that under Standing Orders speeches should be delivered, and not from a written speech.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Russack):** I ask the honourable member for Brighton whether he is reading the speech.

**Mr GLAZBROOK:** I have numerous copious notes, as the material to which I am referring has a great number of quotations. I do not wish to present those quotations out of context.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! As the honourable member realises, it is the normal practice of the House that speeches will not be read. If the honourable member is referring to copious notes, he may continue to refer to the notes and speak from them.

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr HEMMINGS:** On a further point of order, I understand that the written speech that the member for Brighton is delivering to this House this evening was circulated to the press before his delivering it. I cannot therefore agree with your ruling, Sir, that it involves copious notes.

**The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy:** Do you want to move a motion to disagree?

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** I ask the honourable member for Napier whether he is disagreeing to my ruling.

**Mr HEMMINGS:** I made the comment in my first point of order that the speech, as being delivered to the House this evening, had been circulated to the press in printed form. It is up there in the press gallery tonight. If the member for Brighton is saying that he is reading from copious notes—

**Mr Mathwin:** You read from full notes all the time, and that's finished now.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The matter that concerns honourable members is what occurs in the Chamber. If the honourable member for Brighton has, as the honourable member says, taken other action concerning his speech, I feel that that is of no concern in this Chamber. I have asked the honourable member for Brighton whether he is reading his speech, and the honourable member has said that he is referring to copious notes. I bring the matter to the attention of the member for Brighton and call on him now to continue his speech in that vein.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** In the 11 years that I have been in this House—

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! Is the honourable member rising on a point of order?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** I am sorry, Sir. I should have thought that that was self-evident. I apologise to you. I have been here for long enough—

*Mr Mathwin interjecting:*

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** For the interest of the member for Glenelg, I have been in this place as long as he has, and I do not need any help from that honourable member.

**Mr Mathwin:** You don't think you do.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Russack):** The honourable member for Mitchell will resume his seat. The debate has proceeded, there has been decorum in the Chamber, and I have now called on the honourable member for Mitchell, who has a point of order. I would ask the honourable member to state that point of order and to ignore interjections in the Chamber; they are out of order. I appeal to honourable members not to interject.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** I have endeavoured to ignore the interjections, but the honourable member concerned was so rude that I momentarily lost my—

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable member for Mitchell to state his point of order.

**Mr Mathwin:** Get on with it.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** I shall put my point of order and ignore the interjections still rudely continuing from the other side of the Chamber. I ask you, Sir, to carefully consider the precedent that you might be setting here tonight, if this kind of speech is to be allowed in this House. I give you notice, Sir, as Acting Speaker, that I will take very careful note of the procedure followed in this Chamber tonight, and that I will follow that precedent to the maximum.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Is the honourable member for Mitchell disagreeing with the Chair?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** In the 11 years we have known one another, Sir, I do not believe that you have ever been in any doubt as to what I am saying to the House. I have indicated to you that I am asking you to make a ruling, carefully—and that may be a little presumptuous, but I want you to know how strongly I feel about the prurient manner in which the information given to the House tonight has been given by the honourable member concerned. What your ruling will achieve is that this will be the procedure in future. I ask you to note that, Sir, because I personally will follow that ruling to the letter in this Chamber in future.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** There is no point of order. In calling on the honourable member for Brighton, let me say that I will watch him very closely. I accept that he will be reading from notes in speaking to the House.

**Mr GLAZBROOK:** Thank you, Sir, and thank you for your protection. It is obvious that people do not want to hear anything further on the progressive attitudes of the progressive people opposite in the social changes that they wrought in this State in the past 10 years.

For some considerable time, social change has been entering into our lives more and more, and it has reached to some magnitude. The emphasis of modern change has occurred not only in the movies and the media, the stage and the arts, but it has also occurred in social legislation prepared by Parliaments. Slowly, the tide of change has crept up on people in the community until they suddenly awoke to find what has happened. They are now concerned, and so they should be. It reminds me of the article written by one Cleon Skousen—

**Mr Trainer:** Not that garbage!

**Mr GLAZBROOK:** Yes. He wrote 25 years ago—

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Brighton has the floor.

**Mr GLAZBROOK:** Thank you, Sir. In a book called *The Naked Communist*, 25 years ago he wrote of 45 different ideas of how the West would crumble. He wanted to say certain things about socialism, and that is probably why members opposite do not want to hear it. Let us consider a few of the things he said. He said, 'Let us take control of the schools, use them as transmission belts for socialism and current Marxist propaganda; let us soften the curriculum, get control of the teachers associations and control of student newspapers; eliminate all good sculpture from the parks and buildings, substitute shapeless, awkward and meaningless forms; eliminate all laws governing obscenity by calling them censorship and a violation of free speech and free press.' He said, 'Break down cultural standards of morality by promoting pornography and obscenity in books, magazines, motion pictures, radio and T.V. Present homosexuality, degeneracy and promiscuity as normal, natural and healthy behaviour. Infiltrate some churches and replace revealed religion with social religion.'

**Mr Trainer:** Are you reading from the *Protocols of Zeon*, too?

**Mr GLAZBROOK:** No. I do not need to. If you have a guilty conscience, you might like to do it later. In looking at some of these aspects we must consider the children of our country and of this State. If you are not concerned about your children, I am concerned about mine.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** On a point of order, Sir, the honourable member should know that he is not entitled to refer to members on this side in that manner, as 'you'. I ask you to correct him.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** I uphold the point of order. It is normal procedure in this Chamber for members to refer to other members as 'the honourable member', and then name the electorate.

**Mr GLAZBROOK:** I was referring to people in general, Sir, and therefore I did not use the singular version. One of the questions which comes to mind and which is posed by this question of sex education is whether or not the Education Department in this State has abdicated responsibility for some of the sex education that goes on in schools. I wonder who is accountable for some of the resource material being used by some schools and some teachers. As I said, I have the greatest respect for the teachers I know, and 99 per cent of them do a worthwhile and excellent job in this area, but a small minority need to be weeded out, need to be controlled.

Some people might ask, if what I have said is occurring is fact and I guess we will know that when parents start speaking up about this subject—what they can possibly do about it. I suggest that they take one of several courses of action. I would say that they should perhaps write to me in confidence or to their local member stating their area of concern. They should perhaps contact the principal and the teachers of each individual school with which they are connected, stating their concern and requesting the permission of the principal and the teachers to look at the resource material and the curriculum involved.

I would suggest that, if they find material which is unsuitable, in their minds, they should write to the Minister of Education. If they find material which perhaps may be of obnoxious or obscene content, they should write perhaps to the Attorney-General.

Another possible course of action would be to write to or contact the president of their school council and have the matter of concern to them raised before that school council for open discussion. It is not until people take action in this regard that we will get to the nitty gritty of the problem. We have only the information which is fed to us. If parents

are to receive the truth, and if members of this House are to receive the truth, that must come from concerned people, the parents, and it is the right of parents to determine what they want their children subjected to in this important area.

If members opposite do not think that this is an important subject, and if they think that morality is not worth fighting for, not worth standing up for, then surely they should not be here. We are here to try to create a better world and a better future for our children. I would suggest that members should pay more attention to the question of morals in this State than they have done in the past.

**Mr MILLHOUSE (Mitcham):** The member for Brighton says that we are here to create a better world, or words to that effect. I am at a complete loss to know how he has furthered that objective by the speech he has made in the last hour. To use the word which I heard the Leader use a moment ago and which one of his members used, that was a most prurient speech, and utterly irrelevant, in my view, to the problems to which this House should be addressing itself.

**Mr Mathwin:** You used the same words about eight years ago when talking about the *Empire Times* from that very place.

**Mr Langley:** The leak has started again.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** I can remember one occasion when the former member for Adelaide used some pretty disgusting language in this House, too, but that does not excuse what we have heard here tonight. If the honourable member simply wanted to draw attention to undesirable sex education being taught in our schools, he could have done so without any of the quotations which he gave to this House and which I, because I was to follow him, was obliged to sit here and listen to. I have no doubt that the honourable member will get some publicity out of this. No doubt that is the real reason why he and his colleagues promoted this speech. Let no one be under any misapprehension. If that speech was written by the member for Brighton (although I doubt it), it certainly was known to some of his colleagues. I am told that a Mr Richard Yeeles, who is the Press Secretary, I believe, of the Deputy Premier, distributed the speech in the press gallery, and I saw a copy of it before dinner tonight. We all knew what was coming, and I am only thankful that some of the worst bits even the member for Brighton omitted when it came to the crunch.

Now, Sir, that was not a good speech, in my estimation, and I hope that it will not be repeated in this House. Members on this side of the House, even if there were none on the other side of the House, wanted to stop the member for Brighton from going on like that, but I am afraid that there was no way of stopping him. Members of the Labor Party did their best—and I was behind them on that—to try to stop him, because he was reading the speech word for word. This euphemism about copious notes we know is a fiction, and it was a fiction this time, too; he was reading the speech word for word. You, Sir, were prepared to take his assurance that it was only notes and nothing else, but it was not. Nevertheless, you took his word. The real reason we wanted to stop him was because of the filthy contents of the speech. I have looked through Erskine May and I am afraid that what we heard here tonight was so bad—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** —that Erskine May never contemplated such stuff being used in the House.

**Honourable members:** Hear, hear!

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! I ask honourable members to show decorum in keeping with this Chamber and

ask them, please, not to interject while the honourable member is speaking.

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** I was not aware of any interjections, except your own. I do not know why you stopped me.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! I hope that the honourable member is not reflecting on the Chair. There were audible comments being passed from side to side, so I make no apology.

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** Mr Acting Speaker, *Hansard* will show tomorrow whether there were any interjections or not, I suppose. I do not propose to say anything more about the speech of the member for Brighton.

I propose now to get on with my own speech which is, members may be pleased to hear, or disappointed to hear, on an entirely different subject. This debate gives me an opportunity to canvass certain matters which, under Standing Orders, until now I have not been able to canvass because they have been *sub judice*. I take my text, if I need a text for what I am going to say, from page 5 of the Governor's Speech, paragraph 21, in which he reports that two Government departments, the Department for the Environment and the Department of Urban and Regional Affairs, were amalgamated. I want to say something about the Department for the Environment and some of those who have been officers in it.

I begin by saying that the longer I have been in this place the less regard I have had for public servants as a group. No doubt many of them are very decent, honourable, hard-working people and have good intentions but, by gum, the disasters and injustices which are perpetrated by public servants in the name of government are legion, and that of itself is a very good argument in favour of small government. What I am going to recount is, I hope, a sufficient confirmation of what I have said, and sufficient justification for the low opinion in which I hold many public servants. The Department of Environment and Conservation was formed in 1972. In 1973, the then Premier, Mr Dunstan, in his policy speech, boasted about it and said:

South Australia today leads the nation in town and regional planning and in the protection of the environment. We will continue to lead because we know how much there is to do and are prepared to do it.

Those were brave words. A number of us felt that all was not well in the Department of Environment and Conservation and in 1977, if not on other occasions, I raised in this House matters concerning the activities of officers and the way in which they were treating people who were interested in the fauna of this State. I had a slight passage of arms in November 1977 with the then Deputy Premier and Minister of Environment and Conservation, Mr Corcoran, the member for Hartley, because I took up the cause of a Mr Darrell Levi who was interested in reptiles, kept reptiles, and who had been prosecuted by the department. I say no more about those matters.

In January 1979, a Mr Bertram Field came to see me. I was on holidays at the time, and he came to see me at Moana at our holiday house. He told me a story I could hardly believe at the time. It has led to a number of events which have had some publicity. I propose to go into those events by using the opening which I had prepared for the hearing in the Supreme Court of his action for damages against the State of South Australia. I can assure you, Mr Acting Speaker, that these are in fact merely notes and that I will not be reading word for word from my opening. This is what I was ready to say, but the Crown settled the matter within minutes of my having to say it: The defendant is a man of 67. He was a mechanic by trade, but is now retired. He has been in poor health in recent years and has had a number of operations. He is an aged pensioner. He was previously on an invalid pension, which was first

granted in June 1973. Practically all of his life he has been interested in and has kept birds as a hobby. He had a crash repair at Barmera. For many years he lived up the river. There he knew a man called Pollard who was also keen on birds. Between 1970 and 1977, he lived at McLaren Vale; he now lives at Christies Beach. In 1973, Field was working for his brother at a motor garage at Kings Park. There he was approached by Pollard who said he had joined the National Parks and Wildlife Service. There were a number of meetings and the plaintiff, Field, was introduced to a man called Brian Eves, who was said to be the Chief Inspector of the National Parks and Wildlife Service.

It was suggested by Pollard and Eves to the plaintiff that he should help the service by trapping birds and selling them to illegal operators engaged in the smuggling of birds within and outside Australia. They told him the aim of the exercise was to catch Mr Big, the person believed to control such illegal operations.

I pause here to say that the traffic in Australian birds is and has been for a number of years very big business indeed. In my comments I would have further stated that at first Field refused but Eves and Pollard kept at him and, after discussion with members of his family, he agreed. He is a poor man and was attracted by the rewards offered him. These conversations took place while he was living at McLaren Vale, but now he has left there and is at Christies Beach. He owed about \$18 000 on his house and he was anxious to have money to keep up the quite heavy monthly payments.

The arrangement he made with Pollard and Eves, and which was known to a man named Lyons, who at the time was the Director of the service, was that he would have his expenses, one-third of all fines imposed on wrongdoers convicted as a result of his efforts, and \$10 000 when the job was finished. He was also promised by these people the best collection of birds in Australia.

In the meantime, he was to keep the money he obtained by the sale of birds which he trapped. He trapped and sold only at the direction of officers of the department, and he kept them informed all the time of what he was doing. He was told that in this way the service would track the birds which Field caught to Mr Big, and he estimated that he was many thousands of dollars out of pocket for his expenses in trying to do so.

Officers of the Commonwealth Department of Customs were also part of the arrangement and for about 12 months, from January 1974, a man known as Peter Hedges (we now know his real name is Harris) lived with Field and was passed off as his nephew. He was both a bodyguard and assistant. It is believed that Harris was working in the Customs Department as a narcotics agent.

Early in 1977 the plaintiff met two other customs officers, Odell and Turrell, and by arrangement between the officers of the National Parks and Wildlife Service and the Customs Department he was told that these men, Odell and Turrell, would give him directions as to the trapping and disposal of birds. He was to report directly to them as well as to Eves. There may have been other officers in the service privy to these arrangements, and one of them was a man called Trevor Guess.

The arrangements continued to August 1978, when Guess and a man named Harrington came to the plaintiff's house and seized a number of his birds. By that time there had been changes of postings in the Department for the Environment. I then would have gone on to say that he had never been paid anything for the work he had done. I would have then set out the evidence that was to be given and would have said that a number of dummy permits were issued to Field by Eves and they were to be produced. I have them here, and one was in the name of a man called

Bavistock, who was apparently supposed to be Dr P. R. Bavistock, of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science.

From the time Harris or Hedges came to live with Field the latter kept a diary of his activities in this regard. Some volumes of it disappeared from his house after a visit there by Odell, Turrell, Eves and Pollard, but he still had others and he was to refer to them. Early in August 1978 it was announced that Lyons had resigned as Director of the service. This caused the plaintiff to wonder whether his arrangement was to continue. Therefore, he got in touch with Lyons by telephone and arranged a rendezvous in order to talk to him somewhere out near Victoria Park Racecourse.

This was not the first time Field had met Lyons at a rather unusual place. They had met at the cross on the top of Tapleys Hill. To protect his own interests the plaintiff had concealed on his person a tape recorder and he had recorded his telephone conversation with Lyons. He also recorded the subsequent conversation at Victoria Park. For the same reason he later recorded other conversations with Eves, Odell, Turrell and others.

I was proposing to invite the court to listen to the tapes and to see transcripts of them. That is all I need to read for my opening. It is enough to set the scene. The fact is that this man was used for many years as an undercover agent, by both the Department for the Environment and the Commonwealth Customs Department. The idea, it was told to him, was to trace the path by which birds were being smuggled out of Australia at great profit to the smugglers. I had, of course, taken a statement for Field, so that he could give his evidence, and I propose to quote a few sentences from part of that statement to show those who were in fact involved in giving him instructions and who knew what was going on. The statement includes this:

Bob Lyons who was the Director of the department, but I only dealt with him on a few occasions. I know that he was aware that I was an undercover operative of the department. I first met him at Eves' place, some time in 1975. I discussed what I was doing on a particular job. We went to the back of Tatachilla. At different times in the office I saw him and at Tapleys Hill at the end of 1977.

Brian Eves was the chief inspector of the department. He was the person who recruited me and who gave me most of my directions as to whom I would report. During 1974 I was directed that I was to report only to Eves or Lyons. Bert Pollard was another inspector in the department, but in 1974 I was directed that I was no longer to report information to him.

Trevor Guess was an officer in the department and, whilst I did not report to him, I believed that he knew that I was an undercover operative. He was Bert Pollard's off-side. He'd come to my place at McLaren Vale at least twice with Pollard. He would have known this by being present at conversations between Pollard and myself in 1974 and 1975.

He refers to a conversation concerning red-tailed black cockatoos and states:

The following people from the Commonwealth Department of Customs knew about my involvement as an under-cover person. Jeff Morgan from Canberra and another man whose Christian name only is known to me, this being Doug. Later on in 1977 Odell and Turrell became aware of my status. Its hazy when I met them—end of 1976 or in 1977. They came and saw me at home. At this time, whatever I was reporting back to Eves, I would also be reporting back to Customs. Customs also supplied to me my so-called nephew, Peter Hedges, who acted as my bodyguard and assistant. He lived with me for approximately 12 months beginning on 14 January 1974.

That is enough from the statements that I took. A lady whose name I will not mention but whom I trust implicitly also took a statement and had it taped from Mr Field. I have a transcript of it here and I propose to quote a few paragraphs from that transcript. First, on page 4 of the transcript, when asked the reason for all this, he stated, as follows:

The whole reason for this was to get into where the big boss was, that was putting the stuff out of the country. Right throughout the whole of the time, Peter and I moved about like this, well, we did right through 1974. Peter eventually went back to his job. He was a Narcotics agent actually and I've carried on with the same undercover work ever since by myself.

Later, at page 8, he is asked about why he was apprehended by Guess and Harrington, why they came down to his place and seized the birds. He replied:

This is something I'm not sure of, but, since going over things, I feel that maybe I was getting too close to a particular party, a Terry Little, in Canberra.

This man Little's name comes up again and again. I do not know whether it is a true name, whether the man exists, whether it is an alias, or what it is, but certainly that is the name that Field believes is the name of a man in Canberra. The transcript continues:

Female: Now who is Terry Little, what job does he do?

Field: This is Terry Little, he's an A.C.T. Policeman in Canberra. I know that he's been in tow with Odell and an ex-dealer, Peter Scott Gardner. I have Gardner on tape having plenty to say about the dealings and that he had with Odell and Terry Little.

He goes on a little later:

I have a tape where Odell was asking me when are you going down the South-East. I had to go down the South-East to trap long billed corellas and these were to be taken over to Terry Little at Canberra. Odell asked me 'When are you going to get these corellas' and I told him 'Not this week but I'm going next week'.

I went down to get them. I went on the Thursday, nobody tailed me, nobody tails me wherever I go. The next morning, I'd come back that same night, the Thursday night, and I hadn't done any trapping and I put the nets down ready and put seeds into it. No birds there to be got at the time. The next morning, the Friday morning, Trevor Guess and Graeme Harrington came down to my place.

He said later on tape that he had a larger order to fill for Terry Little. That is part of the tape. There are a couple of other bits that I will quote from. Page 10 of the transcript states:

Field: ... anyway, the way I see the business of me being knocked off is that I was getting a bit too close to Terry Little. This is hypothetical—Odell said, 'Field's gone down trapping', because he asked me when I was going prior to that, this, I may be way off the mark on this but I cannot understand why out of the blue Trevor Guess and Harrington came and see me.

Female: Can I interject at this point and say that had you just prior to going to the South-East been trapping any Adelaide Rosellas in the Adelaide Hills?

Field: That's right, yes.

Female: You had been?

Field: And at Odell's direction.

He goes on a little further:

... what was going on was all the birds that I got were to be sold to where they would eventually direct the powers to be onto where they went and how if they were going out of the country. Right throughout the whole operation, any birds I trapped and sold I did retain the money, but this was a part to defray and cost of running around—

This is the last piece that I want to quote from in this statement, as follows:

Field: ... that was going to be the lead in to what was going on, and like I say, I was just getting onto it after all this time. Now those Adelaide Rosellas were trapped for that specific reason and I did sell some around here to cover my expenses and they were in possession of that fact, as a matter of fact, this is Odell I think, started to get a bit edgy because I'd sold some to this Peter Gardner and it was how I come to get to know about Terry Little.

Female: So in other words, you are being prosecuted for trapping and selling birds that were trapped and sold with the express permission of customs officer Bill Odell?

Field: That's right, that's correct.

There is one other reference that I want to get in, if I can. At page 18, Field said:

Terry Little could be tangled up with anything. The whole thing with Terry Little that was so frustrating to me is the fact that after all the years I had been doing it and I get right on to the verge of where things are happening and I get knocked off. I know nothing about Terry Little, other than that he is a policeman in Canberra,

that he was going to take the birds that I got and I was to deliver them over there.

It may be difficult, as I read these extracts, to follow precisely what was happening, but the fact is that for five or six years this man was trapping these birds, known to officers of the Department for the Environment. He believed he was just getting to Mr Big when he was stopped by two officers of the department who came down to his place and seized his birds.

When, as the papers show, he asked them to telephone Odell, the Customs man, to reassure them—Guess and Harrington—that he was in the clear, Odell would not know him and disavowed him altogether. That was the end of that. I have mentioned that this man was sensible enough to tape-record a number of conversations; in fact, he tape-recorded 17 conversations with different people. One was a conversation on the telephone with Lyons and one when he met him at Victoria Park on 4 August 1978; five conversations with Eves, three in August and two in October 1978 and eight conversations with Odell and Turrell.

Mr Bannon: They must have been illegal tape recordings.

Mr MILLHOUSE: No, they are not. If the Leader looked at the Listening Devices Act (and he has a law degree and should know something about this) it is perfectly proper and this Parliament enacted that it is perfectly proper to tape conversations in which one is participating if it is in self-protection or in the public interest. The Leader ought to look at the Act, and I think it is section 6.

He taped eight conversations with Odell and Turrell, two in August, five in September, and one in October. He taped one with Odell alone on 28 August, and one with Peter Scott-Gardner, the dealer, on 17 September 1978. It would be tedious to try to go through all these tapes and I could not possibly do it even if I read full tilt.

I propose to read out one or two extracts from these tapes. The first is the tape with Lyons at Victoria Park on 4 August. This is what was said:

Lyons: Yeh. Bert: And Bill Odell, he comes up and see me from time to time, but now like he wants me to go away. Lyons: Yeh. Bert: Okay get some stuff to quite a few who've. Lyons: Yeh. Bert: Been, you know Lyons: Mmm. Bert: Nosing round they've been down. Lyons: Yeh. Bert: The hospital. Lyons: Yeh. Bert: Well now that you're out of there, I won't be able to get any cover from you anymore, I take it that way anyway. Lyons: Well I'm not involved in it anymore Bert. Bert: No well, well that's just it. Lyons: Yeh. Bert: Is, er, I've got a few Adelaides' now you know. Lyons: Yes. Bert: I've been trapping a few Adelaides er, more or less to get some excess, cause he wants me to go to the territory. Lyons: Yes.

The whole of the tape shows beyond a shadow of doubt that Lyons knew everything that Field had been doing, and acquiesced in it. There can be no doubt whatever. Even reading out those few passages shows it. Another passage from that same conversation is as follows:

Lyons: And who's after them at the moment. Bert: Rutte wants them. Lyons: Where the hell does Rutte want to send them. Bert: Well he'd be putting them out of the country but I don't know who he's putting them out with. Lyons: Hmm.

That is the conversation with Lyons, and there are other passages, as I have said, to the same effect.

I now turn to one of the conversations with Eves. This conversation took place on the next day, 5 August, at Eves' house at Blewett Springs. Eves says that by that time he had been pushed out of the department, too. The transcript of the tape continues:

I'm waiting to go back now that Lyons has gone. Bert: Oh are ya. Eves: Yeh. Bert: Oh yeh. Eves: But er ah well (both talk together). Eves: But ah I want to go back now I wouldn't go back with him there, oh no he did the dirty on me that bloke. Bert: Ah well I wondered about that. Eves: Ah he's a (beep) and I mean that in no uncertain terms.

There is no doubt from that what Eves thought of Lyons. It has been left out by the typist. On the next page he says a few things about Harrington and states that, 'He is a

pretty vindictive sort of bloke', 'a real bully boy', and so on. I need not go on with that. These tapes show beyond a shadow of doubt that all these National Park and Wildlife Services officers knew what was going on, aided and abetted it, and did everything they could over a number of years to encourage Field to make these trips and to trap these birds, even though it was contrary to the law to do so.

I now refer to the tapes, because they are significant and nothing has yet been said publicly about this. They are tapes of conversations with Odell and Turrell, the customs officers. This conversation took place at Field's house when the officers went to see him on 17 August. Field stated:

I said, I'm going away soon and I yer know like, I'm doin things with Bill now.

That is a reference to Bill Odell. It continued:

He said, yeh, and I said, 'Well, I look to Bill to get me off the hook if I get caught,' and he said, 'Well yeh that's right,' so I thought well I'm glad I seen ya.

And so it goes on. It is pretty hard to get any sense from the reading of the tape conversations.

**Mr Bannon:** They sound like illiterates.

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** Indeed, that is one of the problems. Mr Field is not a well-educated man. Some of the conversations sound as though he is illiterate. Odell and Turrell, the two customs officers, talked to Field and comforted him on a number of occasions after the birds had been seized. Reading these conversations, there can be no doubt whatever that they were in it up to their necks, just as the officers of the National Parks and Wildlife Service were in it up to their necks. It beats me how two Governments could have allowed this to go on—the State Government and the Commonwealth Government—over so long a period and how, even now, no-one has been punished for what has happened. I will come to that in a moment. I will not attempt to read out the extracts from the tape of Odell and Turrell but, because the matter is important, I will quote from the tape of Gardner, the bird dealer. At his pet shop on 7 September 1978 (they got into his motor car to have a conversation), Gardner said:

Oh get in the car and I'll talk to ya, (getting in car) Bill come, see what happened, the bloke from Canberra rung me up last week right? Bert: This is er Gardner: Terry Little. Bert: Terry Li yeh. Gardner: an he rings me up an he says to me last week. Somebody in South Australia has got a big mouth, I said oh yeh why? What's the matter? He said someone, he said I've got a mate in the customs who's told me, that somebody's coming over to er to Canberra with some birds for me.

Indeed, that was just what Field had planned to do on their instructions. It was further stated:

I said oh yeh, I said I don't know nothin about that, so I said what's that. What's it National Parks, oh he said oh it's nothing to do with the National Parks, it's to do with the customs. So I said well oh yeh, so I left it at that.

Something was then said about Harrington, and Gardner further said:

But Bill said to me that he was frightened that er Terry Little, he said to me, get on the phone to Terry Little and say to Terry Little. Did you knock, did you dob Bert in to the National Parks? Fine, I said no he wouldn't, he said say that to him anyway, he said because Terry Little, although he's a copper, and although I've sent him all the birds, I sent him, I sent a no licence, and he sends me birds no licence, I'll get him covered. He said that he double deals. Field: Who? Bill reckons he double deals? Gardner: That's what he said he does, you know.

There is no doubt that Gardner in that tape absolutely implicated this man Little, whoever he may be—the man in Canberra. Mr Field came to me first because, to add insult to injury, not only had his birds been seized but also he was prosecuted for offences under the National Parks and Wildlife Act. I advised him to plead not guilty.

I wondered why in the couple of weeks before the hearing (which was to be at Christies Beach) a few suggestions were made by the prosecution that, perhaps if we did not

ask for costs, they would not go on with it. I told him that I thought we should fight it, and we were prepared to fight it. When we arrived at the court that morning, the Crown said, 'Oh no, we've decided not to go on with this.' I then asked the magistrate, when he came in, for costs and I obtained an order for \$1 000 for costs against the Crown, because it was not prepared to go on with the prosecution of Field.

**The Hon. D. J. Hoggood:** What was the date of that hearing?

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** It was about the middle of 1979—about June, I think. That leads to two things: first, there was some publicity and it was announced by the then Minister (I think Mr Corcoran, the member for Hartley, was the Minister at that time) that there would be a police inquiry into the activities that had led to this sort of thing happening. There was an inquiry, and it went on for months and months. First, we were told that five police officers were involved, then the number swelled to eight, and Commonwealth police were in it as well. At the same time, once the prosecution was out of the way, Mr Field began his own proceedings against the State of South Australia for damages, because not only had he been treated as he had been but also not one cent had been paid to him by the State to honour the promises that had been made to him with the authority of Lyons, who was the Director of the service.

What happened then is well known. There was the inquiry by police officers, which led to the arrest of four men—Lyons, Eves, and two other customs officers, Harris (the man who lived with Field for 12 months and who, so far as I can tell, was only doing his duty anyway) and Lattner. They were charged with conspiracy. I have a copy of the opening that was given in the Magistrate's Court. Apparently, the Crown could not even find enough evidence to sustain the charges after all the inquiries and investigations that had been done. The charges were dropped after three days of hearing.

At the same time, we pressed on with our action for damages and that, of course, as these things do, went on over many months. The Crown made a number of offers of settlement ranging from \$27 000 to the final figure of \$60 000 plus our costs, as well as an indemnity from prosecution and birds to replace those that had been seized. That is the sorry tale, and most of it is public up to that stage. It beats me how any group of people could so callously use up an old man in the way in which Mr Field was used up over that period from 1973 when he was first approached to 1978 when, after there were changes in the department, the arrangements came to an end and no-one wanted to know him any more. They were going to prosecute him. That was the most callous conduct imaginable. Then, to go on and prosecute him added to the scandal, in my view.

A number of questions are unanswered in all this. I have mentioned tonight the implication of Odell and Turrell, two customs officers: I have mentioned the name of Terry Little, who is apparently a man in the Australian Capital Territory and is said to be a policeman whom Field suspected was the man he was about to catch.

**Mr Bannon:** Why don't you inquire as to whether he does or did exist?

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** I hope there will be an inquiry now. What inquiry does the Leader of the Opposition think I could or should have made? I certainly did not propose to call him as a witness, but it might be that the Crown would have called him as a witness—I do not know. Those people I have named tonight I believe to be implicated in this matter, and there are other people whose names are mentioned on those tapes that I have not already mentioned tonight. There are a number of questions that I want to



ask. The Leader of the Opposition is listening quite closely to what I am saying. Governments on both sides of the fence are implicated in this matter.

It started during the time when Mr Dunstan was Premier and partly when Mr Corcoran, the member for Hartley, was the Minister for Conservation. It continued when Mr Corcoran became Premier and went on into the time of the present Government, because the action which we took for damages (when I say 'we' I am identifying myself with Mr Field) came to a head during the time of the present Government.

All sorts of excuses were used as to why there had to be a settlement. In my view there are two real reasons why the matter had to be settled. First, we had a good case at law for damages and, secondly, the Government, advised by the same people who advised the Labor Government before it, did not want all this to come out as it would have come out in court. It had to settle eventually and it did settle, paying Mr Field almost the precise amount that he had claimed in his writ and statement of claim. Those are the facts.

I ask some questions and I believe that they should be answered. This is the first opportunity that I have had to come to them. Why, if the whole idea of getting Field into this was to trace the path that the birds took out of this country, was there so little result from it? All that the Crown would admit before we got to court was the prosecution of one man—a man called Happy Walker. It offered us, some months before the hearing, \$1 000 which it said was a third of the fines that had been levied on him. Why was there not more result from what Field was doing if it was all above board? If there were going to be no results, why did it let Field go on for five years, as both the National Parks and Wildlife Service and the Customs Department did?

Those questions are unanswered but what is known is that Field, over that time, trapped birds for which he believed he got \$12 000 to \$15 000 when he sold them to the dealers, with the knowledge of the officers in the department that I have mentioned. The Crown claimed that he got \$28 000 for the birds he trapped. When we remember that at the other end of the scale, retail sales, after the birds have been exported, the price multiplies by about 40 or 60, one sees that this man trapped birds that would have been sold and someone would have got probably about \$1 000 000. Where did they go and who got that money? We do not know. It has never been explained.

After the inquiry that was made, nothing was said at all. It was said in the dear old *Advertiser*, in its usual sententious way when Field's claim was settled, that that was the end of the matter and it would seem wise for the Government to have paid up. What did the inquiry lead to? Did it really lead to nothing after all that time other than the anti-climax of the prosecution of those four blokes and the subsequent dropping of charges? These questions are completely unanswered.

Why are those officers still in the department? Lyons was pushed sideways into the Woods and Forests Department and he is still there. He had been the Director of the service. Eves has retired on grounds of invalidity, having gone to the Coast Protection Board for sometime before he retired. Guess is still in the department and in fact he swore the answers to the interrogatories over the questions which we asked before the hearing and which had to be answered on oath. Harrington is still there, and I am not sure what has happened to Pollard. None of these people has been punished for anything he did—not one of them. As far as I know, none of these men in Customs have been dealt with in any way. Odell and Turrell (the men here in South Australia) were obviously hand in glove with the officers of

our department. I find it very difficult to see any innocent explanation for all this, and I believe that we should now go into these questions and find out the answers to them.

One cannot trap as many birds as Field trapped over the years and put them through dealers and then not have them show up at all on the market, unless they have gone out of the country. They must have gone out of the country, and there must have been a tremendous profit in it for someone or some group of people. We ought to find out about that, as it involves not only South Australia. I have mentioned the man in Canberra. There are shadowy suggestions about ships and aeroplanes leaving from Queensland, going to New Guinea and Indonesia with the birds and coming back with drugs in exchange. This is very big business and it is a despicable trade both ways. It should not be swept under the carpet as it has been so far. Everybody is saying that is the end of it, as Mr Field has been paid his money. There is far more to it than that.

One wonders whether any other people were recruited, as Field was recruited to do this sort of work and, if so, what happened to them. I have mentioned Darrel Levy—the man with the reptiles. He undoubtedly was recruited in that way to trap reptiles, and so on. He was not in as good a position as Field to defend himself. Has there been anybody else besides them? I do not know and we all ought to know. The matter should be brought out into the open and explanations should be given.

When we settled the action a statement was prepared by the Attorney-General and by the Minister for the Environment. They must have known that it was not true, but they stated in part:

It appears Mr Field had carried out this work after a former officer of the division had promised that he would receive certain payments and benefits. However, the officer did not have the authority to make all the promises.

They knew that was not right because Guess, when he swore the answers to the interrogatories, implicated not one officer—he implicated Lyons, Eves, Pollard, Guess himself and, as it was put there, agents of the Commonwealth Customs Department. Yet we have Ministers trying to excuse the payment by saying that one officer had known about it and he did not have the authority. If the Director of the service does not have the authority, one wonders who does. If he did not have the authority why has he, or those down the line who did this, not been punished for acting beyond their authority? The Minister stated:

It is obvious that there was not proper supervision of officers and the general administration was very poor. Hence, the whole operation got completely out of control.

So it did get completely out of control. But why has something not been done about it? It was known. They went on to say that it was a very wrong thing to make this arrangement to pay fines and so on. It was known that that was being done. There was a line in the Estimates for the payout of rewards in this way. I looked it up. It was there every year from about 1973. I have seen a minute which Lyons wrote and from which that line originated. Members of the Liberal Opposition knew as well as Government members that it was going on, but not a word was ever said at the time.

These two Ministers tried to explain away the settlement, but they have done nothing. Nor has this Government done anything to repair and remedy the situation within the Public Service which this must disclose. There is nothing more that I can say about it. I hope that I have now been able to do something to assist in bringing the matter out into the open. I hope it may lead to some result. I am sorry that when I started to read those transcripts I got into such a mess—I had not realised how difficult they were to read. However, any member is quite welcome to look at any of



the 16 or 17 transcripts which I have, which are transcripts of conversations with officers of the State Public Service, with officers of the Commonwealth Public Service, with that bird dealer, Gardner, which show beyond doubt that everyone knew what was going on, that it was common knowledge that it was accepted what was going on. There can be no answer, no suggestion whatever that Bert Field was lying or that what he said was not accurate, yet he was the one who suffered for so long. He was the one who was going to be denied anything at all for the work he had done. As I said, it was callous, and in my view it was dishonest. It reflects very badly on one part of the Public Service at least, and it reflects very badly on Ministers in the Dunstan Government, in the Corcoran Government, and in the Tonkin Government, that this has been allowed to go on and nothing has been done to clear it up. Well, I hope that now something will be done to clear it up.

**Mr PLUNKETT (Peake):** Without any disrespect to the Governor, I suggest that the Speech that was prepared for him would have been better if it had been given by the Premier, as I would not accept many of the remarks in it as being the Governor's opinions. I take this opportunity to speak on four topics: the South Australian Housing Trust, the disabled—some individual problems, Adelaide Airport and rail and tourism in South Australia. South Australian Housing Trust applications for 1980-81 to date record 11 500. This is 1 250 more than last year's record. There are more than 20 000 people on the trust's waiting list for rental accommodation. These applications have increased so dramatically in number owing to State and Federal Government incompetence. Rises in interest rates, the disbanding of the South Australian Land Commission, the stopping of price control, incentives to private developers, who charge exorbitant prices for land, are forcing people to apply to the trust for accommodation. Working-class people who would otherwise be able to afford to purchase their dream home are forced out of that possibility by these huge rises, adding to the long Housing Trust lists.

People are forced to pay market rentals because the waiting list is so great. They cannot afford the high market prices and are forced into substandard housing where they are asked to pay \$45 to \$65 a week for rent, plus a bond for gas of \$35. In some cases they have no conveniences, no running water and no gas or electricity. I refer to some of the people who have been forced into squatting in poor housing conditions. I know of some cases where the Highways Department, which owns some of these premises, has filled in the toilet bowls, hand wash basins and baths with concrete. The main reason for this is so that the Highways Department can always claim that these places do not come up to the health requirements. We saw a good example of the lack of housing prior to Princess Alexandra's visit to South Australia when hundreds of unemployed youths erected tents in Victoria Square, to some great concern to the Government.

The Federal Government must increase grants to the State for housing. In 1974-75, 3.9 per cent of the total Budget outlay went to housing. In 1981-82, 1 per cent has been allocated. This is a disgrace. In real terms, with inflation eroding this amount, the State will achieve nothing—in fact, we will end up owing money to the Federal Government. Our esteemed State Government with its many promises not kept! Where are the 50 homes promised for the homeless youth following the tent city protest? Fifty homes were to be made available—not in addition to homes already owned by the trust. These 50 homes were to come from the trust's already bursting allocation. Nothing was done about them, and this is one aspect in respect of which I disagree with the Governor's Speech. About 4 000 home-

less young people need to be housed. Liberal apathy is causing such suffering. The Minister's indifference is obvious and apparent. The Liberal Government has had to curb the 200 annually built houses for the trust. Welfare housing suffers an additional 25 houses loss annually. The Government should not be so complacent and apathetic to the needs in the housing sector. Our Housing Trust is no longer self-supporting, no longer able to assist trust home buyers with lower interest finance. The State Liberal Government promises schemes to assist, but nothing eventuates. Funding in real terms has been eroded. Accommodation for the growing number of homeless is not being created to fill the fast growing need. The waiting in the western region is now up to three years.

In the electorate of Peake, trust-constructed rental accommodation, houses and units, total a mere 508. One hundred and sixty-six houses have been purchased in the area for rental—out of a total of almost 8 500 residences a meagre 674 Housing Trust places of accommodation.

My office is fast becoming an agency for the Housing Trust. I notice that a Government back-bencher is grinning. Apparently he lives in a much more fortunate area than I, where I have many unemployed, unmarried mothers, pensioners, and lowly-paid workers. I suggest that the honourable member listen to what I am saying without having that stupid grin on his face. The plight of these people is mixed and varied.

I refer to the case of a 21-year-old who is trying to support a younger wife on sickness benefits. This person was involved in a serious car accident. His scars and the resulting disabilities will be with him lifelong. This person, whose application with the trust is almost two years old, pays market rent of \$45 for an upstairs unit. However, this person's gas was cut off because he did not have the \$35 bond money to pay. I telephoned the Gas Company and got it to turn the gas back on so that this person's wife would at least be able to cook him a meal or make a cup of tea. Surely, our unemployed are entitled to that.

The person to whom I am referring endures pain when using the flight of stairs. The unit is often without hot water, but he is told by the trust, 'Sorry, but your application will have to proceed.' I have telephoned the trust and, through no fault of the person to whom I spoke, I was told that no house on ground level was available for this person, whose injuries prevent him climbing stairs.

I refer also to a 40-year-old father of three who was paying \$55 a week for a house with a leaking roof. He, too, is in receipt of an invalid pension, and his application for accommodation in the western suburbs is on the short list after three years. I do not know how short the Housing Trust's short list is. His name has been on that list for several months.

There are genuine cases that need priority assistance but, unfortunately, there are no priority homes for these people. Weekly, I have single parents inquiring regarding their applications: some nearing the end of their long and difficult wait and others about to face several years of difficulty. The list is endless. In May, Mr Tonkin stated that land no longer required for the proposed transport corridors would be used for new housing projects. What has happened in relation to this Housing Trust expansion, Mr Tonkin? Another broken promise!

The Hon. Mr Hill, outside Parliament last year, stated his pleasure regarding the number of semi-detached houses and cottages to be offered for rental. To date, what progress has been made? That is yet another election promise—another promise not fulfilled.

The Housing Trust is far more important to the State than any interstate housing authority is in its area. However, the Tonkin Government is making it increasingly difficult

for the trust to carry out its primary objective. The basis of the trust's foundation, when founded in 1936, was to provide low-income housing to house workers near their places of employment. In the past two years, this concept has altered dramatically because of the Government's action to support private developers and lifting the lid on price control.

The biggest problem, apart from unemployment, facing young Australians is the cost of housing. South Australia, under Labor, achieved the highest level of home ownership per head of population in Australia. We had the highest level of working-class home ownership. We kept the price of land down, and this kept the ultimate price of homes down. We must re-achieve that level, and for this we must pressure the Federal Government to increase spending on housing, particularly for young and single people, as demand by this section of the community will continue for some years.

I should like now to refer briefly to the disabled, particularly to two cases brought to my attention recently by a constituent. You, Sir, and honourable members may not realise that a disabled person, when employed, is entitled to buy a car and replacement parts less sales tax. However, immediately on retirement such a person must forfeit that benefit.

My constituent has very little use of both legs and needs assistance of two walking sticks. He is unable to use public transport, and has had his car fitted with a special throttle and brake on the steering wheel to enable him to travel to and from his employment. Recently, this person, who retired and went on a pension, had reason to have repairs done to his car in the form of a new exhaust system. On completing the sales tax exemption form, this person was told that he was no longer entitled to the benefit as it applied only when a person with a disability was employed.

This is very discriminatory as, although this person is no longer in the work force, he still needs his car for purposes other than recreation. My constituent is still a very active man, regardless of his disability and retirement. He has had his vehicle altered to carry passengers who are also disabled. This was done before my constituent retired. These people who are transported would not otherwise leave their homes, except for the constituent, who takes the time to pick them up, take them to the beaches, to watch sport, or on visits to doctors, or perhaps for shopping and paying accounts. It seems a disgrace that this person should lose his sales tax exemption on his retirement.

I should like further to add that I agree wholeheartedly with the Government's attempt at making Parliament House more accessible to disabled people. However, we would assist more people on an individual basis if we encouraged Federal members to support the disabled in relation to retaining their tax-free concessions throughout their retirement.

It has also been brought to my attention that a deaf person, if not eligible for free hearing aids through the National Acoustic Laboratory, must pay between \$400 and \$700 for a hearing aid and much more if he is deaf in both ears. That is an enormous amount of money for a person to pay out when deafness is a disability. People eligible for free aids through the N.A.L. service include people under 21, pensioners with health benefit cards and their dependants, invalid pensioners and their dependants, repatriation service pensioners, war widows and supporting parents, as well as Armed Forces members. Those not entitled are people on unemployment benefits (the poor old unemployed) and pensioners not entitled to a health benefit card. Children over 21 years of age cease to be eligible unless they qualify on grounds other than age. It would not be so bad if people not eligible for N.A.L. benefits could recoup

some of their costs through tax or health insurance rebates, but few can.

Hearing aids and other personal expenses, including medical, dental and funeral costs, are no longer tax deductible—that is, deductible from taxable income. Only if a person's concessional expenditure on those items as well as such things as rates, land tax, superannuation, and life insurance exceeds \$1 590 can he claim a rebate of 33.7 cents for every dollar spent over that amount. Unfortunately, only 6.37 per cent of taxpayers last year, most of them affluent, had expenditure of more than \$1 590 a year on which to claim the rebate. Very few hearing aid owners would benefit.

In the minds of many people, a hearing aid is regarded as a necessity, a prosthetic device, like an artificial limb or false teeth, and, as in the case of artificial limbs and other medical and surgical aids and appliances, many of which are provided free by Governments, the Minister of Health has power, under the Health Act, to provide hearing aids free to anyone who needs one. In countries such as Denmark and Sweden, hearing aids are provided free to anyone who needs them. The Governments of Belgium, France, Norway and Switzerland provide, for anyone who needs a hearing aid, substantial financial help which covers the cost of most aids. In countries such as Austria and West Germany, hearing aids are covered by health insurance. In the absence of a national hearing aid service in Australia, it is appalling that no alternative assistance is available to people whose only hope of improved hearing is a hearing aid.

I have not got long before my time is up for tonight, so I would like to touch on a subject on which I will be speaking—

**The Hon. D. C. Brown:** You've got 41 minutes.

**Mr PLUNKETT:** If the Minister will open his eyes, I have to ask for an adjournment in another three minutes. I do not need his help or assistance. After that interruption by the Minister, I should like to speak briefly on the airport. When the member for Gilles spoke today about Adelaide Airport's being made an international airport, I was concerned at what I heard from members opposite. The member for Morphett suddenly came alive. I will have been here for two years in September, and most of the time he appears to be asleep. However, the member for Morphett, the member for Hanson, and the member for Henley Beach attended a meeting with the West Torrens council called in relation to noise at the Adelaide Airport. At that meeting, I was pleased to hear the member for Hanson support, in front of a very big crowd, the idea that the Adelaide Airport should never become an international airport. I was pleased to hear the member for Morphett expressing similar sentiments and, although the member for Henley Beach was not on the stage, he acknowledged that he agreed. He does not live on the flight path. I wonder whether those members no longer have constituents who live on a flight path.

I am not talking about air noise, as mentioned by the Minister of Education the other day in answering a question that I had not put to him. He said that he did not think that the planes were noisy. I know that they are claimed to be not as noisy, but I have done my research and, when I resume tomorrow, I will inform the House of many things, including the fact that one plane produces much greater noise. I will also say what the Federal and State Liberal Governments have done about the upgrading of the airport and what will happen at the airport when the airbuses and Ansetts 737s arrive. It may be easier to take people out on to Tapleys Hill Road than to take them through the terminal. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

**PERSONAL EXPLANATION: ADELAIDE AIRPORT**

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member for Morphett is required to finish his explanation before 10 o'clock.

**Mr OSWALD:** After the dinner adjournment the member for Gilles referred to the relocation of the Adelaide Airport, and stated that the State Minister of Transport had given his support to the relocation of the Adelaide Airport and that this was disbelieved by the member for Morphett. Prior to the dinner adjournment, the member for Gilles, referring to the airport relocation, stated:

Two Wells is an ideal site. That is not my view but the view of the committee set up some years ago to consider this matter. I mention this for the benefit of honourable members opposite. Their own State Minister of Transport has at last come around to this way of thinking.

At that stage, Sir, the bells started to ring and the House went into the adjournment procedure. In the meantime, interjections were carried on in *Hansard*, in which I am reported as responding:

That is not true.

The interjection referred specifically to the statement:

The Minister of Transport has at last come around to this way of thinking.

My response was:

That is not true.

The truth of the matter is that the Minister has not just recently come around to this way of thinking. It is quite untrue, Sir, to suggest that I disbelieve the Minister, who has made it abundantly clear, for as long as I have been in this Parliament, that he supports the relocation of the new international airport terminal out of the metropolitan area. The Minister's views are clear to the State and they coincide with mine, Sir, that the Adelaide Airport international terminal, when it is constructed, should go to Two Wells or that vicinity. It is my personal view that we should move immediately—

**Mr HEMMINGS:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is now going far beyond a personal explanation. The honourable member for Napier.

**Mr HEMMINGS:** Mr Speaker, you pre-empted my point of order.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member for Morphett.

**Mr OSWALD:** I will complete my remarks by reaffirming that I was referring specifically to the statement that the Minister of Transport has at last come round to this way of thinking. It was on that that I was picked up as saying that is not true; I believe that statement not to be true. I hope that has clarified the matter.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN (Minister of Industrial Affairs):** I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

**Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg):** I wish to draw the attention of the House to a couple of matters that I feel members ought to bear in mind, particularly those members who are concerned about tourism. I see the member for Gilles is here, and he is quite interested in tourism, as he stated in a speech this afternoon in this House. A number of V.I.P.s visit this State from time to time and the sesqui centenary year is about to be upon us. I think that the outside of the Parliament House building leaves a lot to be desired. I

believe that the lighting of Parliament House is disgraceful. There are a number of spotlights on the elevation to the south.

**Mr Hemmings:** You're joking!

**Mr MATHWIN:** The eastern side of Parliament House has no lighting at all. The northern side, when the member for Napier has finished laying his egg, also has no lighting. The Festival Theatre and the precincts of the Festival Theatre are very well lit at times, especially on special occasions, and it is a credit to this State. We have the other rather drab building, the railway station, which is floodlit from one end to the other. However, this excellent building, Parliament House, particularly on the elevation facing the plaza, has no lighting at all. I believe that it is time something was done about that, because we should all be proud of this building. Although we have some lighting at the front of Parliament House, it is all ordinary floodlighting.

**Mr Hemmings:** Tell us all about the colour.

**Mr MATHWIN:** There is no different colour; it is just plain colour. Although we have floodlighting, I do not believe that it is sufficient and can be vastly improved. I have been to a number of countries, perhaps a few more than the honourable member for Napier. I am sure that the member who recently visited the Soviet Union to see his comrades over there would have seen it. He came in sporting his little badge on opening day with the words, 'workers of the world unite' and a clenched fist in the middle.

**Mr Plunkett:** It was in Russian.

**Mr MATHWIN:** I could not read it because the A's were the wrong way around and the R's were upside down. Even the member who went over to Moscow to see his comrades would admit that even over there they floodlight their buildings to great advantage. Indeed, they are very proud of many of their buildings.

**Mr O'NEILL:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. I draw your attention to the timing device. Is it stuck? It seems to have been stuck on '9' for an uncommonly long time.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Ashenden):** It appears to be so. The speech began at one minute to 10 and we are watching the clock.

**Mr HEMMINGS:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. There seems to be some conflict about for how long the member for Glenelg has spoken. Is it two minutes, three minutes, or four minutes? We seem to be receiving conflicting advice.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** I have already said that we have noted that the member for Glenelg began his speech at one minute to 10. The honourable member for Glenelg.

**Mr MATHWIN:** Now the member for Napier has had his fun, and he implored me outside this Chamber not to take points of order on a certain member of this House, but now he is up to his old tricks and has taken two points of order on me for no reason at all. Let me warn the member that he has gone too far. If that is the principle he works on—

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Mr Acting Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Mr Acting Speaker, you clearly know that threats made to another honourable member are clearly out of order. I ask that the member for Glenelg withdraw his threat to the member for Napier.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** I do not uphold the point of order. The honourable member for Glenelg.

**Mr MATHWIN:** If the honourable member takes that as a threat, he has a lot to come and a lot to learn. The honourable heir apparent to the Labor Party, the member for Elizabeth, who comes in here—

**Mr HEMMINGS:** Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am sure my colleague, the member for Elizabeth, should not be referred to as the 'heir apparent' in this Chamber.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Napier is being quite frivolous under the guise of seeking a point of order. I ask him to return to his seat and remain silent. The honourable member for Glenelg.

**Mr MATHWIN:** In fact, the member for Napier is a complete disgrace in the way he has acted in this House in the past few minutes. His behaviour is certainly a disappointment to me. It all started when the member started taking points of order on the member for Brighton. It previously happened and we talked about this—

**Mr Hemmings:** When did we talk? You have just breached Parliamentary privilege.

**Mr MATHWIN:** I stated that I would take certain action, which I refrained from doing because of the feelings of the member for Napier. As far as the member is concerned, that is off. The member has gone too far and he can now take the consequences.

**Mr O'Neill:** We don't know what you're talking about.

**Mr MATHWIN:** Of course you do not. You never do. You cannot understand, anyway. You do not have the ability to comprehend anything.

**The Hon. Peter Duncan:** Just read the lines and try not to slur them.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Glenelg has the call.

**Mr MATHWIN:** Is the member for Elizabeth, in saying that I am slurring my words, suggesting that I am inebriated? If that is what he is suggesting, he ought to be damn well ashamed of himself and he is not worthy of his seat in this House. I refer now to the other matter that I was going to raise in this House. That is that I believe there is a need for a stadium to cater for international competition for many sports, perhaps for four, five, or even six different sports, which could be catered for. Ample provision should be made in such a stadium for spectator accommodation, of which we are short in this State, particularly in the small stadia that we have. In those stadia only a small area is set aside for spectator accommodation. We have only the one large stadium, which is taken up mainly by basketball. It is time that a good stadium was erected, and I would certainly prefer it to be in the southern areas.

**The Hon. M. M. Wilson:** You do not think it should be in the western areas?

**Mr MATHWIN:** No, I would prefer it to be in Laffer's triangle, an area in which a previous Labor Government and Labor Premier in this State bought land for the erection of a hospital. However, after buying it and going through all that procedure, the then Government found out that the site was on a distinct fault line and that no building should be erected on it other than a small or light building, but certainly not a multi-storey building involving a hospital of six or seven storeys. That is known as Walsh's folly. Certainly, I would like to see a stadium erected in the southern districts. I ask the Minister to examine the possibility of using Laffer's triangle for such a building. I believe there is ample provision in this State for the sport of basketball. We should do something for the lesser-known sports and so encourage people to participate in them. We should encourage young people to involve themselves as sportsmen. Such activity has a great effect on the development of young people in making them good citizens of the State.

**The Hon. M. M. Wilson:** Do you think box lacrosse should be played?

**Mr MATHWIN:** I think that lacrosse is one of the sports that should be included.

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

**Mr WHITTEN (Price):** Thank you, Mr Speaker, and I assure you that it is not my intention to use any foul language, as we have heard tonight, or to use any false or idle threats. I express my pleasure that the Minister of Transport is on the front bench tonight, because there are a few things that I want to acquaint this House of, and I am sure that the Minister will take the advice I am about to give him in the manner that is meant; that is, for the benefit of this State.

**Mr Hemmings:** He's a pretty fair minded bloke.

**Mr WHITTEN:** I agree with the member for Napier. The Minister is a pretty fair minded fellow and it is unfortunate that he is a Liberal.

**The Hon. M. M. Wilson:** Are you going to talk about the O'Bahn?

**Mr WHITTEN:** Not today—I may talk about that later. I wish to refer to the people in my district, from Adelaide to Outer Harbor and from Grange and the Port Dock, who will be deprived of an adequate rail service and will be forced to use private transport, using up energy that they should not use. They will be turned away from using an efficient, fast and adequate service to Outer Harbor and Port Adelaide.

**The Hon. M. M. Wilson:** They will get a better deal than people—

**Mr WHITTEN:** I hope they do get a better deal, because, after all, those services and time tables have not been altered for a long while.

**The Hon. M. M. Wilson:** Since 1957.

**Mr WHITTEN:** I thank the Minister for his help: I was not aware of that: I thought it was longer. It is time the time tables were upgraded. I agreed with the Minister when he said that they should be upgraded.

*Mr Lewis interjecting:*

**Mr WHITTEN:** I do not intend to talk to the country members, because I want some information from the Minister.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair distinctly gave the call to the member for Price. The Chair is having difficulty hearing the honourable member over the voices of a number of other honourable members who are interjecting contrary to Standing Orders.

**Mr WHITTEN:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. The new proposed time table will cut out 151 services a week. That is a disgrace: we should be endeavouring to attract people to public transport instead of putting them on the roads. When we are trying to cut the road toll, the Minister says that those people will be made to use road transport, and that is very foolish. I never thought the Minister would think in that way. There will be a reduction in the number of existing peak hour express services, and that is wrong. There will be a reduction in the number of trains that stop between Woodville and Adelaide. I have written to the Minister about this matter, because people in my district have contacted me. I am not really satisfied with the Minister's reply. Perhaps I should read to the House one of the letters I have received and the Minister's reply. A letter dated 23 April states:

Dear Mr Whitten,

I am writing on behalf of myself and other people who catch the train at Woodville Park. It is proposed by the State Transport Authority to reduce the train service for stations between Woodville Park and Bowden from every quarter hour to every half hour. Every person to whom I have spoken thinks this is most unfair, and we are hoping that you might speak up for us in this regard.

If the change comes about, the people on the Outer Harbor line whose trains will travel express from Woodville to Adelaide will only be saved four minutes travelling time. This seems very little in relation to the inconvenience we commuters will suffer. Hoping you will take this up urgently with the people concerned.

**Mr Lewis:** That is one.

**Mr WHITTEN:** Surely the honourable member is not suggesting that only one person is affected? This lady had a petition with many names on it. I wrote to the Minister on 27 April and received a reply on 13 May. In part, the reply stated:

The changes proposed for introduction on the Grange and Outer Harbor lines provide substantial improvements in service for the majority of people using the railway.

Only a small number of passengers travel to and from Woodville Park between the morning and evening peak period and these people will still be provided with a regular and reliable service following the introduction of the new time table.

That is blatantly different from what my constituents think about it. I sent another letter to the Minister on 27 April. I will quote the letter, because I do not believe the Minister understands the feeling that there is against curtailing the services. I stated:

In response to requests from constituents concerned at the proposed reduction in rail passenger services on the Outer Harbor line and to Port Dock Station, I wish to draw to your attention that any reduction in these services will greatly inconvenience the travelling public.

An improvement of services, rather than a reduction, would encourage the public to use rail transport particularly when the costs of fuel for private cars is increasing, and roads are becoming congested, thereby contributing to a higher number of road accidents.

Should the Port Dock service be discontinued, a facility used by employees to travel to work will be denied, particularly to those employed at the Department of Marine and Harbors, thereby causing more workers to use private road transport.

The Minister replied:

The number of passengers using Port Dock station is not sufficient to consider retention of this station and the spur line which services it. Only a small proportion of Department of Marine and Harbors employees will be affected by the closure of Port Dock station and they, like many other commuters, will have reasonable alternatives travelling by train to and from Commercial Road station, supplemented by bus services in the area.

One of the things that was put to the employees of the Department of Marine and Harbors when they moved from Victoria Square was that they would have a good train service right to the door. They were told that it would overcome the travelling problems of coming into Adelaide, because they could go down there by train. However, that is now to be cut out, and that will deny many people the opportunity to travel by train. I believe that if passenger numbers are dropping—

**The Hon. M. M. Wilson:** They are not.

**Mr WHITTEN:** I said 'if they were', there should be an advertising campaign launched saying, 'Use our State Transport Authority railway. Drive your car to the station, get on the train and there will be an adequate service.' However, one cannot convince my wife or anyone else's wife to drive over to Woodville Park and then wait 28 minutes for a train if they have just missed one. People will not travel on a train if they do not have the convenience.

I draw the Minister's attention to the problems at G.M.H. at Woodville where, under the new proposed time tables, some workers will have to leave home half an hour earlier to travel to work by train. They will not do that, because their day starts from the time they leave home and ends when they get back at night, and they will not add on that extra hour. We will lose those passengers—maybe the Government wants to run down the service to such an extent that people are not using it, and then say it can be cut out. Australian National is doing that. Melbourne has done that, and now people cannot get a train on Sunday. Does the Minister want to do that sort of thing? I do not believe that he does, but that is what the result will be. Not only have constituents contacted me, but also the Port Adelaide council has written to the Minister because it was concerned—

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

**Mr SCHMIDT (Mawson):** I wish to commend you, Mr Speaker, on your hard rulings on the frivolity that we have seen in the House tonight.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I trust that the honourable member is not reflecting on any decisions already taken by the House.

**Mr SCHMIDT:** I would not do that, Mr Speaker. What I want to refer to tonight mainly concerns the lack of consideration of some people in our community for the wellbeing of others. I refer to the fact that in my area I have had a number of complaints recently from people who have bought houses adjoining vacant land thinking that they would have peace and quiet, that they would have good surrounds and a good view, only to find that their tranquillity is brought to an end by the constant noise of trail bikes being ridden around on the weekends.

I am grateful to see the Minister of Transport here tonight, as I think his department should look at this matter very closely, and consider whether or not the Government should require some form of registration or identification for these trail bikes. Unlike the ruling that trail bikes come under, where people who use them do so primarily for agricultural purposes and therefore ride them on private property, and do not ride them on the public road system, so they do not need to register them, the fact is that many parents are now buying these bikes for their young teenage children thinking, of course, that the bikes will keep the young ones out of mischief. However, regrettably the young ones, in order to get to a place where they can use these bikes, tend to travel down public thoroughfares, to the point of running across people's front lawns in order to take a short cut, and then they romp around all afternoon on one of these vacant pieces of land. If, as in the case of one constituent who approached me only this morning, one happens to be a shift worker who returns home after working all night and who wants a peaceful sleep before going back on an evening shift again, to have these bikes buzzing around all afternoon is not conducive to a very restful sleep.

Similarly, this applies to young mothers at home trying to keep young children asleep in the afternoon. I have had one case brought to my attention where there were eight of these bikes lined up against the fence, and their owners decided to take off for a race across a vacant paddock. One can imagine the noise being generated by eight of these bikes revving up all at one time and taking off. The woman rang the local police, and even the policeman could not hear her on the phone because of the noise being generated by the bikes.

None of the residents involved has anything against trail bikes. Nobody is purporting to have that sort of attitude at all, but what they do want is some consideration given to people who live nearby. The biggest objection to kids using such areas as trail bike areas is that within only a mile from the area brought to my attention is a recognised trail bike track which had been set up by the local council for the purpose of people with trail bikes to use and to romp around. The track is next to a rubbish tip which is about to be closed, so it is right away from any residential area.

**Mr Lynn Arnold:** I have the same problem in my area.

**Mr SCHMIDT:** I think, as the member for Salisbury said, this occurs in a number of areas. It has occurred at the back of Trott Park, and it is now occurring very strongly at the back of Reynella. In such areas, if parents really want to give the kids the opportunity to ride the bikes, they surely should take an interest and show concern in what the young people do and be prepared to put the bikes on the back of a trailer and take them to a recognised track. There are a number of recognised tracks in the outer metropolitan area, particularly in the nearby country areas, where people can go and ride their bikes.

**Mr Lewis:** And they could put mufflers on them, too.

**Mr SCHMIDT:** Of course, as the member for Mallee has just pointed out, there is a need for these sorts of vehicle to have some form of muffler system, because if these bikes are to be used anywhere near a residential area, as one woman said, one has the constant feeling that there is a big mosquito in the room which one cannot get rid of no matter what one uses, and such a situation does aggravate the tranquillity in the community. I request that the Minister of Transport ask his relevant personnel to look into this whole matter.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is too much audible conversation.

**Mr SCHMIDT:** I think that there are a number of people concerned with this matter, which certainly needs reviewing. On the other side of the coin, I imagine that these parents would probably be irate at the idea of having the activities of their children restricted. However, again it becomes a matter of whose priorities or whose liberties are infringed in order to produce a good compromise. Surely we do not want to deny these young children their activity, but again I stress that parents should take an interest in their young ones, and should be prepared to spend the time to take them down to a recognised track where they can use their bikes. Alternatively, we should require that these bikes be registered, and we should make it mandatory that they be equipped with a proper muffler system, so that teenagers could ride to the appropriate track and exercise this particular activity.

The other matter to which I wish to refer also relates to my area along the beaches and the problem that we have every summer with people who go to have a picnic on the beach, take their stubbies or dozen bottles of beer with them and, regrettably, leave the empty bottles and rubbish behind. Most councils take a keen interest in this matter and provide on beaches a number of bins into which people can put their empty bottles. Regrettably, people being what they are, they will take the easiest option and not make the

effort of going five or 10 yards to deposit their bottles in these containers.

I commend the Minister on his stance regarding the PET containers. I sincerely hope that, because of the effect that they have on the environment, he will in no way back off from maintaining the 5c deposit on PET containers. It is also important that the Minister, through his own department, encourage action by the breweries, which have, on a voluntary basis (and I stress that), raised the deposit from 1c to 3c a beer bottle. Unfortunately, not enough people realise that there is a deposit on beer bottles, and I would certainly endorse any encouragement that could be given to breweries either to increase their deposits or, alternatively, conduct a comprehensive advertising campaign to the effect that there is a 3c deposit on beer bottles. In this way, people will be encouraged to take their empty bottles to a Bottle-O and get a refund thereon. In this way, the bottles will be removed from our beaches.

Not only is it unsightly to have bottles on the beaches but also, and more important, there is the danger involved in having them there. On a number of occasions before I came into this House, I taught learn-to-swim classes on the beaches, and not one season would go by when I would not have to take a child to the local doctor or to a medical orderly in order to have his feet bandaged because the child had stepped on a broken bottle. Broken bottles tend to get washed up and lie between the rubbish.

Children, being exuberant as they are, do not always keep a keen eye on the sand in front of them. They tend to jump off a rock and, of course, once one is in mid air and going towards a bit of broken glass, it is hard for one to change one's course in mid air. The number of incidents that have occurred over the years must surely warrant a higher deposit being placed on bottles or sterner action being taken to try to get these broken bottles off the beaches and make them safer for our children as well as ourselves.

Motion carried.

At 10.28 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 5 August at 2 p.m.



**MOORE'S BUILDING**

1. **Mr MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Public Works:

1. What is now the estimated cost of converting the Moore's building to law courts, how is that cost made up, and when was such estimate of cost made?

2. When is it now expected the building will be ready for occupation?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The replies are as follows:

1. (a) Estimated cost \$30 100 000.	\$
(b) Building cost at October 1980	19 200 000
Escalation on building costs; interest charges; property purchase and associated charges	10 900 000
	<hr/> \$30 100 000 <hr/>

(c) 22 October 1980.

2. 30 June 1983.

**CEDUNA LANDS**

7. **Mr MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs: When does the Minister propose to reply to the member for Mitcham's letters to him of 1 April and 5 May about the transfer of land at Ceduna from the Lutheran Church to the Aboriginal Lands Trust, and why has he not already replied?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** A reply was forwarded to the honourable member on 29 May 1981.

**RAPE**

8. **Mr MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Premier: When does the Premier propose to reply to the member for Mitcham's letter to him of 30 April about the increasing incidence of rape and the likely link between that and the police action in closing down brothels, and why has he not already replied?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I refer the member to my letter of 1 July and subsequent letter of 17 July.

**Dr FULLER**

9. **Mr MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Has the Minister received the member for Mitcham's letter to her of 4 May 1981 about Dr Clarence Oliver Fuller and, if so, why has she not—

(a) acknowledged it; and

(b) replied to it fully,

and when does she propose to reply?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** A reply was forwarded on 2 June 1981.

**WINDANA**

10. **Mr MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Why has not Windana yet been opened as a nursing home?

2. How long, so far, has been the delay in its opening?

3. When is it now expected that it will open?

4. What action, if any—

(a) has the Minister already taken; and

(b) is intended (and when), to avoid delay?

5. How much money has the Government spent on the conversion to a nursing home?

6. Who is to run it and what are the financial arrangements between the body to run it and the Government?

7. How much accommodation will it have?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. There have been protracted negotiations with the Commonwealth Minister for Health over the recognition of Windana Nursing Home as a special purpose facility for the rehabilitation and care of nursing home patients who also suffer from brain failure.

2. Before these negotiations could be commenced discussions were held through the Voluntary Care Association with a member organisation, namely Southern Cross Homes Inc., with a view to Southern Cross Homes Inc., operating Windana Nursing Home. Cabinet approval for this was given on 21 April 1980.

3. It is not at present possible to give a firm opening.

4. (a) The Minister of Health and the South Australian Health Commission have undertaken extensive and complex negotiations with the Commonwealth Minister for Health and officers of the Commonwealth Health Department in an attempt to accelerate resolution of the acceptance of Windana as a nursing home.

(b) Further negotiations are continuing.

5. \$1 360 277.

6. Southern Cross Homes Inc., conducts the day centre which has already been established and is actively operating. In the 1980-81 financial year a sum of \$56 195 was allocated for the commissioning of the day care centre, and \$143 000 for the operating costs. Arrangements concerning the conduct of the nursing home component of Windana await resolution of the status of Windana as a nursing home.

7. The residential accommodation is for 90 patients.

**Mr GARDNER**

12. **Mr MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. What sewerage connection fee was charged to Mr K. C. Gardner of Eden Hills; when was this fixed and by whom; on what basis was it fixed and what had such fee been previously?

2. When was Mr Gardner informed of the increase and by whom, and by that time had Mr Gardner agreed to accept \$50 as compensation for giving an easement across his property?

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** The replies are as follows:

1. Mr K. C. Gardner was charged the current sewerage connection fee of \$70 on 29 September 1980. The fee was fixed at that figure by notice in the *Government Gazette* dated 21 August 1980. The determining factor on the fixing of the sewerage connection fee is the average cost of inspection of sanitary plumbing and drainage installations connected to the sewerage system. The fee was previously \$50.

2. The first indication of advice of the increased fee appears to be Mr Gardner's visit to the services section of the Engineering and Water Supply Department on 29 September 1980. This advice would have been given by one of the officers of that section. Mr Gardner's agreement to \$50 compensation for the easement was obtained on 13 February 1980.

**PARLIAMENT HOUSE PARKING**

14. **Mr MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Public Works:

1. What prosecutions have there been pursuant to section 85 (4) of the Road Traffic Act in each of the last 10 years

for parking on North Terrace outside Parliament House and what was the outcome of each such prosecution?

2. How many such prosecutions are now pending and against whom?

3. Whom does the Minister now permit to park on North Terrace outside Parliament House pursuant to section 85 (3) of the Act, why and on what terms?

4. For how many years had members of Parliament been permitted to have their motor cars parked on North Terrace outside Parliament House and on what terms?

5. Are members of the public allowed to park on North Terrace outside Parliament House—

(a) when Parliament is sitting; and

(b) when Parliament is not sitting,

and, if not, why not?

6. What action, if any, is taken to police any prohibition of such parking—

(a) when Parliament is sitting;

(b) when Parliament is not sitting—

(i) in the evenings; and

(ii) during the day;

(c) at weekends; and

(d) on public holidays?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The replies are as follows:

1. So far as is ascertainable, none.

2. None.

3. The area may be used for passenger loading, couriers and Ministerial vehicles.

4. Members of Parliament were permitted to park in the area prior to the construction of the Festival Theatre car park, which now provides members with undercover, secure, parking facilities.

5. No, unless they have the permission of the Minister of Public Works.

6. While the parking of unauthorised vehicles may result in prosecution, offenders are initially advised by notice attached to the vehicle that parking is prohibited. It is anticipated that amendments to the relevant legislation will be placed before Parliament later this year in order to strengthen the legislative authority in this area.

### MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATION

16. **Mr MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Has the Minister set up a committee to investigate a new system of registration of title to motor vehicles and if so—

(a) why;

(b) when;

(c) who are its members;

(d) what are the precise terms of reference;

(e) when is it expected to report; and

(f) will its report be made public and, if not, why not, and, if not, does the Minister propose to set up such a committee and when?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows: Yes.

(a) Because of the problems encountered by some motor vehicle dealers in respect of fraudulent conversions of encumbered motor vehicles.

(b) A working party was set up in January 1980.

(c) The membership has changed over the past 18 months but at the present time the members of the working party are:

Mr M. A. Noblet, Director-General, Department of Public and Consumer Affairs; Mr W. S. Scott, Assistant Registrar, Motor Registration Division, Department of Transport; Mr R. Flashman, Executive Director, S.A.A.C.C.; Mr B. Farr, Deputy Chairman, S.A. Division Australian Finance Conference.

(d) To examine the feasibility and cost effectiveness of possible systems for the registration of security interests in motor vehicles and, with respect to any system found to be feasible and cost effective, make detailed recommendations as to the development and implementation of that system.

(e) A report is expected within several months.

(f) Until the contents of the report are known any action arising from it cannot be determined.

### HOUSING TRUST HOUSES

21. **Mr TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment and Planning representing the Minister of Housing: What facilities for the disabled will be provided in South Australian Housing Trust residences being constructed in Morphettville and South Plympton?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The South Australian Housing Trust is constructing a group of 13 age pensioners' cottage flats in Morphettville and a group of eight age pensioners' cottage flats in South Plympton. One unit in each of these groups will be suitable for immediate occupancy by tenants confined to wheelchairs. Each of the remaining units will be readily adaptable for the disabled with grab rails at the front and back doors and in toilet and shower areas, shower fittings suitable for the disabled, raised power points, and all doors of sufficient width to permit the passage of wheelchairs.

### RADAR UNITS

22. **Mr TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: Is the Minister aware of the contents of an article in the 10 May Sydney *Sun Herald* on the advantages and disadvantages of the KR-11 speed detection radar unit mounted on mobile patrol cars and does the Government intend to introduce these for use by the South Australian Police Force?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** Yes, but there are no proposals to introduce the device into South Australia.

### MARION HIGH SCHOOL CLUB

25. **Mr TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment and Planning representing the Minister of Local Government: Will the Minister of Local Government be providing funding to allow the highly successful Marion High School Community Club activities to continue and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The Minister of Local Government will consider the funding of the Marion High School Community Club provided: an application for assistance is lodged under the Local Government Assistance Fund 1981-82; the application for assistance falls within the guidelines for the Local Government Assistance Fund 1981-82; the application is reviewed and receives a high priority from appropriate local council(s).

### STRATA TITLES

27. **Mr TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment and Planning: Does the Government intend to make any legislative amendments pertaining to the operation of the corporate bodies or committees which operate in strata title units and, if so, in what manner?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The legislation pertaining to strata titles is currently under review and it is hoped to have some amendments before Parliament in due course.

**HOUSING TRUST UNITS**

28. Mr **TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment and Planning representing the Minister of Housing:

1. What is the present stock of housing units owned by the South Australian Housing Trust in the electorate of Ascot Park that is being rented or is available for rental and where are the major locations within the electorate?

2. How many of these units are:

- (a) two or three bedroom semi-detached;
- (b) two or three bedroom detached;
- (c) single-person cottage flats;
- (d) two-person cottage flats; and
- (e) other types,

and what are the dates of applications the trust is presently considering for the area in each category?

3. What construction of South Australian Housing Trust rental units has taken place or has been commenced in the last two years in the Ascot Park electorate and what construction, if any, is proposed for the next two years?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The replies are as follows:

1. The present stock of Housing Trust rental dwellings in the electorate of Ascot Park is 1 324. The major locations are: Parkholme (299 units), Plympton Park (299 units),

Edwardstown (295 units), Morphettville (255 units) and South Plympton (139 units).

2. The types of units are as follows:

Semi-detached .....	1 039
Detached .....	11
Single-person cottage flats .....	64
Two person cottage flats .....	119
Other—purchased houses, flats .....	52

Total ..... 1 324

Applications lodged at the following dates are currently being considered:

Semi-detached, March 1978.

Detached, March 1978.

Single-person cottage flats, December 1976.

Two person cottage flats, December 1979.

Other:

Purchased dwellings, March 1978.

Flats, very infrequent vacancies.

3. During the last two years, 76 rental units have been constructed and commenced in the Ascot Park electorate.

During the next two years it is proposed to construct an additional 41 rental units. Additional units may be constructed subject to the availability of finance and suitable sites.