

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 29 September 1981

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

PETITION: SWIMMING POOL

A petition signed by 59 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide adequate funding for a heated therapeutic swimming pool at the headquarters of the Western Rehabilitation Centre, at Royal Park, was presented by Mr Hamilton.

Petition received.

PETITION: PORNOGRAPHY

A petition signed by 40 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 Mathwin.

Petition received.

PETITION: INTEREST RATES

A petition signed by 97 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.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the written answers to questions, as detailed in the schedule I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos. 102, 116, 137, 145, 157 to 166, 168 to 170, 173, 174, 178, 180, 181, and 186 to 190.

MOORING SITES

In reply to Mr PETERSON (5 August).

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The need for a review in regard to mooring sites has been evident for some time, particularly since the transfer of the fishing fleet to the North Arm when pleasure boats have occupied the substantial facilities vacated at the Cooper Co. wharf without the imposition of fees.

In the interests of the boating public, whereby they may be assured of the best possible use of available areas, it is considered that all sites should be registered and subject to licences or permits being issued at appropriate fees and conditions. It is envisaged that a scale of fees will be introduced which will relate to the size of the vessels and the type of mooring facility provided. Fees presently charged for sites in public mooring areas (Angas Inlet and Outer Harbor), which have not been reviewed for some time, will be brought into line with those proposals.

However, the matter is still being considered and it may be a few months yet before I will be in a position to make a recommendation for the introduction of appropriate regulations. It is not envisaged that the Department of Marine and Harbors will provide improved or expanded facilities immediately, but in the long term it may be possible that the Jervois Basin will be developed to provide additional mooring sites.

For obvious reasons, the department cannot accept any responsibility for the safety of vessels which in all cases must be moored at the owner's risk.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT:
NORTH-EAST BUSWAY

The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Transport): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I wish to report to the House on the progress of the work being undertaken by the North-East Busway Project Team. As members would know, the team has been working on the preliminary design for the busway which will run from Park Terrace at Gilberton to Tea Tree Plaza.

One of the most important aspects of the busway has been the inclusion of O'Bahn guided bus technology. This technology is well established and proven in operation in Essen, West Germany, and several members have taken the opportunity to visit Essen and ride on the system. I know that those members have been extremely impressed with what they have seen. The House will know that it was this Government's aim to provide an improved rapid transit system in the north-east suburbs at a cheaper cost than that proposed by the former Government.

The north-east suburbs have for many years suffered inferior public transport services by comparison with other regions of the metropolitan area. This Government is providing a bus system using an exclusive busway, which will be built at an acceptable cost.

It was necessary that special consideration be given to the environmental impact of a busway in the Torrens River Valley. For this reason, O'Bahn guided technology was to be adopted from Park Terrace to a point east of Portrush Road. Preliminary design work has now been completed and the Government has had to make some important decisions based on the work done during that design stage. Honourable members will realise that the estimated cost of the busway in 1979 dollars, before the preliminary design was completed, was in the order of \$45 000 000, by comparison with the previous Government's light rail proposal costed at \$115 000 000. Inflation over the past two years brings these estimates to \$55 000 000 and \$140 000 000 respectively.

One of the most important aspects Cabinet has had to consider is the new vertical alignment of the proposed busway which has been made possible by the recently announced flood mitigation programme developed by my colleague, the Minister of Water Resources. This work will reduce the flood potential in the Torrens Valley, and the busway can now be built at a lower level to reduce visual and noise effects on surrounding residents by allowing the busway to go under most roads along the valley, rather than over them. This is a tremendous advantage in reducing the overall impact of the busway in the most sensitive areas through which it will pass. The option of a lower alignment is slightly more expensive, but the Government has decided that it should be adopted in the interests of the environment and the people living adjacent to the busway. Several other factors have come to light through the work done in prelim-

inary design and the evidence available from the busway in Essen.

These include the fact that the guided track is extremely safe and comfortable, providing a ride far superior to that of normal bus travel, and the guideway itself has a dampening effect on noise. Also, it is anticipated that the guideway will require far less maintenance than is required for roads, conventional busways, l.r.t. or other rail systems. Zublin engineers estimate there could be a maintenance-free period of up to 30 years. Even if this were only half, it would be a major saving in maintenance costs. The Government was, therefore, faced with whether to adhere to its original decision to build O'Bahn in only part of the corridor or to extend it the full length to Tea Tree Plaza.

Reasons against extending the guideway were that the project in the short term would be more expensive due to construction costs, particularly in overcoming soil characteristics in the outer area. The advantages, as I have already enumerated, are comfort, quietness and safety, as well as reduced maintenance costs. Honourable members will realise that the design speed of buses on the busway will be 100 km/h, although operating speeds may be nearer 80 km/h. With a conventional busway this would mean buses would have to pass each other in opposite directions with the risk, however slight, of a collision at a combined impact speed of at least 160 km/h.

The Government has, therefore, decided that the most responsible decision is for the O'Bahn guideway to be constructed for the whole of the length of the busway from Park Terrace to Tea Tree Plaza. The additional cost to implement both the low-level alignment and the latter decision will bring the cost of the busway to \$63 000 000, plus an estimated contingency allowance of \$5 500 000, giving a total cost of \$68 500 000. Of this, \$15 000 000 will be spent on rollingstock, of which \$10 000 000 would need to be spent by the State Transport Authority whether the busway is constructed or not.

Bridge construction costs will be substantially reduced by the adoption of O'Bahn guideway instead of conventional road bridges. This year's Budget makes provision for \$6 700 000 to be spent on detailed design and construction. Building will start in February with the Reservoir Road overpass near Tea Tree Plaza. Tree planting and landscaping is already under way.

In the next two years, sizable contracts will be let to South Australian firms for the supply of prefabricated concrete elements for the construction of the track. Construction will be carried out by South Australian firms with South Australian workmen, leading to increased employment in the building industry. The bodies of the Mercedes-Benz buses will be built in South Australia, once again providing jobs for South Australia.

The route from Park Terrace to Tea Tree Plaza has some slight variations but remains similar to that chosen for the previous Government's l.r.t. system. Stations on the busway are proposed at O.G. Road, Darley Road and Tea Tree Plaza.

Bus access from adjacent suburbs will be provided at the Darley Road and Tea Tree Plaza interchanges, with provision for future access at Grand Junction Road. Emergency access points will be incorporated along the length of the busway.

Passenger stations will be designed off-line, which means that they will be set back from the guideway so that express services may pass buses pulling into a platform. Agreement is being sought with the Adelaide City Council and the City of Adelaide Planning Commission to operate the buses via Park Terrace, Hackney Road, Rundle Road, East Terrace and Grenfell-Currie Streets.

I assure honourable members that this rapid transit system will be one of the most innovative, modern and efficient in the world. There is no doubt that it will become a major attraction for tourists in Adelaide as it will be incorporated in a most imaginative re-development programme for the Torrens River. The new O'Bahn system will provide one of the most scenic public transport rides in any major city.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. D. O. Tonkin)—

By Command—

Public Servants Appearing Before Parliamentary Committees—Guidelines for, Report.

By the Treasurer (Hon. D. O. Tonkin)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Superannuation Act, 1974-1980—Regulations—Cost of Living Increases.

By the Minister of Industrial Affairs (Hon. D. C. Brown)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment—Report, 1980.

By the Minister of Fisheries (Hon. W. A. Rodda)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Fisheries Act, 1971-1980—Regulations—Prawn Licence Fees.

By the Minister of Marine (Hon. W. A. Rodda)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Department of Marine and Harbors—Report, 1980-81.

By the Minister of Environment and Planning (Hon. D. C. Wotton)—

Pursuant to Statute—

City of Tea Tree Gully—By-law No. 48—Reserves, Ovals, etc.

By the Minister of Health (Hon. Jennifer Adamson)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Trade Standards Act, 1979—Regulations—Folding Tables.

MOTOR CAR INDUSTRY

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion forthwith and that such suspension remain in force no later 4 p.m.

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition will support the suspension of Standing Orders on this occasion because we believe that the matter is of great importance and it is as well to have a resolution on this subject carried by this House. In supporting the motion I believe that the Government, in denying the Opposition Question Time (as this procedure does), is not behaving in the way which one would expect. This matter is certainly important, but we believe that Government time should be made available for it to be debated. The effect of this motion is to make some Government time available and, as I have said, we support a matter of this importance being discussed and debated by this House, but it will be done at the expense of Question Time, which the Opposition values highly. Clearly the Government wishes to avoid Question Time.

Mr Ashenden interjecting:

Mr BANNON: If the member for Todd and others are correct in believing that the Government would be pleased to have Question Time, perhaps the Government could modify its attitude and allow us to have Question Time either immediately or at the termination of the debate. In any case, while we certainly support the suspension to enable this important matter to be discussed, we believe that it is a pity this is being done at the expense of the

Opposition's opportunity to question the Government, and its policy.

Motion carried.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I move:

That this House calls upon the Federal Government to reject the recommendations contained within the draft report of the Industries Assistance Commission on assistance to the motor vehicle industry after 1984 which, if implemented, would have a disastrous effect upon the South Australian economy with the loss of at least 10 000 jobs; calls on the Federal Government to protect the local industry and employment with the use of local content plans, export facilitation, and import quotas; commends the South Australian Government for its efforts to ensure the long term viability of this vital industry; and asks the Premier to convey this resolution to the Prime Minister.

In moving this motion, I believe, as does the Government, that it is important that this House have an opportunity to express its opinion on something that so vitally affects the future of manufacturing industry in this State. Last Tuesday, about 7 000 workers in the car industry expressed their views outside of this Parliament.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: They didn't express it too well when they related it to you.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I am coming to that. Unfortunately, due to a small group of Labor Party hecklers—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: It was a small group of Labor Party hecklers, well and truly orchestrated at the front of the meeting—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. H. Allison: It was—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister of Education will assist the debate if he is not heard again.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I may add that those Labor Party hecklers apparently did not believe in the freedom of speech. They prevented the Government from having its view expressed on the steps of Parliament House.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: A number of people who attended that meeting have already expressed to me personally their apologies for the behaviour of a small minority of the people at that meeting.

Mr Max Brown: All 10 000.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I put that aside. I assure the member that it was a very small minority of the meeting outside of Parliament House that was heckling. Those who were heckling were under a specific instruction by Labor Party organisers. I put to the House the point that no Government in Australia has done more to protect the automotive industry of this country and of this State than has the South Australian Government.

I personally have spoken at length to Sir Phillip Lynch, Minister for Commerce and Industry, on at least three occasions. I have raised the matter at a Ministers' conference. We have put forward a submission to the Industries Assistance Commission on two occasions, one before the preliminary hearing, and one when the draft report had been received.

This State has public servants who are regarded throughout the nation as having the best knowledge of anyone of the effects of any change in the car protection policy on the car component industry, and I am delighted to say that Sir Phillip Lynch acknowledges the tremendous expertise that we have within the Department of Trade and Industry in the South Australian Government. The Government has done much more. It has surveyed the entire component industry of the State, the 98 component companies that manufacture and employ so many people. We have set up

the Motor Vehicle Industries Assistance scheme. We have allocated consistently approximately \$1 000 000 a year to allow the restructuring of the South Australian car and component industry. We are allocating \$1 000 000 a year on a constant basis.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Who did that?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: It was first done by the previous Government, which expended, I think, \$250 000. It was the present Government that in fact allocated a further \$1 000 000 in 1980-81 and a further \$1 000 000 in 1981-82.

In fact, it has been through the assistance of this Government that we find that our component industry has been able to make significant changes to restructuring for world car production. I shall give some examples: there are two significant low pressure alloy casting companies in this State, Castalloy and R.O.H. The Government has assisted both companies, and through that assistance we now have the best low casting technology available in Australia, which is allowing those companies to participate in the Australian and, in fact, world production of alloy wheels, cylinder heads and manifolds.

One of those companies already has a sizable contract to supply engine parts to the G.M.H. export engine factory in Melbourne, which is anticipating an annual production of some 350 000 engines a year.

The Government is making sure that the case is effectively put not only to the Federal Government but to the Federal Parliament. I invited all South Australian Federal members of Parliament to attend a briefing. I spoke at that briefing and I would like to thank those loyal South Australians who were so keen to support the local car industry. In addition, I wrote to every Federal member of Parliament.

Mr Keneally: Did the Liberal members come to that briefing?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Yes, they did. I assure the honourable member that, although many Liberal members could not come to the original briefing, they have been to subsequent briefings. I have written to every member of Federal Parliament in both the House of Representatives and in the Senate, and I have also put the case, along with public servants, at the back-bench committee of the Liberal Government on manufacturing industry. Our record is such that we have taken the lead in making sure that the Australian Government understands what type of protection and support is needed for the car industry in the long term.

What is currently being looked at is the policy or support for the Australian car industry post-1984. To briefly summarise, present policy is that there should be 85 per cent Australian content with no more than 20 per cent of the invested market being imported into Australia as wholly made up vehicles. From the beginning of next year, a new variation to that policy is being implemented, with the concept of import/export facilitation. That means that a local manufacturer can export 5 per cent of his production and, by so exporting that 5 per cent, can import 5 per cent of component parts free of duty. That effectively will mean that there is a trade-off between imports and exports, and that 5 per cent will expand to 7½ per cent by the end of 1984.

The important policy is that which applies post-1984, because up until the end of that the die has already been cast. I want to take this opportunity to briefly summarise the entire case put by the South Australian Government. So far, much of the debate on the car industry is centred on only the loss of jobs. Supporters of the motor vehicle industry rightly argue, as does the South Australian Government, that at least 10 000 to 15 000 jobs could be lost in South Australia and 60 000 or more could be lost

throughout Australia if the recommendations of the I.A.C. were accepted.

However, the real argument against accepting recommendations of the I.A.C. is even far more fundamental than the immediate loss of jobs. It looks at the future of manufacturing industry in Australia as a whole. Australia has a substantial manufacturing industry and its future, and therefore the structure of our employment basis hinges on Federal Government support for local manufacturing industry. Some 20 per cent of all employment is in the manufacturing industry, and even more is in the support and service industries.

Moving from a policy of local content, which guarantees local production, to one of tariffs only, as proposed by the I.A.C., will result in cars being manufactured in Japan, Europe, or the United States of America, where there is already surplus production capacity. I cannot overstress that point, namely, that there is already surplus capacity outside Australia, and, if we remove the requirement for local production, it is quite obvious that, for example, the Ford company in Tokyo, Detroit or somewhere in Europe will dictate that the surplus capacity in its factories should be used ahead of any capacity here in Australia. This would mean that there would be no vehicle production in Australia. The rest of our manufacturing industry would therefore face major disruption.

We must support our component industry in this State and the assemblers, particularly General Motors-Holden's and the Mitsubishi company. I want to stress the important point that just those two companies alone make to this State. General Motors-Holden's is South Australia's biggest employer, with approximately 8 000 employees, while Mitsubishi is one of the biggest employers, with some 4 000 employees.

People who talk glibly about removing support from the motor vehicle industry ignore the wider contribution it makes to Australian industry generally. Many support industries would be more expensive and would even disappear if it were not for the production economies provided by the motor industry. The industry has been too often characterised as inefficient and a burden upon the rest of the economy, but those who believe that this can offer simple economic solutions ignore the vast social and economic consequences which would follow if the industry were wiped out.

The free traders ignore these consequences and the immediate loss of jobs. They argue that they will get cheaper cars and that is about the entire content of their argument. I will come to deal with the free traders shortly in more detail. However, experience in the past, particularly in the area of motor bikes, has shown that the prices do not fall just because tariffs are removed, so it is an important argument that must be noted, because the free traders are arguing that the removal of support for the car industry in Australia would result in cars being some \$3 000 cheaper. However, the places where Australia has already experienced such a removal of tariffs show that that is not the case.

Another basic flaw in the argument of the free traders is that they claim that competitors overseas in such countries as Japan operate in a free market situation. That is pure myth. They may not maintain direct tariff protection, but they do use subtle and often more effective means to stop significant imports. Despite ill-informed comment to the contrary, there have been significant gains in efficiency in the car industry and it is shown that, given a big enough scale, it can produce many items at competitive prices, even on world markets.

The South Australian Government does not oppose change. This must occur. But it must be implemented in

such a way that the industry can adjust. The South Australian Government has put forward an alternative, which is a balanced programme of local content, market sharing, and export facilitation, and a phased reduction of duty on imported built-up vehicles over a prescribed period. We will continue to press vigorously to the Federal Government the policies that will help support the Australian car industry and ensure its long-term viability, and to press that Government to reject the I.A.C. recommendations.

At this stage, I would like to come in more detail to a number of those points that I have raised. First, I will deal specifically with the case put forward by the free traders, or what has become the society of modest members of Parliament, with their patron, the former Federal member of Parliament, Mr Bert Kelly. Invariably, they are known as 'the Kelly gang'. This group of members argues that there should be support for the I.A.C. recommendations. They are basically free traders. They believe that there should be no trade restriction about coming into Australia whatsoever, and that, if the car industry wishes to be competitive and viable, it must compete on world markets without any competition.

They put forward no alternative as to where they will find employment for the 60 000 who have lost jobs in the car industry alone, let alone the many hundreds of thousands of jobs lost in other manufacturing industries. They are idealists. They believe that the rest of the world shares their same ideals of free trade. There are four key points I wish to raise as to why the free traders, the Kelly gang, or the modest members of Parliament, have fundamental flaws in their argument.

First, they ignore the fact that the motor vehicle industry has already significantly improved its efficiency and productivity in this country. I take one classic example in South Australia. The former company Chrysler, which is now Mitsubishi, over the past 3½ years, has reduced the number of man-hours to produce a vehicle in hours from 80 to 22, using Australian management and Australian workers.

If ever there was a tribute to what we can achieve in this country with efficient management, good workers and good industrial relations, that is a classic example. The knockers of the car industry ignore such facts, yet a company like Mitsubishi, for the comparative size of that plant now, has achieved a level of productivity which would compare with any automobile plant of that size elsewhere in the world.

The second important factor is that the so-called free traders or the Kelly gang ignore the factor that the whole policy of import-export facilitation has not even started to apply in Australia. We find the knockers of the car industry trying to judge that industry on what it has been historically rather than on what it is likely to be at the end of 1984, just before the introduction of the new policy. After all, I am staggered at the apparent indifference and lack of support for this motion shown by members opposite. The knockers of the car industry fail to appreciate what significant gains could be achieved from productivity and economies of scale through the concept of import-export facilitation.

Certain components will never be able to be efficiently produced in Australia, and we must be realistic about that. For instance, the production of micro-processors for what is likely to be introduced into automobiles in the next five or six years could never be produced efficiently in Australia. It is unlikely that the front-end live axle for the new front-wheel drive vehicles could be produced efficiently in Australia, given that now that the vehicles are much smaller they have to be specifically produced for that type of vehicle. In other words, the Mitsubishi Colt has a specific

front-end axle for that vehicle as a quite separate design and a specific axle for the Mazda 323 and the Ford Laser. It is not feasible to produce the entire front axles in Australia for that one model of vehicle.

Mr Keneally: Did Laurie Carmichael write this speech for you?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Laurie Carmichael supports the points I am making. I congratulate him for coming out to protect the manufacturing and motor vehicle industry in this country. It is interesting to note that this Government has been saying these things for two years and so far we have received little support, from at least the Opposition at this stage. I do not think at any stage has it come out—

Mr Hamilton: That's a lie, and you know it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Albert Park will withdraw the word 'lie'.

Mr Hamilton: Yes, I will withdraw it: it is a blatant untruth.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I just ask members opposite to highlight where they have congratulated what we have done for the automobile industry in the last two years—

The Hon. D. O Tonkin: Or supported us.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Or supported us, as the honourable Premier has just interjected. Through export facilitation, it is possible for Australian component manufacturers to significantly contribute to and produce for world cars and particularly for cars in other countries. Take the example of the \$100 000 000 export order received by Gerloch in Sydney for the production component parts (brake calipers) for the General-Motors Corporation in the United States and the export of General-Motors Holden's vehicles out of the Fishermens Bend plant in Melbourne and the fact that South Australian component part manufacturers contributed to that.

The third argument that the Kelly gang ignores is that the world car concept has only just been introduced, particularly into Australia. So, it is only in the past year or so that we have been bound to start to gain the benefits from producing universal cars that have basically the same design, regardless of which country they are produced in, and where our component suppliers are able to produce for both that car in Australia and the same car in Japan, the United States or Europe. Before that there was a very specific design for Australian cars, which meant that component manufacturers in this country had little opportunity to ever participate in producing those component parts for use outside Australia.

The fourth point on the failure of the argument put forward by the free traders is that they believe, as I have said, that all countries have an ideal situation to allow free trade. Take a country like Japan, which imposes, not through tariffs but by other means, particularly banking, very severe restrictions on imports into that country and, as such, almost effectively precludes exports to Japan unless it is at extreme cost to the exporter. If that is the case, why are we allowing Japanese vehicles to come into Australia virtually free of any tariff protection or support for the local industry? That is the basic argument which has been ignored by the Kelly gang.

The other point I highlight about them is that, although they have used the New South Wales study, which the Premier will comment on shortly, to support their argument that total employment in the industry is likely to be increased, any person who has any understanding of the motor vehicle industry would realise that that so-called Professor Parry argument does not hold water. That has been well and truly smashed already by the far more credible study by the University of Melbourne, in which it is admitted that, with the adoption of I.A.C. recommen-

dations, there would be significant job losses throughout the automotive industry in this country.

The I.A.C., in its report, went into a great deal of detail, but, again, there are one or two key fundamental flaws in the I.A.C. study of the car industry, and a fundamental flaw that it took a historical view of the car industry, rather than a view of what the car industry is likely to be by the end of 1984. No industry in Australia has undergone more fundamental change than has the car industry in the past two or three years. It will continue to undergo such fundamental change by the end of 1984.

For instance, it is only now that we find our component manufacturers even tendering for overseas orders, because for the first time they have the chance to participate. There is a number of examples, which I am sorry I cannot give because they are still in the final stages of negotiation, but I believe that in the next 12 months we will see how our component industry, particularly here in South Australia, can obtain significant benefits by manufacturing under the export facilitation plan. Through it, they will gain access not just to a slightly enlarged vehicle market, but to a significantly enlarged one.

The total Australian car industry produces about 500 000 vehicles a year. There is no way, when we have five manufacturers, that we can reach reasonable economies of scale in an industry of that size. The only way we will achieve those economies of scale is through export facilitation, where in one simple order we can suddenly start to produce another 300 or 350 components or units of production in any one year. So, we can effectively triple or quadruple the market for which you manufacture under export facilitation.

Finally, I come to the point as to what future policy should be. The policy must contain export facilitation, if for no other reason than that it is the only way in which we will be able to preserve our component industry both here in South Australia and interstate. Secondly, it must have local content. As I indicated earlier, tariffs alone will not protect the Australian car industry. Without a local content plan, boards overseas will dictate, and manufacturing will take place outside Australia. That policy must include a restriction on imports of vehicles into Australia. Although there is some room for adjustment, import quotas should remain at the current 80/20 level. However (and I put this policy to the Federal Minister in some detail), that 20 per cent allocated to import needs be redistributed so that it includes both local manufacturers and car importers that do not manufacture in Australia.

Mr Keneally interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Stuart will remain silent.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I am delighted to say that the Federal Minister fully appreciates and acknowledges the arguments put forward by the South Australian Government. We have a good advocate in the Federal Minister, who supports the type of arguments I am putting forward this afternoon. We expect the Federal Cabinet to make a final decision on the future policy for the car industry during October, November or early December. It is important that this State clearly express what its policy should be. We are not advocating that there should be no change. A policy of no change is not realistic, especially as we need a policy of import/export facilitation, and especially with the introduction recently of the world car concept. There are some components that we will never efficiently produce in Australia, but there are many components that we can produce here, and not only produce for the local market but also for export markets.

This is the area that we should be getting into and concentrating our efforts on. It will mean a restructuring

of the component industry in this State and other States. That is why the South Australian Government has committed at least \$1 000 000 a year to encourage the local component manufacturers to restructure so that they produce new component parts, particularly those that can come under the export facilitation plan.

I ask the House to support this important motion, which has a fundamental impact on the future of manufacturing industry in this State and country as a whole. The South Australian economy will be in tatters if the recommendations of the I.A.C. report are adopted. I look forward to getting support for this motion from all members of the House.

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): At one point early in this debate the Premier interjected to the effect that he thought that this was going to be a bipartisan matter. It is fair to say in broad terms that this is, as it happens, a bipartisan matter. It was interesting that he should make that interjection hard on the heels of the Minister beginning his speech by talking about a demonstration of concern by thousands of workers in the motor vehicle industry, which he characterised as being dominated by a small group of Labor Party hecklers. That is what he talked about. Those people who are concerned about their jobs and future and who are demonstrating that very loudly and clearly, not in the way that the Minister wished them to demonstrate, are characterised as being dominated or directed by a small group of Labor Party hecklers. That is the way he started the debate. That is the sort of bipartisan spirit that the Minister of Industrial Affairs wants to come in on.

Let us get this debate in perspective. As far as the Government is concerned, this is not a debate about the future of the motor vehicle industry and the horrendous effects of the I.A.C. recommendations, if they were put into effect: it is all about the ego of the Minister himself. At that demonstration the Minister appeared and told those workers a few things about what a great job his Government was doing. Much to his surprise, rather than listen to him, they decided that they were observing a member of the Liberal Government in South Australia, which has actively supported and is processing these very threats to their jobs. It did not matter to them that the Minister wanted to give them a little lecture about how well he had been supporting the case. What they saw was a Liberal standing up before them, and they let it be known what they thought of him and his Premier, who had urged people to vote for the Prime Minister (Mr Fraser), who is behind all this.

Instead of accepting that in some sort of spirit of humility, as one would hope anyone would, the Minister waved his finger at the demonstrators and tried to lecture them about how they should behave. Again, he is talking to men and women whose jobs are threatened, as a Liberal Party member, and yet he is surprised. The upshot is that he leaves the demonstration, tail between his legs, feeling very hurt indeed that his great contributions to these workers have not been recognised by tumultuous cheers for his efforts, and the bruising of his ego has to be fixed up—and it is fixed up in the form of this motion. We are not debating the car industry. We are attempting to save the Minister's pride, and we are having a debate about Brown's ego.

Having said that, let us get the matter in perspective. The Opposition certainly would support a number of the sentiments expressed in the motion, and will do so. We have some amendments to the last part of the motion, although they do not affect the substance of it. I am happy to say that, yes, indeed, despite the jibes of the Minister of Industrial Affairs, despite his attempts to politicise this issue, the

Opposition indeed is supporting him in the broad thrust of what he is saying early in the motion. We have been doing so consistently, and in fact at the Federal level it has been the Labor members, spearheaded by one of our own local members, the member for Adelaide, Mr Hurford, who have led the fight against the so-called Kelly gang. That is something the Minister neglected to tell us. He did not talk about the unified opposition by the Labor Party to these proposals, loudly and clearly expressed; he talked about a group within his own Party, of his own political persuasion, a significant force on the Government back bench, people who include one or two local members from South Australia, including also the member for Barker (Mr Porter), described in the press as a free trader—one of the very group that he characterises—led in fact by the former South Australian member for Wakefield, Mr Bert Kelly, whose influence over some of his former South Australian colleagues is strong.

They are the people the Minister is talking about—and he asks us to deal with this in a bipartisan spirit. He then proceeds to get very smug indeed about the role of the Government. The lecture that he tried to deliver, with a lot of finger waving, to the group of angry workers he is delivering to us. No Government, he says, has done more for the motor vehicle industry in South Australia, and he lists a number of proposals. There was no reference whatever to the 1974 intervention by the Dunstan Government—and there was a Labor Government in Canberra then; we do not back away from that.

• That 1974 intervention, in the face of an I.A.C. report, was the first major intervention by a State Government in the history of tariff protection in this country. It was well researched, and it turned the whole debate around in Australia, because it woke up the Federal Government and the I.A.C. to the fact that we were talking not just about a few people employed directly in the vehicle-building industry—a few thousand, but few in national terms—but about the many thousands more in the associated component industry.

That was done by the Dunstan Government in 1974, and that submission has been at the base of every defensive move against the I.A.C. and its recommendations. Not a word of that did we hear from our smug self-satisfied Minister who, in the period when he was in Opposition, carped about and criticised everything the Government did and now has discovered that it did more for the vehicle industry. The other example he gave was the Motor Vehicle Assistance Scheme. He said that the State Government had introduced a scheme, and he began to expatiate on that scheme, until he was called to order by an interjection from this side. He was asked whether that was not a Labor Government scheme, and he had to admit that it was, but he said that the Labor Government spent only \$250 000.

Mr Ashenden: Peanuts!

Mr BANNON: The member for Todd says that that is peanuts. Let me put the facts before the House. The scheme was announced in June 1979 by the member for Hartley, as Premier, to facilitate structural change in the automotive components industry. The sum of \$1 000 000 was to be allocated to the scheme in the 1979-80 Budget and had been announced by Premier Corcoran at that time. Which Party was in office from the time that scheme came into effect? The Minister and his colleagues were in office, and how much of that \$1 000 000 did they spend in 1979-80? They spent \$503 000, which amounted to a 50 per cent underspending.

Members interjecting:

Mr BANNON: I would suggest that Government members listen to the truth. In 1980-81, \$443 000 was spent, a reduction on the previous year, and an even greater reduction taking inflation into account. Now, in 1981-82, we are

told proudly by the Minister that the Government has budgeted for \$1 000 000—the same figure as Premier Corcoran budgeted for—in the face of underspending and the inability to progress with that scheme. So, that is the record of the Government concerning that scheme introduced by the Labor Government, so let us not have that smug self-satisfied nonsense again from the Minister.

One of the most extraordinary things about this whole debate and the holier-than-thou attitude of the Minister about these threats from Canberra is that every single word he uttered (while we would agree with a lot of what he said) is completely at odds with the philosophy of the Liberal Party and the philosophy that the Minister has rammed down the throats of the South Australian people, in company with his Premier and also the Prime Minister, for the past 10 years or more. Talking about getting out of the way of business, is that not what the I.A.C. says? Is not that what the so-called Kelly gang says? It says, 'Get out of the way of business; let the industry see whether it can sink or float by itself.' The result of that approach would be absolutely catastrophic, and the Minister knows it. However, that is his philosophy; that is what he has been urging the South Australian people to support and vote for. That is what the Premier loudly trumpets—'Get out of the way of business, and let the free market forces operate.'

I am very pleased for South Australia's sake, to use the memorable phrase of the Premier, that the Government has somehow seen the light and has realised that free market forces cannot operate in this situation, but suddenly we are being lectured again by the Minister of Industrial Affairs about the fact that there is no such thing as a free market, that in Japan there are as many constraints and Government interventions as there are anywhere else, and that in that situation we must regulate, control and protect. I am glad that the Minister has made that discovery. Let us see him now apply it across the board to a few more areas of our State's economy, because unless he does, and unless he convinces his Premier that that is what should be done, we will be even worse off than we are at the moment.

We have had this extraordinary sight of Liberals agitating and stirring in complete contradiction to their Party's whole philosophical basis of getting out of the way of business and allowing free market forces to operate. Opposition members have been totally consistent on this issue. We realise that industry must be efficient, that industry must be competitive and encouraged to export. Of course we realise that, but we also recognise that those things cannot happen unless industry is allowed to develop and grow within some form of protective environment. Whether it involves tariff protection or complementation schemes, etc., there are various methods of supplying such assistance, and this must be done. Most importantly, these methods need Government support, Government planning and clear guidelines. However, all of those things are lacking in this situation, and it is all very well for the Minister to raise his voice and say that he has had long chats with Sir Philip Lynch, but the damage was done years ago by him and his colleagues at State level, as well as at the Federal level, in their philosophy and their approach to these issues.

South Australia will be one of the States hardest hit by this. The Labor Government recognised that in this State it was the component industry, in particular, which was hanging on to the motor vehicle industry. Incidentally, the component industry is not just producing components for those motor vehicle firms that operate here: massive amounts of components are also produced for interstate motor vehicle makers and firms that are household names in other fields, such as Hills Industries, Castalloy and Tubemakers, etc. Add those firms to the list that the Minister mentioned, involving another range of products,

which are also very dependent indeed on motor vehicle componentry.

So, let there be no doubt about the importance of this industry to South Australia and the jobs that are involved, and let us indeed have some sort of bipartisan approach and not the cheap, snide remarks about Labor Party hecklers with which the Minister greeted us in the opening words of his speech.

One of the chief problems that we face at the moment is that the I.A.C. report has been published. It has been debated. There is obviously enormous support for it on the Liberal Party back bench and within the Liberal Government Cabinet in Canberra. Yet, there is no decision forthcoming. In a sense this is even more damaging than doing nothing, or announcing that nothing will be changed, or implementing the I.A.C. report.

The facts are that since the I.A.C. report has been sent out for discussion in the industry there has been massive evidence produced, evidence in terms of reasoned submissions, in terms of delegations, in terms of advertisements, in terms of mass demonstrations in the street, all of them pointing to the fact that to introduce these recommendations would be catastrophic for the South Australian economy and for Australia as a whole.

Surely there is enough evidence there and enough has been said for the Federal Government to come out loudly and clearly today and say, 'We are not going to implement these terms. We have rejected the report.' But are they doing it? No, indeed. They are leaving the industry in a total state of turmoil and suspension. Recommendations and a Cabinet decision were expected last month. We have not seen them. The matter was deferred for a month. And then we read only a few days ago in the *Financial Review* that yet a further deferral is taking place. It was in fact on 14 September 1981—'New delay expected on car industry policy. The Government's decision on car industry policies after 1984 may be further delayed, and no final announcement made on the issue before November.' So, there will be no decision before November. What is needed most of all is a decision immediately. There are companies which have to make investment decisions. There are employees who do not know whether their jobs are going to be there after December of this year. What sort of Christmas present are they going to be given if the Government announces in December that it is accepting the I.A.C. recommendations, and the component industry may as well pack up within the next few months? We must have a decision now to get rid of this uncertainty. Eventually it is going to effect the productivity and, indeed, the competitiveness of our industries in Australia. The slow seeping of morale has been recognised by employers. It is certainly felt by employees and their union representatives. It is going to reach such a stage that in fact we will be immobilised.

That is no way to conduct a major industry in this country. The industry has to be confident of its forward planning, confident of its future, and to be confident it must have a decision. That is what the Minister ought to be urging on his Federal colleagues. That is what the Premier, who helped get Mr Fraser elected last year, ought to be saying to the Prime Minister. We need a decision, and we need it now.

As to the performance of some of the South Australian members of Parliament, members of Federal seats in particular, and members of the Senate, they ought to be called to account a little more firmly. When I say 'members', let me be specific. I said 'members' in a non-partisan spirit. The fact is that every one of the members about whom we have some doubts belongs to the Liberal Party. They presumably attend the monthly conferences of the Liberal Party, go to sub-branch meetings of Liberal Party members,

and talk to the Premier and his colleagues. They are part of the Premier's organisation, and they ought to be called into account accordingly, but we have not heard a word of that from the other side.

Let the Tonkin Government place on record not just its attitude but the attitude of its Party. We have grave doubts. Extraordinarily, in the course of his address, again, the Liberal Minister of Industrial Affairs in this State did not refer to the fact that his Party is actively contemplating a platform on industry which in the words of the manufacturers' publication recommends the dismantling of protection. That comes as no surprise to members on this side of the House; that is what the Liberal Party is all about, but we hear nothing of that in the context of the motor vehicle industry, but a draft Party platform has been circulated to all State branches of the Liberal Party which includes the plank:

The gradual removal of quotas and reduction of tariffs, to remove the burden on efficient industry and promote competition.

That is good sound Liberal Party philosophy, indeed, which is completely at odds with what this motion seeks to do and with the problem that is embodied in this motion. I challenge the Liberal Party now: that is the policy which has been circulated from its national office, going to all its State branches, and publicised in the business press. How about the Liberal Party coming out at its next State council meeting, as the A.L.P. has done, with a firm solid opposition to this I.A.C. report and its recommendations! Let us see that on the record book, before coming in here lecturing us or going out on to the front steps and trying to lecture the workers whose jobs are in trouble.

I am sure it is clear enough to all members what the impact of the I.A.C. recommendations will be on this industry. I have not gone into detail on the effects on employment; the figures vary, but we are talking about thousands and thousands of jobs; we are talking about thousands of dollars; we are talking about the future of hundreds of thousands of migrants who came to this country and found jobs in the motor vehicle industry—jobs, prosperity and a future—and we are going to dash that as well. There are so many social, economic and other factors wrapped up in this that a debate of this kind cannot cover the full scope of it. However, I think the implications of a collapse of the motor vehicle industry in Australia are understood by all members. They are horrendous, and they must be resisted at all costs, particularly in this State.

I am afraid that while urged to take a bipartisan policy, and while indeed supporting aspects of this resolution, it is hard indeed for members on this side to swallow the nonsense we have had from the other side which is so contrary to its philosophy and to its performance, both federally and in this State. I wish to amend this motion. The amendment leaves untouched the first three-quarters of the motion but changes—

Dr Billard: Oh!

Mr BANNON: I suggest to the member for Newland, who immediately jumps to the conclusion, like his Minister, that I am going to launch into some partisan attack about Labor Party hecklers, that we do not work that way on this side of the House and he would do well to remember that, because he will find that out clearly amongst the swinging voters in his district at the next election. I move:

Delete all words after 'import quotas' and insert the following in lieu thereof:

commends the South Australian Government and the Opposition for their efforts to ensure the long-term viability of this vital industry; and directs Mr Speaker to convey this resolution to the Prime Minister and all South Australian Senators and request that the South Australian Senators meet the Prime Minister as a group to support South Australia's case.

I have added 'the Opposition' to the commendation of the Government for reasons which ought to be patently clear and which have been explored by me in this debate and relate to our Federal colleagues who, to a man and woman, have opposed the I.A.C. recommendations, unlike the Minister's colleagues in Canberra.

I have incorporated a reference to the conveying of the resolution being done by you, Mr Speaker, as the representative of this Parliament, rather than by the Premier as the representative of the Government. I believe this should come as a resolution of the Parliament unanimously supported, with you, Sir, as our representative in such matters, conveying it to those to whom it is appropriate to be conveyed. I have added a request that the resolution be conveyed to the South Australian Senators. We know that the Senate is a political Party body, but in many respects it still represents the States. As members of a States' House, these Senators have a primary role to play in supporting South Australia's interests. I believe that, if we are going to do something effective in Canberra with this resolution, our Senators as a group (Labor, Liberal and Australian Democrat) should take that resolution to the Prime Minister and press our case.

I think all those amendments make sense, but most importantly I would stress that all of them point up the bipartisan approach which we believe is vital here. Let this resolution be one that deals with the role that the Government and Opposition have both played. Let this resolution be one that is a resolution of the House conveyed by you, as representative of Parliament, and let that conveying go to our Senators of all political persuasions to take right into the heartland in Canberra and prevent this I.A.C. recommendation being implemented.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): What an extraordinary performance we have just heard from the Leader of the Opposition. It is in fact an enormous contrast when taken with the remarks of the Minister of Industrial Affairs. The Leader has, indeed, in the last few moments of his speech suddenly become bipartisan, because for the rest of the time he was totally and absolutely political and biased. I would feel much more inclined to support the course of action that he has put forward in his amendment if he had not spent the major part of his speech being political.

What a contrast it was; not only was he political in almost everything he said but he had the nerve to say beforehand that he was not going to be political, that he was going to adopt a bipartisan approach. He proceeded to go on and talk not only about the Party politics of it, but what I resent more than anything else (and what I suspect is a matter which characterises the attitude of the Opposition now), he talked in terms of personality, about the individual and the Minister of Industrial Affairs, and he spent a good deal of time on personalities. The Leader seems unable to keep off personalities, and I find that attack on the Minister, who was in fact more than generous to the Leader's Party when introducing the motion, quite disgraceful and disgusting.

The Minister gave due credit to the members of all sides of Federal politics for their stand. The Minister mentioned all members of the Federal House and all South Australian members on both sides who took part in the representations which he has made and which I have made in the various meetings that have been held. However, the Leader, in sharp contrast, attacks all Liberals and praises all Labor Party members. The Minister, in passing, recognised the role of previous State Governments in dealing with similar attacks, previous Governments which included, I would have thought even to the Leader's mind, the Dunstan Government of the time, and the Minister alluded to the efforts

which had been made by previous Governments. The Leader—no way; he castigated this Government and Liberal Party members in the Federal and State spheres at all times. I found his speech, quite frankly, carping, small minded, mean and displaying a miserable attitude indeed. There is little, if any, evidence of any sort of statesmanship in the remarks made by the Leader today.

The Leader of the Opposition grizzles (I cannot think of any other word for it) about the deferral of the decision. I would have thought the Federal Government's deferral of a decision on the I.A.C. report was probably something that should be welcomed by all members, because it shows that it is having second thoughts about the I.A.C. report. I would go further and say that it is because of the strong representations that have been made to the Prime Minister and to members of the Federal Cabinet that that deferral has taken place.

Why on earth the Leader of the Opposition, for some reason, believes that that is a bad thing, I do not know. He has not in any way described it to my satisfaction. He demands a decision today, which is a typical attitude of Oppositions who have no responsibility. Since he started the politicking, I point out to him that the Labor Party itself reached a decision on the policy of this matter only yesterday. It is a matter on which it has taken that Party a great deal of time to reach a conclusion.

A fascinating thing I found about that policy was that Mr Hurford, the Federal Member for Adelaide and the spokesman for the Labor Party, said in a commentary that there would have to be a rationalisation of car industry manufacturers from five to three, and preferably two. Where do the Leader of the Opposition and his State members stand in relation to that policy? If they support it, perhaps they will be kind enough to stand up today and tell the people of South Australia which of the two car manufacturers in South Australia should be thrown out, because one of them, in those circumstances, is bound to be affected. Which one are they going to close down?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: From five down to two.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Leader of the Opposition had better watch out. People who live in glass houses, as Opposition members undoubtedly do, should not be throwing stones. As the Minister has so clearly interjected, the Opposition's own policy is far worse than anything the Federal Government's acceptance of the I.A.C. report could do to the industry in this State. The Leader of the Opposition knows this, and he has been desperately trying to put forward a smokescreen to hide and protect his Federal colleagues, as he does at all times.

The Minister of Industrial Affairs had every right to object to his treatment by a very small group of organised people at the rally on the steps of Parliament House the other day. I say to members opposite that the tactics they adopted did not go unnoticed by very many people in the community. Exactly what was happening was clearly shown on the television services, namely, how a small number of people so successfully were able to drown out what the Minister of Industrial Affairs had to say. They were organised by the Labor Party. It was a cowardly thing to do and in no way suggests a bipartisan approach to a problem that should concern us all.

The Leader of the Opposition tried to justify that which I believe is unjustifiable. A small group of individuals did the best it could to deny a fundamental right, freedom of speech, and the freedom of a gathering to hear what is said. Those people worked to deny that freedom, striking at the very basic principles of freedom, generally. A few people tried to turn it into a political rally, which does them no credit. It was an attempt to turn it into a politically

partisan meeting, and will reflect only on those who organised it. Certainly, the Labor Party lost many votes.

The Government has been spearheading this general South Australian approach, and will continue to do so. It does very little credit to those trying to turn it to political advantage. The motor vehicle industry grew up in Australia, particularly in South Australia, on the basis of imported engines fitted to locally produced bodies. It moved in quite well, following Sir Thomas Playford's changing this State from a predominantly agricultural to an industrial economy. Local industry was protected by a series of *ad quantum* and *ad valorem* tariff measures until 1966.

Then the first of many local content plans was introduced, and this had the effect of limiting the value of imported components to a specified percentage of the wholesale selling price of a car, which system has been with us ever since. The purpose of motor vehicle content plans (and I have figures here) was to ensure that a predetermined level of activity in the automotive industry was retained in Australia. Plans brought in from time to time have all been based on much the same principle, with differing content levels.

From 1966 to 1975 we had the 95 per cent content plan. In other words, a vehicle producer could build an unlimited number of vehicles, provided that he imported not more than 5 per cent by value of the wholesale selling price. The imports of 5 per cent were duty free. Then we had the small volume plan, under which vehicles could be produced with by-law concessions on imports, subject to the following volume constraints: one to 2 500, 45 per cent local content requirement; 2 000 to 5 000, 50 per cent; and 5 000 to 7 000, 60 per cent. The content of each model within a producer's range was considered individually, so that he may have different vehicles entered in the 95 per cent plan in each of the small volume plans.

From 1976 until the present time we have worked on the company average plan. The basis of local content was changed to this plan, which required an average of each producer to equal 85 per cent, when weighted according to volume of each individual model in the range. Under this plan the individual performance for each model is not separated or measured separately, which was a significant departure from the earlier content plan. In addition to those local content plans, we also have a degree of protection afforded to local industry by market share regulations, which require that the sale of completely imported built-up units represents no more than 20 per cent of the total annual sales into the passenger car market.

The C.B.U.'s, the completely built up units, are dutiable at the rate of 57.5 per cent *ad valorem*, and are allocated by quota to importers. In the second half of 1979, a portion of available quotas was sold by tender and the highest price tendered so far is equivalent to a duty of 131 per cent. The position has become no easier; it is certainly no less complicated. The local content plan was amended in 1979 to provide for credits to be earned by export performance. The new arrangements will become effective in 1982, with maximum credit accelerating from 5 per cent initially to 7.5 per cent in 1984.

In simple terms, the export facilitation programme will mean that a vehicle producer need achieve only 80 per cent local content and export components to a value of 5 per cent of the wholesale selling price. The producer is then deemed to be at 85 per cent company average, so the criteria come back to that local content figure. Obvious attractions for such a scheme are provisions of economy of scale through specialisation and export; replacement of Australian components with high cost disabilities, with exports at world competitive prices, which is obviously good business; and allowing imports of some new generation fuel

efficient technologies, development and tooling of which would be prohibitive in Australia (the Minister referred to some of the problems) when amortised over local market volume. They are all ways in which the car industry in Australia, particularly South Australia, has been given the protection it needs to keep operating and to maintain jobs, at the same time to improve productivity and increase our ability to compete on world markets.

The motor vehicle industry, in broad terms, can be said to be totally and absolutely the backbone of this State's economy at present. It constitutes the manufacturing and technological base of the State. Its employment significance is evident from the following statistics, being the latest supplied by the A.B.S. from May 1980, when the figures were last produced. In plain terms, we can see just how important the I.A.C. report could be to South Australia if its recommendations were implemented.

There are 1 163 000 civilian employees in manufacturing in Australia; in South Australia there are 80 800. There are 79 900 (nearly 80 000) people employed in motor vehicle and component manufacturing in Australia; in South Australia there are 16 300. The percentage of the manufacturing work force in the motor vehicle industry itself in Australia is 6.9 per cent, whereas in South Australia it is 20.2 per cent. This is a very significant figure for South Australia. These figures relate to direct employment in the motor vehicle industry. When we take into account the multipliers, the employment opportunities dependent upon the automotive industry, these numbers would be more than doubled.

In other words, South Australia has something like less than 10 per cent of the Australian population but produces something like 20 per cent of the total of locally manufactured vehicles. Although only 10 per cent of employment in the independent component industry is in South Australia, the G.M.H. operations at Woodville and Elizabeth produce components in house for assembly plants in other States, in Queensland and New South Wales, as well as in South Australia. South Australia produces the total G.M.H. requirements of body panels, engine sheet metal, soft trim, auto transmissions, and body hardware. As members know, General Motors have recently established the first stage of their plastics facility at Elizabeth.

South Australia has a large captive component industry in its General Motors operation. Mitsubishi is the only Australian vehicle producer that has headquarters in this State. In addition to producing engines and components for its own requirements in this State, Mitsubishi also manufactures engine block castings for Nissan (including export requirements) and other components for Ford, G.M.H. and Toyota (sometimes through independent suppliers). The significance of this industry for South Australia cannot be over-estimated.

The Minister of Industrial Affairs has talked at some length about the various theories put forward, theories with which we cannot agree, as with the argument by Professor Parry that the removal of tariffs will increase employment. I think he bases this on the fact that he says the adoption of the I.A.C. recommendations may well increase the number of locally produced vehicles and that changes in production related employment would therefore be minimal. That conclusion presupposes that the market has already been compressed by high vehicle prices and supply limitations or smaller more fuel-efficient vehicles.

If he asserts that the abolition of quotas and phasing down of tariffs would increase the vehicle density per thousand of population (I think his figures were from 392 in 1979 to 410, a figure he describes as conservative) I totally disagree with him. That is a finding by historical data and by economic model: by almost every test we can put against

it. Another argument that has been put forward by Professor Parry is that an increased level of imports will reduce prices, and therefore demand will be stimulated. I cannot see that this is going to happen, either. Experience in other industries has shown that prices will always be related to what the market will sustain. Since the market has not been compressed by prices, we should expect prices of imports in the longer term to remain at the same sorts of levels as they are at now. This is in real terms, allowing for inflation.

Professor Parry makes the point that local production will remain at relatively constant or slightly higher levels, based again on the fact that he supposes that prices will be down. I cannot see that at all. If imports are to be increased without the compressed market suddenly expanding, there must be a downturn in the sale of local products. Finally, Professor Parry predicts that employment will be increased in the sales and service sectors because of increased sales, the increased number of cars, the increased number of cars needing servicing, and so on.

One with any knowledge of the motor vehicle industry today will know that technological advances are being built into every new model and that the need for servicing is being reduced steadily year by year. Whereas it was necessary to have a full lube and oil change, I think, every 1 000 miles, those days have gone.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes, the time now is after every 10 000 kilometres. There are not the same number of people being employed and there is not the same demand for the services, because of technological changes. The introduction of technology, computers in particular, has reduced the number of people involved in storing, selling and accounting.

I cannot bring to light any evidence that supports Professor Parry's contentions. Any policy that depends upon increases in sales and service employment is disadvantageous to South Australia. Demand for labour in the areas is related directly to vehicle population. South Australia has only 10 per cent of the national vehicle population, whereas it manufactures 20 per cent of the national output of finished vehicles. If we put one against the other and expect to make up for the downturn in employment in manufacturing and service jobs, it does not match up at all.

Professor Parry's work, well meaning though it may be, has received recognition far beyond that which it deserves. It certainly does not in any way square up with what this Government believes, what its findings have determined, and, I believe, what members of the Opposition really believe about the car industry. If the recommendations of the I.A.C. report are implemented by the Federal Government, we are at risk. I have made that point of view known in the strongest possible terms to the Prime Minister and members of the Federal Cabinet. I have discussed the matter with a number of Federal members on both sides of politics, asking them to add their weight at all times to defend South Australia and our employment situation.

Some emphasis was given by the Leader of the Opposition to the philosophy that we hold, namely, get out of the way of business. I remind him that we believe also that we should get out of the way of individuals and do everything we can for their welfare. Our philosophy is ideally suited and directed towards the well-being of the individual. There are too many people whose well-being is at risk on the whole question for us to resile from the position of doing everything we can to protect their jobs and well-being.

The Minister of Industrial Affairs has drawn my attention to the Melbourne Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research study, which has undertaken an analysis of the situation, using their I.M.P. model. They reduced the tariff

to 50 per cent in that study, and an import quota set a new level of 20 percentage points higher than the current prevailing ones. They also confirmed our point of view. In the third year after policy changes, all industries are affected by the decline in motor vehicle production. The downturn ranges from 5.1 per cent in the 'other industrial machinery' category to 1.1 per cent in the petroleum and coal products. Economic activity in South Australia is reduced by approximately 5 per cent. Total employment falls by 51 000 jobs, 39 000 of which are in the manufacturing sector. It all adds up, no matter which way we look at it, to the fact that any significant contraction of the motor vehicle industry can be expected to have a major impact on the overall level of economic activity.

It is an impact which, in the short term, far exceeds any of the gains postulated and theorised about by the proponents of the I.A.C. report. All of the theories in the world to project the impact of motor vehicle industry policy changes can be regarded at best as broadly indicative—I believe that is the official term for them—and at the worst grossly misleading. There is no way in which I can do anything other than oppose the I.A.C. recommendations, refute and discard Professor Parry's arguments, and put forward the South Australian Government's position in the strongest possible terms. However, we do that in the knowledge that, in spite of the rather unfortunate speech of the Leader, we have the support of the South Australian people, especially the people in the motor vehicle industry and in the components industry, all the people who depend on the industry for their prosperity and livelihood, and I believe we have the support of the total community in what I think is a truly bipartisan approach.

We will be putting forward our point of view. We believe that the present structure of the industry can be improved and changed, but any such change must be gradual. It must be carefully monitored, and that monitoring of the economic, employment and industrial situation of the time is critical to the successful implementation of any restructuring measure. Our proposals are a very carefully balanced package of local content rules, market sharing, and export facilitation that would lead to a more efficient industry, while preserving the maximum number of jobs—because that is what this is all about.

I support the motion. I will be pleased to convey the resolution to the Prime Minister in the strongest possible terms, as that resolution properly should be conveyed, as head of Government to head of Government. I will add the weight of this resolution to the repeated and intensive representations made to him already, to the Federal Cabinet, and the Commonwealth Government generally. I am quite certain that we will be supported in this by the entire South Australian community, and even by the Opposition.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I support the amendment, because quite clearly the amendment is the best proposition placed before the House today. I am sure that the Government is now concerned that it did not think of the provisions of the amendment before they were put forward, so that it could have suggested them in the first place. The amendment clearly binds the Senators of both political persuasions in this State to do something about the matter.

Simply carrying the motion in its present form will mean that a letter will go to the Prime Minister, and we will hear no more about it. Perhaps that is what the Liberal Party wants, and what it is about. I have been trying to work out for the past couple of hours why this proposition was put up. At first, I thought it was to satisfy the ego of the Minister of Industrial Affairs, who, unfortunately—and I say that advisedly—was not allowed to put a point of view

last week. I believe in the right of free speech, and I support the right of any political Party to put its point of view. The Minister was deeply hurt about the matter, and he probably concocted the motion for that reason and for one other, to satisfy his own ego.

However, he could not stop at that. Unfortunately, he had to criticise what he referred to as a few Labor Party hecklers in the audience. It is a pity the Minister did not come directly to the Parliament today to get a bipartisan view on this motion, without talking on Party lines and criticising what he called Labor Party hecklers. I was on the Parliament House steps when the Minister was there, and I did not see anyone organising those hecklers, as he called them. The reaction seemed to me to be spontaneous. I am not saying that the comments were directed at this Minister; I think they were directed at the Liberal Party, quite clearly, and I believe it was a spontaneous reaction to the general policies of the Liberal Party nationally.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The Minister of Industrial Affairs and the Premier have accused the Labor Party of not taking a bipartisan stand on this issue, not taking an interest in it, not supporting the car industry in South Australia, and therefore not supporting the industry and the workers in it. Let me remind the House that it was on my initiative in the first instance that the first meeting was called of the unions involved. That is on record, and it was after the Labor Party became the Opposition. It is on record that that meeting, for the first time, commended the actions of the Opposition in sorting out some direct policy. The policy on that occasion was to go to Minister Lynch and put a proposition from South Australia, supported by every trade union concerned with the industry and by the Opposition. The Minister came in the back door, got on to Minister Lynch, and asked that he lead the delegation. Having the advantage of being in Government, with the Opposition not being considered by the Federal Government, the Minister of Industrial Affairs got the kudos and took over a delegation. I reiterate that it was my idea in the first instance, and the Liberal Party subsequently adopted the idea and tried to get the kudos.

It is useless for the Premier or the Minister to come into this House and say that the Opposition has not done its job in trying to protect the industry. I believe that we need protection in this State. In his speech today, the Premier criticised three or four times the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition. The only thing that can be said about the Leader's speech is that it was so good, and that is what the Premier was hostile about. It was one of the best speeches I have heard in this Chamber. It was one of the best speeches I have heard in the 10 years I have been in this House, and that is what upset the Government. The Leader was able to turn the tables and expose the hypocrisy of the Government, driving the nails into the coffin. There is no doubt that that is what upset the Premier. It was quite clear that the Leader of the Opposition knew more about this subject and that he was able to expose the inability of the Liberal Party and the hypocrisy that occurs within the Party.

The second reason I have arrived at for the introduction of this motion today by the Minister (I have talked about his ego) is that I have picked up something he said to the effect that Federal Minister Lynch was a good advocate for South Australia's position. If that is so, why is it necessary to bring such a motion into the Parliament for support? There is only one deduction I can make: the Prime Minister himself does not support that stand. So, we have a diversion and a dissension within the Federal Liberal Cabinet; the Minister wants to take up the cudgels for South Australia

but the Prime Minister opposes that. One can only deduce from what the Minister said that that is the real reason for the motion. He is trying to give some support to the Federal Minister so that he can take the resolution from the South Australian Parliament to the Cabinet and oppose Prime Minister Fraser.

I would like the Minister of Industrial Affairs to come clean and tell us whether that is the real reason for the motion. He is smiling, but I do not know whether that indicates assent or disagreement. Now he is nodding, so it is probably assent, and we have probably found the real reason for the motion: there is dissension. What about the South Australian Ministers in the Federal Cabinet? What stand are they taking? Are they supporting the South Australian stand? I hope that the Minister, if he has time to reply, will tell us what stand they are taking.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: They are.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: They are—so it is on record that the South Australian Ministers in the Federal Cabinet are taking up the cudgels and supporting the same line as the Government in this State is supporting. That is very good, if that is the case.

Mr Hemmings: There's not many of them.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: There are two Ministers involved, and if they are taking up the case for South Australia that is good. I received in my box the other day a very interesting pamphlet titled 'The destruction of an industry', put out by the Federation of Automotive Product Manufacturers (F.A.P.M.). The pamphlet states:

The Federal Government will decide the future of the Australian motor industry very soon. The Government's advisory body has put forward proposals which car makers and auto parts makers agree would demolish the local motor industry. It has taken 30 years and huge amounts of investment to build the industry up to the present stage where it employs over 100 000 people and produces 400 000 vehicles a year.

The Australian auto parts industry is vital to this total scene. It employs 35 000 men and women making parts for new vehicles as well as spare parts.

Why workers, suppliers and shareholders should take Australia's part—

The pamphlet mentions jobs first and states:

In the last two years falling sales of Australian made vehicles forced car makers and auto parts makers to lay off thousands of men and women. Over the next three years a further 9 000 jobs will be lost from auto parts factories because of Federal Government policies introduced last year.

That is how much concern the Federal Liberal Party has for jobs in the manufacturing industry in Australia. It goes on:

Import policies now being considered by the Government will destroy the remaining jobs in the total industry. Over 100 000 jobs are at risk.

They are fairly serious allegations that the F.A.P.M. is making. The pamphlet then mentions suppliers and states:

Parts makers and car companies are large buyers of goods and services. Many firms which supply raw materials and services depend on the motor industry. Investment and jobs in steel, plastics, glass, textiles and many other Australian industries are at stake.

It then states, 'Your business is at risk'. There is a fair amount of unanimity of thought throughout Australia, irrespective of which firm one approaches. In South Australia, and I have been around to most firms during the last few months, one finds that this is the case for various reasons. No doubt Mitsubishi has its reasons, General Motors has its reasons about the Holden complementation scheme, etc. Yesterday I was at Tubemakers, and I have been to Carr Fastener, etc. All these firms are affected and, together with the trade unions and workers in this State, are all vitally concerned about the view that the Federal Government is going to take. In my view the utmost pressure (honest pressure, not hypocritical pressure) should be placed on the Federal Government to look after South Australia.

I spoke to the Vehicle Builders Union a few days ago about what its membership in the industry was over the past five years. One finds already that considerable retrenchment is occurring in the industry. The figures given to me by that organisation indicate that from a total of 14 000 members throughout the industry in 1976, just five years ago, the membership of that industry is now only 9 000. The Vehicle Builders Union (and others, but I have not had time to check) has lost some 5 000 members. Other unions in the industry would be affected in exactly the same way, and the figure could be somewhere between 10 000 and 15 000.

Mr Ashenden: But employment is going up at the moment with both the major manufacturers.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am interrupted by the member for Todd telling me that there is an escalation at the moment—there is a slow escalation. I was at Mitsubishi the other day, and there are some people being put back on, but not in droves. I hope that that escalation can increase quickly. I am not knocking the industry, but simply stating the fact that there has been a decline throughout the industry. We have been informed (and the Premier touched on this matter) that with the introduction of the I.A.C. plan the consumers of Australia will be able to buy cheaper cars. The V.B.U. has given me fairly irrefutable evidence that that will not be the case. It could be for a very short time, but one does not have to be Einstein to work out that, once the major manufacturers, or any particular manufacturer or whoever was in control of the industry, got control of the car industry by the implementation of the I.A.C. report, consumers in Australia would be at the mercy of those people concerning what prices were going to be charged.

For once I can see that the member for Todd is agreeing with me, because he is nodding his assent. It is clear that on this occasion members on both sides of the House agree that the forecasts being made are not accurate. Once the monopolies get hold of the market place then of course we will be at their mercy and will be paying all sorts of prices for their cars.

The Premier alleged that the Federal member for Adelaide, Mr Hurford, released a policy some two or three days ago concerning rationalisation down to two particular car-manufacturing industries in Australia. I have not seen that release by the member for Adelaide, and I am quite sure that had he made such a statement he would have sent it to someone in the Opposition, or at least would have informed the Leader about it. The Leader informs me that no such contact has been made by Mr Hurford, but even if he had made it—

The Hon. D. C. Brown: He was on radio today.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Well, the Minister of Agriculture said it was three days ago; the Premier did not know when I challenged him, and now the Minister of Industrial Affairs says that he was on the radio today. All right, let us assume that he made contact, although I do not believe he has: if a rationalisation is needed, which is the policy and the conclusion that the Federal Labor Party has come to, what is wrong with having two motor vehicle industries, provided that they are both based in South Australia—G.M.H. and Mitsubishi? If that were the conclusion reached, one would not have to oppose it very strongly, that is, provided those two major manufacturers were kept in South Australia and the State received the benefit from them. However, I am still disputing the facts, because I have some information here supplied by Mr Hurford, involving seven major points that he has consistently made. I want to include some of these points in *Hansard*. Let me say that any allegations made by the Government against Mr Hurford do not appear in any of

this documentation that he has supplied to me. With regard to his policy in this area he begins by saying:

We of the Labor Party are committed to a healthy, developing manufacturing sector. Only by stimulating this sector will we have any hope of creating the 2½ million new jobs we need in the 1980's.

He continues:

The motor vehicle manufacturing industry is the 'engine' of our manufacturing sector. Without the five major 'plan assemblers' and the component makers who serve them, our manufacturing industry would be negligible.

There is no comment there in relation to rationalisation to two major manufacturers. He continues:

For the motor manufacturing industry to survive, quotas are essential in the present climate. At least the 80/20 market sharing arrangement must remain. The U.S. and E.E.C., with their vastly greater scale economies, have 'voluntary restraints on imports' from Japan—with far larger shares for their home products, than we maintain under our quota system. How could our smaller industry possibly survive without quotas?

I think all of those things that are being said by the spokesman in this matter for the Federal Labor Party are consistent with those matters that we are talking about today. He said:

In my view, supported by the Caucus Economic Committee when I reported at the time the I.A.C. draft report was published, a form of the local content plan must continue. There is not a lot of room for change. It would be unwise of us to commit ourselves to particular ingredients of this plan until we had seen the I.A.C. final report, otherwise we could correctly be accused of premature, knee-jerk decisionmaking.

His fifth point was:

We are all committed to seeking the lowest possible prices for Australian-made vehicles to overcome a 'buyers' resistance' which undoubtedly exists. However, we should not get carried away with the idea that our industry is unduly inefficient and uncompetitive. It takes the average Australian worker 22.3 weeks of earnings to pay for an Australian car. Some figures for other comparable countries are Sweden, 29.9; France, 30.7; Britain, 42.0; Japan, 17.2 and the United States, 17.6.

I think a further point worth mentioning is this:

A major area of difference between us and our conservative opponents is in the government machinery we believe is vital for achieving the continuous 'managed change' which is needed in this sector which requires a particularly close government-business partnership. That is why we have advocated the establishment of an authority to examine constantly the tariff/quota situation, to eliminate transfer pricing, to monitor and regulate any changes from local to overseas component sourcing, to seek to achieve more standard parts manufacturing between the big five companies, etc.

It is evident to me, and it must be to anyone who has made some attempt to understand this industry, that we need to get away, and directly away, from a body like the I.A.C. The I.A.C., in my view, is not taking all of the facts into consideration, such as the social and economic facts, the unemployment that could come about in industry, the position of companies, and the effect that the recommendations could have on them. I think the proposition as outlined by Mr Hurford is a tremendously important one when he said in his speech, of only 15 September 1981, that a motor vehicle manufacturing authority should be set up. He said:

This authority will take over the functions of the I.A.C. and other regulatory bodies in relation to the motor vehicles industry, and would be seeking planning agreements to be entered into between such a restructured industry in Australia with the unions so that employment can be sustained with shorter hours to offset resultant rationalisation and higher possible levels of technology.

In essence, Labor's commitment is to the existing concept of a motor vehicle plan which guarantees the continuation of a motor vehicle industry in Australia. We reject the underlying approach of the I.A.C., which is to throw the industry open to virtually unrestrained competition from imports as a means of attaining greater efficiency and technological improvement.

However, in rejecting the I.A.C.'s method, we do not reject the objectives of greater efficiency, and technological improvement. In substitution for the free market, we propose a planning approach, which provides sufficient certainty for firms to invest in new products and methods. Within that plan, however, market forces

will still operate to influence the pattern of production and, necessarily, to expose and eradicate the least efficient.

Clearly, ours is a very different approach from that adopted by the I.A.C. The I.A.C. approach is supported by Fraser Government rhetoric and is based on the same philosophy which can be summed up as leaving everything to the market place. We reject that philosophy, and I believe that industry should also reject it. If we don't reject it, we will be swamped by the Japanese motor industry. Not even the car industries in Europe and the United States, with their greater advantages over us of scale economies, can compete without voluntary restraint on the part of the Japanese. Our quotas are vital. We refute the National Farmers Federation view that removing quotas will lead to lower car prices. In the long run, the importers will charge the maximum price the market will bear.

I have relied for a lot of my information today on the Federal member for Adelaide, the spokesman for the Labor Party in Australia, who, I believe, has worked as hard as has anyone else in Australia to guarantee the safety of the car industry in South Australia, to guarantee the jobs of the working people in South Australia, and to guarantee the future of those industries in South Australia which are and will be affected if this I.A.C. report is implemented.

I want to place on record in the Parliament my sincere congratulations to Mr Hurford, who, as I said, has worked untiringly within the Labor Party federally and, of course, who will continue to work untiringly. He has been responsible for calling meetings of unions not only in this State but also in all other States, and getting some sort of agreement with those unions. The ideas amongst those people, of course, can vary as to what they think should occur. I believe the Labor Party has carried out its responsibility in all aspects of protecting the industry for South Australia and South Australians. I do not think there is any doubt about that. I do not think the non-bipartisan approach of the Minister today and the attitude expressed by the Premier do their Party any good, because I believe, as I have said, that we have done our very best to give that protection which is necessary for South Australia.

It is in those circumstances that I ask the members on the Government side to really consider their position at the moment. They have been asked by their leaders on the front bench to vote for a motion that I believe does not go nearly far enough. It does not bind our Senators. The person who is responsible, in my view, for representing this Parliament is not the Premier of South Australia. I believe the person who represents this Parliament is the Speaker, because he is elected by the Parliament for the Parliament. The amendment today asks the Speaker—

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Is that why Don Dunstan always sent Gil Langley over to Canberra?

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I cannot recall, except that I can recall that a motion or an amendment similar to that moved today was moved by the Opposition when the Hon. Tom Playford was the Premier of this State, and he abided by the Opposition's resolution at that time because he thought it was a proper one.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: He saw the sense in it.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: He saw the sense. He realised it was the correct approach to this matter, that it was a bipartisan thing. If we realise we are to pick up the strands of what the Government has been saying about bipartisanship, quite clearly the Liberal Party members, particularly those back-benchers who must be searching their consciences about this matter, must vote for the amendment. There is no alternative, in my view. The only sensible and sane approach and the only bipartisan approach in this matter is to ask our Speaker to go to the Prime Minister conveying this amendment.

There is no difference so far as the substance of the motion is concerned. It is the conveyance, and the binding of those people who represent the State of South Australia. Of course, I refer to the Liberal and Labor Senators alike,

and to the Democrats. We have a Democrat as well. I am quite sure that, if a resolution of this Parliament was expressed to them by our Speaker, clearly they would abide by that request and that resolution.

I ask, before we now vote on this matter, that back-benchers on the opposite benches give some consideration to the merit, to the justification and to the commonsense approach the Opposition has taken to this debate. No-one can accuse the Opposition in any circumstances of not supporting the guts of this motion. The real meaning of the motion has not been destroyed at all. The only thing that has been changed is the method of conveyance, and I sincerely believe that the way to do that is to have it done by the Speaker of this House.

The SPEAKER: I can call the honourable member for Todd, he knowing that there would be only 1½ minutes available to him. If the honourable member for Todd did not want to take the call I could call the honourable member for Salisbury, whose name is on the list or, alternatively, the honourable Minister of Industrial Affairs to wind up the debate.

The House divided on the amendment:

Ayes (18)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon (teller), M. J. Brown, Corcoran, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, O'Neill, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (22)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown (teller), Chapman, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Langley and McRae. Noes—Messrs Evans and Gunn.

Majority of 4 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus negatived.

The SPEAKER: The question before the Chair is the motion moved by the honourable Minister of Industrial Affairs. Those of that opinion say 'Aye'; those against say 'No'. I believe the 'Ayes' have it.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I rise on a point of clarification, Mr Speaker. There was a 'No' coming from the Opposition.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has given a ruling that the 'Ayes' have it.

Motion carried.

FIRE BRIGADES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

At 4.6 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 24 September. Page 1188.)

Mr PLUNKETT (Peake): I am continuing my speech, which I commenced on Thursday 24 September. The Premier and his Canberra colleagues must be made aware of the 135 000 householders in Adelaide alone who are paying off mortgages. The Tonkin Government must reveal the depth of social misery being caused by the higher mortgage repayments and the crippling blow to South Australian families.

On 9 June concerned community activist and real estate agent, the Minister of Local Government, announced that responsibility for the control of substandard housing was to pass from the Housing Trust to local councils. In his press release, the Minister stated:

The new arrangements are in line with the Government's philosophy that local government is best suited to manage local affairs.

He went on to claim that the move had the full backing of local government associations, that it would result in cost saving to the trust and redirection of funds to the needy, and that additional costs would be borne by councils which already had offices equipped to do the work.

During the war years, legislation was enacted giving the trust power to set rents for substandard housing. The legislation was intended to keep a roof, no matter how badly repaired, over the head of a tenant who would otherwise be on the street if free-market rent forces were to prevail at a time of acute housing shortage.

The Housing Improvement Act of 1940 was amended in 1962 to provide the trust with additional power to classify houses as being substandard and to place restrictions on rental. The objectives of the current Act are to provide for the improvement of substandard housing conditions, to provide for housing of persons with limited means, to regulate the rentals of substandard dwellinghouses in the metropolitan area and in certain other parts of the State, and for other purposes.

The background to this is the role of the Housing Trust. Part 7 of the Housing Improvement Act provides the trust with power to control rents of substandard housing. In a practical sense a Trust Building Inspector 'doing the rounds' spots a house which appears substandard.

Alternatively, a tenant may complain to the trust, alleging substandard housing. The trust employee, who has power of inspection, will visit the premises and determine whether it is substandard from a building point of view, such as regarding no toilets, plumbing, bad floors, severe cracking, salt damp, and so on. In the first instance, an approach is always made to the landlord, in an attempt to persuade him or her to make basic improvements.

If this fails, the trust can declare the house substandard and set a low rental. The low rental does not effectively come into operation for 60 days, allowing the landlord to appeal or upgrade the premises. Declaring a house substandard clearly provides the landlord with an incentive to upgrade, because he or she is stuck with a low fixed rent and the place cannot be sold without declaring that it is under a Housing Trust improvement order, thus dropping its sale value.

During this period, the tenant is protected against spiteful or any other form of eviction. The following statistics are interesting, lest it be thought that the trust is not very active in rent control or declaring buildings substandard, or, alternatively, too active and has unlimited power. Since 1940, 63 000 dwellings have come under rent control determinations where the landlords have had the right of appeal to court. On only 29 occasions, one in 1 000, landlords appealed against trust determinations. In all of these, offices or commercial, not residential dwellings were involved. Clearly, landlords have accepted the role played by the trust in setting rents, or at least have not sought to challenge that. Since 1963, 16 000 dwellings have been classified substandard. There has never been a successful appeal against a substandard declaration. Clearly, the trust makes very few mistakes.

Turning to the role of local government right from the start it should be pointed out that the trust and local government work side by side, and have done so for the past 40 years, in the area of unsatisfactory dwellings. Trust building inspectors have used the Housing Improvement

Act as a vehicle to upgrade substandard accommodation, and local government health inspectors have used provisions of the Health Act to similar ends, but their powers and roles are quite different. Local government inspectors look for fleas, vermin, chooks, unsanitary toilets, drainage problems, etc., and declare premises unfit for human habitation.

Trust inspectors look for salt damp, unsafe structures, electrical faults, and so on, classify houses substandard, and set a low rental. The not-so-subtle difference is that, if the local government inspector declares a rental place unfit for human habitation, a tenant is out on the street. If the trust declares a place substandard, a low rental is fixed. One is protected against eviction and pressure is put on the landlord to upgrade.

The other problem with local government power is that a place may be falling down without actually being unsanitary. If the local government inspector cannot find fleas, then one continues to live in a state of collapse, paying whatever rents the landlord can screw out of one, subject to eviction, if the landlord is unhappy about a tenant's calling in a health inspector. Local government inspectors have power under the Housing Improvement Act that, until June this year had never been used, basically the same as power under the Health Act regarding declaring premises unfit for human habitation. Local government inspectors do not have the housing improvement powers to declare substandard premises, or to set rents.

Since the Minister of Local Government handed control of substandard housing to councils, two attempts have been made by local government inspectors to use Housing Trust Improvement Act powers. As a result, one tenant was evicted because the house was declared unfit for habitation, and the other tenant had the rent doubled by the spiteful landlord. Some large councils also have building inspectors, in addition to health inspectors. However, local government building inspectors have no more power than local government health inspectors. In any event, they are largely office-bound, because of work pressure in approving building operations or new structures.

In his press release, the Minister of Local Government suggested that local councils would inspect houses claimed to be substandard and, if necessary, issue an improvement order. The rent would then be fixed by the Housing Trust; this is clearly impossible under current legislation. In an attempt to get around this problem, the Minister is apparently now suggesting that, first, when a tenant complains, a local government inspector will inspect the accommodation. Secondly, if he finds that the accommodation is substandard, he will request the Housing Trust to declare the premises substandard and set the rent. Thirdly, the council will decide when the order is to be lifted.

This proposal is aimed at stopping the trust initiating any activity on substandard housing and indicates that the Minister is aware that the local council does not have adequate powers to carry out the work that has been pushed on to it. Regarding the effect of that decision and the cost factors, the Minister claimed three things: First, it has been claimed by the Minister to be the cost saving to the trust; secondly, money redirected to the needy with accommodation problems; and, thirdly, that council was to absorb costs because it already had staff.

Turning to the savings for the trust, cutting out substandard housing work will eventually save some \$200 000 in inspectors' salaries, but the trust will, in fact, outlay an additional \$200 000 because funding for the housing improvement and rent control sections does not come from the trust budget. The money comes from the Treasury, via the department. Because this money will no longer be available, the trust will have to relocate employees in the maintenance section and pick up the salary tab, at the time

when the maintenance budget has been drastically pruned. Secondly, regarding redirection of resources to the needy, what the Minister, Mr Hill, means here is that the additional funding is being made available to the emergency housing office, which is about \$100 000 extra.

The headquarters gets its money from local government along similar lines to the Housing Improvement Section. What has happened is that the Housing Improvement Section has lost \$200 000, E.H.O. has picked up \$100 000, and \$100 000 for 'the needy with accommodation problems' has disappeared. The statement is made that local government will be able to absorb additional costs. Minister Hill is obviously a believer in the tooth fairy and flying pigs. The response of health and building inspectors working for the councils is that they are already overworked. Local government can do one of two things: it can put on more staff (some are advertising now) and pass the cost on to rate-payers; or it can leave staffing as it is and ignore the substandard housing work.

On a cost basis the trust loses \$200 000; \$100 000 disappears from public housing and local government or the rent payer foots the bill. Interestingly enough, the building industry gains some spin-off from trust activity. Landlords whose dwellings are classified substandard are often persuaded to upgrade accommodation in order that the classification be lifted. It is reliably estimated that \$3 000 000 has been injected into the building industry over the past three years as a result of upgrading work on substandard housing.

Regarding social factors, at present there is the highest level of applications ever for trust rental accommodation. The reasons for this are many. First, higher interest rates are putting home ownership out of the question for the majority of people who do not currently own property. We can expect to see increases in the number of people currently purchasing homes who are unable to meet their loan commitments. Secondly, the trust is no longer pursuing the construction of houses for sale or assisting with low interest second mortgages. Thirdly, there is rising unemployment. Fourthly, returns on capital from rental accommodation are not sufficiently high to stimulate construction investment in flats, homes, units, etc., and this is aggravating the current rental accommodation shortage.

The decision to remove the trust's activity in substandard accommodation (and hence cut back its rent control function) will hasten an increase in private sector rents. The people who cannot pay increases will add to the trust's already strained capacity to provide accommodation. The trust is confronted with several problems. First, there are over 20 000 applications on the trust's files for accommodation. Secondly, applications are increasing at a rate of about 13 per cent per year. This percentage increase is likely to rise further—on the most recent figures available (six months to the end of December 1980) there was an increase of 23.4 per cent over the same period in 1979. Thirdly, during the six months the trust found accommodation for 2 890 applicants but received 5 636 new applications. In short, Minister Hill's decision further aggravates the accommodation problem faced by the trust. People on low incomes can expect further rent increases and greater difficulty in transferring from private to trust accommodation.

Regarding local government politics, it is no secret that real estate and development interests are disproportionately represented on local councils. There is a fear that local government inspectors may be pressured to 'go easy' on declaring accommodation unfit for habitation. There are at least two possible motives for this: landlords on councils looking out for their own and their mates interests; or the fact that houses declared unfit for habitation do not exactly

pull in the rates. There is also concern that there will be a lack of consistency between local government areas. With 26 metropolitan councils and 103 State-wide all policing the control of substandard housing, no 'standards' are likely to apply.

If any effective control is to be exercised over the 30 000 substandard dwellings in the metropolitan area, there must be a centrally administered organisation free of self-interest pressure and with full-time skilled personnel. The trust's Housing Improvement and Rent Control Section clearly fits the bill. The councils, for their part, are divided on whether it is good for them to control substandard housing. Many have reservations of the kind outlined in this report, and at least one, the Salisbury council, has announced that it will not take on the responsibility. It is certainly not the case, as Minister Hill has suggested, that the councils are giving unreserved support.

In summary, first, councils do not have sufficient experienced personnel or legislative power to effectively control substandard housing. Secondly, the entire exercise will add costs to the trust and ratepayers. Thirdly, additional pressure on the trust for accommodation and rent increases in private housing are likely. Fourthly, effective control of substandard dwellings will disappear or be confined to individual councils.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): First, I refer to remarks made by the member for Hanson on Tuesday last, 22 September, when he mentioned the South Australian Film Corporation and the burden he believed it was on the South Australian economy. It is obvious to me that the member for Hanson is not only stupid but also at odds with his own Minister of Arts (Hon. Murray Hill), as well as with the Premier. Given the time, I would like to be able to elaborate on the remarks made by the member for Hanson, because it is clear that he does not have a great understanding of the formation and charter of the South Australian Film Corporation.

Regarding the Budget, there is no doubt that the policies of the Tonkin Government, aided and abetted by its Federal colleagues in Canberra, has led—to use the Premier's words—to this State being in a very sick situation financially. These words were from a transcript of a speech made on 8 September on a 5AD programme with Kevin Crease: sick, because we have 48 700 unemployed South Australians who are looking for full or part-time employment (according to the August A.B.S. figures); sick, because the South Australian unemployment rate of 8 per cent is greater than the national rate of 5.6 per cent; sick, because South Australia's share of total unemployment has risen from 12.2 per cent in August last year to 12.9 per cent this month, even though we have only 9 per cent of the national work force; sick, because on comparable figures, South Australia's total employment has fallen from 559 200 in July 1979 to 558 100 in July of this year. That represents approximately 1 100 fewer jobs under this Government, a Government that promised thousands of jobs for South Australia in September 1979; sick, because South Australia's unemployed spend on an average 45.1 weeks on the unemployment list, as against the national average of 32.7 per cent, and more than the South Australian figure of 30 weeks in 1979. Not only are the economic policies of this Government sick, but so is the average man in the street; he is sick of the duplicity and half truths of this Government. Let me quote a few examples. In the *Sunday Mail* of 2 July 1978 the Premier, then in Opposition, was quoted as saying that State charges and taxes had become an impossible burden on all South Australians. He went on to say that they were the greatest deterrent to industrial

expansion in South Australia. How hollow are those words today—hollow indeed.

Moreover, the Premier had the gall, on radio 5AD on 8 and 9 September, to criticise the Premier of New South Wales, Nifty Neville, for increasing some State charges by up to 50 per cent. Let us look at some of the percentage increases in charges imposed by this State Government. Licensing of private hospitals has increased by from 140 per cent to 200 per cent; boat haven fees have increased by from 50 per cent to 82 per cent; boat registrations by 71 per cent; abalone permits by from 308 per cent to 485 per cent. These are merely some of the major increases.

Application for and renewal of liquor licences has increased by 100 per cent; ship masters certificates have increased by 1 000 per cent to 1 900 per cent; drivers instructional licences by 150 per cent; train fares by from 17 per cent to 100 per cent; copies of Acts of Parliament by 140 per cent; advertising in the *Government Gazette* by 200 per cent; birth certificate extracts by 100 per cent; boiler attendants competency certificates by 233 per cent; welders certificates by 108 per cent; licences to keep liquid petroleum gas by 100 per cent; fishing boat registrations by 150 per cent; certificates for competency as a rigger by 150 per cent; lift installations by up to 167 per cent; Cleland Park entry by 100 per cent; outdoor liquor permits from 1 000 per cent to 2 000 per cent; land subdivision application fees by 200 per cent; and liquor licences for festivals by 100 per cent. Yet the Premier had the gall, on radio, to criticise the Premier of New South Wales for his 50 per cent increase in charges.

We have also seen Housing Trust rentals increase twice in six months. There have been huge increases in sewerage and water bills, even though the Premier went on record in 1979 saying that it was the Liberal Party's policy to arrest charges for water. How hollow are his words, and how shallow is the Premier! We have seen massive increases in electricity and hospital bills, plus increases in bus, tram and train fares. With all these increases, we can recall the Liberal Party promises to improve health and education. What has this Government done? It has scrapped free hospital care and cut-backs threaten one of our greatest resources, our children.

If that was not bad enough, parents have had imposed on them a sales tax on school uniforms which adds about \$14 to the cost of the average school uniform. It is interesting to see the comments in a report in the *News* of 24 August 1981, in which an Adelaide retailer was reported as having launched a campaign to have school uniforms exempted from the new sales tax. The report states:

Parents Trading Company General Manager, Mr Gary Lockwood, has started contacting school parent bodies to rally support for an exemption. Mr Lockwood, who specialises in the sale of school uniforms, says the tax will add about \$14 to the basic outfit for two schoolchildren next year.

That is another impost on the part of the supporters, the cohorts of members sitting opposite. We have seen the average working man fighting a losing battle with his family budget, with more and more increases, day in and day out, week in and week out, and yet we hear so much of this Government bashing the trade union movement, simply because the workers want increases to keep up with the cost of living. There was an interesting article, which I recommend that workers read, in the *News* of 10 July of this year.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Russack): Order!

Mr HAMILTON: The heading was, 'Mr Average losing battle of the budget', and the report states, in part, that council rates have increased, insurance on house and contents has suffered a steep rise, and there will be rises in

contributions to health benefits, and the like. The report further states:

We have not included clothing, house and car maintenance, and looking at his weekly wage this family obviously will decide that the wife will have to get a part-time job to pay for the little luxuries a family would like.

I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it a table of statistical information under the heading 'Then and now'.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Does the honourable member give an assurance that it is purely statistical?

Mr HAMILTON: Yes.

Leave granted.

THEN AND NOW

Here, at a glance, is how essentials have risen in price for the Hill family on a weekly basis:

	July 1980	July 1981
	\$	\$
House payments	75.03	81.32
Food	67.30	76.32
Council rates	3.27	3.46
Electricity	2.56	3.07
Gas	5.00	5.60
Petrol	23.10	27.64
House and contents insurance	2.49	3.35
Car registration and third party	2.94	3.54
Medical benefits	9.96	9.96
Beer, cigarettes	11.76	12.84
Water sewerage rates	3.23	3.63
Total	\$206.64	\$230.73

Mr HAMILTON: Not only have we seen those increases, but also we have seen big increases for the average working man in council rates. Only yesterday I received a complaint from a constituent, one of the many who have come into my office, about the steep increases foisted on the working class in this State, who feel the brunt of the increases more than do the silver tails that many Government members opposite represent. These are the increases that are hurting the working class, because of the policies imposed on the people of South Australia by the Federal and State Governments.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Do you call my electorate silver tails?

Mr HAMILTON: I said some, if the Minister had listened. Not only have we seen a cruel reduction in wages and living conditions, because of the policies of this Government and its Federal cohorts, but also we have seen the great Australian dream of owning one's home becoming harder and harder to achieve under the policies of this Government and the Federal Government, due to the abdication by the Federal Government on housing and interest rates.

I received a letter the other day from a constituent, who I recall had a very interesting article in the *News* some months ago, and who works at General Motors-Holden's at Woodville. His letter is as follows:

Dear Sir,

I would like to explain to you what would happen to myself and my family if the Liberal Government were to implement the recommendations contained in the I.A.C. report. I find it abhorrent that this Government can simply, with a nonchalant stroke of the pen, put a massive number of people in the vehicle, component and associated industries, out of work.

It is clear that I would lose my job as a residential toolmaker with G.M.H., along with a good many more workers. As the job situation in South Australia is, to say the least, already quite serious, I believe that it may take sometime for me to find suitable employment. In the meantime, as my wife works as a teacher-aid, I would be unable to claim the dole. With the high rate of interest on my mortgage, tipped to rise again shortly, I would have to put my house on the market. As I have recently added an extension, I am doubtful if I would recoup the amount of money invested in my family home.

Regarding the interjection from the Government benches about those people whom I represent and who live in West Lakes, I point out to the Minister of Agriculture, sitting

opposite, that this letter is from a resident of West Lakes, one of the many people in that area who is battling to keep up with interest rates. The letter continues:

My son would undoubtedly have to leave the Adelaide Conservatorium of Music and try to find employment. My daughter, at present at Urrbrae Agricultural School, wants to attend the Roseworthy Agricultural College when she attains Matriculation exam passes. This would be impossible if I lose my job at G.M.H.

The snowball effect of so many people cast out of work would surface in quite a few other areas. People can only spend when they are earning. Entertainment would be curtailed. Luxury items would not be purchased. In fact, most people in those circumstances would be hard put to eke out a mere existence. I am deeply concerned that this Government may be allowed to carry out such retrograde steps in order to, in some rather obscure way, bolster its already tarnished image. Nothing is more certain that should these recommendations be adopted a good many hardworking Australians would be thrown on the scrap heap.

I believe it is the duty of the Opposition to defend working standards and jobs to the utmost of their ability and I would urge you to do all in your power to assist the vehicle industry workers in their fight against the I.A.C. recommendation. As I am well aware that you take your vocation extremely seriously, I will thank you, in advance, already certain that you will endeavour to help ensure vehicle industry workers retain their jobs.

The letter is signed by one of my constituents. I have heard a great deal from those sitting on the Government benches today, but not once did I hear of any Government members particularly those in marginal electorates, going to the F.A.P.M., or to any motor part manufacturer in an endeavour to get their pamphlets to put out to workers in the motor vehicle industry and car component industries so that they could be filled out and sent to the Minister in Canberra or to the Prime Minister. Not one word have I heard from the Government benches about that. I believe that they talk with a forked tongue. I believe, too, that they know that they are in trouble in this State if their Federal cohorts implement these I.A.C. recommendations.

A classic illustration of the hostility of the working class in South Australian motor vehicle industry was clearly demonstrated last week on the steps of Parliament House. It was interesting to hear the comments of the Minister of Industrial Affairs today, when he tried to level the blame for the interjections on so-called Labor supporters who were at the front of Parliament House last week. It is obvious that the Government knows that it is in trouble and that it wants to get out of it. I have distributed some 3 300 leaflets in my electorate in an attempt to get people to fill out these pamphlets from the F.A.P.M. to forward them to the Federal Minister and also to the Prime Minister, in order to express the views of people in my electorate concerning the Federal Government's I.A.C. recommendations.

It is most important to the people of the electorate of Albert Park that the Prime Minister gets their message. I have written to the Minister concerned on a number of occasions. I have also gone into print in the media expressing my views about the jobs that could be lost as well as about the diminishing number of employees at General-Motors-Holden's at Woodville and Elizabeth. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard*, without my reading it, a table detailing those figures which are purely statistical.

Leave granted.

TOTAL NUMBERS OF G.M.H. EMPLOYEES

Date	Senior Males	Junior Males	Senior Females	Junior Females	Total
G.M.H. Elizabeth					
June 1981	2 618	2	264	26	2 910
June 1980	2 918	4	344	27	3 293
June 1979	3 599	89	557	24	4 269
G.M.H. Woodville					
June 1981	1 412	32	—	—	1 444
June 1980	1 804	25	—	—	1 829
June 1979	2 265	26	12	—	2 303

Mr HAMILTON: What has this Government done to assist people battling with their interest rates? If one follows the newspapers, as most members of this place do, one can see that the average working man is finding it increasingly hard to keep up with his repayments. I am well aware of the statements made by the Government in respect of the \$20 000 000 that has been allocated for the South Australian Housing Trust to build additional homes. However, I was disappointed that the Government did not take on board a similar proposal to that implemented in Western Australia last month where the Court Government allocated some \$40 000 000 to assist home buyers in that State. A Western Australian press article, dated 2 September 1981, and headed 'Relief for home buyers' states:

The Western Australian State Government yesterday announced details of a \$40 000 000 plan to assist home-buyers hit by rising interest repayments. The programme is aimed at families whose incomes are between \$240 and \$300 a week. The minimum weekly income required to qualify for an average building society loan of \$30 000 at 13.5 per cent interest is \$300. The honorary Minister for Housing, Mr Laurance, said that up to 1 500 Western Australian families would be helped to buy homes under the Government's plan. The proposals include:

An interest rate subsidy scheme, financed by the State Government and permanent building societies, which will assist about 650 first-home buyers.

Reducing interest payments to an affordable level of around 27.5 per cent of family income, with the shortfall from the prevailing rate being paid by the Government.

The granting of \$8 000 000 to terminating building societies for low-interest loans to applicants on the housing priority list.

The allocation of \$1 600 000 to the State Housing Commission to allow tenants to buy the homes they are renting.

The S.H.C. providing \$4 000 000 to help commission tenants to buy new homes built by private builders on S.H.C. land.

Lending institutions introducing slow-start mortgages to reduce repayments, with repayments increasing annually over a seven-year period.

Mr Laurance said that the proposals would release about \$40 000 000 in available housing funds.

Some of the money would come from existing building society resources, from the State Government and from an increase in interest rates on home purchase assistance scheme loans which were taken out before 1978.

One could envisage that I would get a retort from the opposite benches when members say, 'Well, where is the \$40 000 000 coming from?' I would have imagined that instead of this Government repaying the \$36 000 000 to the Loan Council in 1981-82, it could have delayed the repayment of that money to the Federal Government until 1983-84, when it would certainly be due. People trying to repay their home loans could certainly take no consolation from the Federal Government, because the Prime Minister, in an article in the *Age* on 13 July this year, is reported under the heading 'Prime Minister rules out tax deduction', and that is for interest paid on family homes to be tax deductible. That is one of the schemes that I believe the Federal Government should investigate very thoroughly so that the working class in this country at least could achieve the dream of owning their own homes. It was only on 25 September that the Deputy Leader of my Party, in a speech to those at the Annual Residential Accident Control Course, at Raywood, made the following remarks in respect of industrial safety:

Quite frankly, Australia's record of industrial safety is a disgrace. In 1981 we can expect more than 300 000 to be injured and more than 1 000 killed at work places. The social and human costs cannot be quantified, but the losses in terms of production are enormous. But there are other costs.

Employers in 1976-77 paid a hefty \$926 000 000 in employers' liability premiums and, according to Ian Spicer, Executive Director of the Victorian Employers Federation, the total cost of industrial accidents to Australian industry in 1979 was more than \$3 600 000 000.

Other figures released by the International Labour Organisation show that Australia's industrial costs are now about 40 times higher than the costs of industrial disputes. Yet, every day in our news-

papers and on radio and television we read, hear and see news items about strikes, disputes and stoppages.

He goes on to say:

Compared with the cost consequences of industrial accidents, industrial disputes in South Australia are a secondary problem.

I could not agree more with those sentiments. There is one issue to which I would like to refer briefly in the remaining four minutes left to me. That is a situation that occurred only last week. I received the following correspondence from the Australian Railways Union, and I certainly hope I can have it inserted in *Hansard*. It is addressed to me, dated 25 September 1981, and is as follows:

As you are no doubt aware, a member of this union was seriously injured in a railway accident at Bridgewater on the morning of Tuesday 23 September 1981. This organisation is very concerned at the manner in which notification of the accident was relayed to this employee's wife and clearly demonstrates the cold heartedness and almost a 'couldn't care less about employees' attitude by A.N. officers in responsible, high and well paid positions.

The accident in which the employee was injured happened at 12.30 a.m. and he was taken to the Royal Adelaide Hospital by St John Ambulance and admitted to hospital for extensive surgery to his hand. This surgery took in the vicinity of 7½ hours and the extent of the injuries are the loss of the little finger, ring finger and the top of the thumb on the right hand and very extensive nerve damage to the hand and a broken right wrist.

The reason for our concern is the fact that this member's wife was not informed by the A.N. of the accident, although I have since ascertained that the officer under whose control Bridgewater was informed by Train Control at 2.10 a.m. of the accident and the fact that our member had been admitted to Royal Adelaide Hospital for surgery. We have discovered that the member's wife was made aware of the accident and the hospitalisation of her husband by a doctor from Royal Adelaide Hospital.

I admit that the employee's wife was therefore notified of the accident, but I would insist that there is a definite indication of a shirking of responsibility by officers whose duties should definitely include notification to next of kin as soon as possible after any accident or mishap in which one of their employees is injured, whilst on duty, to the extent where he or she is unable to return to their home due to hospitalisation.

I am led to believe that at least 12 hours had elapsed since the time of the accident before any officer of A.N. made contact with the employee's wife to speak to her and this was done by telephone without even the decency of a personal visit, which I think is just not good enough for a statutory authority of the size and importance of the A.N.

He goes on to say that his union was disgusted at the attitude meted out to the wife of this employee, and he states:

In the case detailed above the members of this union wished to take industrial action, to bring forcefully to the attention of their employer that they were intensely dissatisfied with the heartless and unjust treatment meted out to this injured employee and his family by the complete lack of notification to the family by the A.N. in as short a time as possible. It was only due to the elected officials of this union that industrial action was avoided because of our insistence that the problem could be handled internally between the union and the employer.

Quite clearly, there are many instances where the employer is at fault, but rarely do we hear Government members raise this in the Parliament. They do not raise the issue of industrial accidents. Four to five times more time is lost in this country through industrial accidents than through industrial disputation. Yet we hear very little from members opposite. That shows the hypocrisy from which they are bred. They are not concerned with the average working man, and that has clearly been demonstrated in this Parliament time and time again by the union-bashing exercises meted out by members opposite.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): In addressing my remarks to the Budget, I refer to the line for the Department of Trade and Industry, Small Business Advisory Bureau, and under 'Contingencies', Industrial and Trade Promotions, and publicity generally associated with that department. On 19 August this year the Deputy Leader of the Opposition stood up in this House and sailed into the Liberal Party by

alleging that the Tonkin Government placed small business policies so low on its priorities that it would not even consider a genuine bipartisan Select Committee attempt to tackle some of the problems faced by small businesses.

Certainly, there are businesses across the country that are having difficulty in maintaining a profitable cash flow, but I assure the member that any small business men in South Australia would be most apprehensive at having the A.L.P. joining a committee to suggest to them how they should run their businesses. It will take a long time for South Australian business men to erase from their minds the 10 years of onslaught on them during the Dunstan era.

The Deputy Leader is also obsessed with the idea that the Liberal Party masquerades only as a champion of free enterprise, open markets and competition, and is, in fact, the fiercest supporter of the heavy-handed monopoly, where the smallest entrepreneur has no place. These assertions by the Deputy Leader are utter rot and are totally disproved in this Bill that is before us. His assertions make great reading in *Hansard* for his Party faithful, but I doubt that even the honourable member really believes in what he is saying when he casts his eye over the occupation of my colleagues on the Government benches. To say that this Government has not rated assistance to small industrial and commercial ventures as high on its priorities in this Bill is to totally misrepresent the situation, and the Opposition deserves the fullest condemnation for saying it. Just in case the small business man thought he had had enough at that stage, along came the former Attorney-General (the member for Elizabeth), with all his consumer legislation, adding further costs to both business and to the consumer; then, of course, along came Premier Dunstan and his plans for industrial democracy.

A brief reference to the Estimates of Payments will show what I mean. For the Department of Trade and Industry, under Small Business Advisory Bureau—advisory and clerical staff, actual payments last financial year totalled \$50 000 and it is proposed to raise that to \$84 000 for this financial year. For industrial and trade promotion (publicity), the area the Government will use to promote industry, the amount is now \$120 000. Payments to consultants who were available to business men has gone from almost \$69 000 to \$195 000. The amount under incentives to industry totalled \$5 869 000 last financial year and this amount has been increased to \$9 300 000. Actual payments for reimbursement to consultants in the small Business Advisory Bureau have been increased from \$23 000 to \$70 000.

Translated into words rather than figures, I think even blind Freddy would see that the assistance to small business is being given a well thought out shot in the arm. It is easy to see that the main thrust of this whole Budget strategy is the recovery of the private sector, the stimulation of small business, and the subsequent creation of jobs.

I wonder whether the member for Adelaide has changed his mind, following the tabling of the Budget and since his Address in Reply speech, on his assessment of this Government's attitude towards help for business development in South Australia. I wonder whether members opposite will take time to read in detail the lines under the Department of Trade and Industry before they sound off in the media during the next 12 months about our alleged inactivity in helping industry and small business.

The actual fact of the matter is that the excellent work of the department during the last financial year in promotion and development of industry is to be expanded. I have only praise for the way senior officers of the department handle potential investors in South Australia. Last year I introduced the principals of a Greek company, Petsikakis, to the head of the department of Trade and Industry. The reception and handling of these business men was superb.

They received advice on investment, land, housing, premises and industrial relations in South Australia. They were also advised on the industrial incentives available to them if they came to this State. As a result of my introduction, a visit was made by the Premier to the company in Greece and as a result this company is to set up in South Australia, rather than interstate. To assist in reception and the advice given to business men we are increasing our promotion within the department and increasing its resources in the Small Business Advisory Unit.

In its 1980-81 Budget the Liberal Government has already arrested the decline in jobs available and it is on public record that over 12 000 jobs have been created since this Government came to office, which is already 2 000 more than the Premier promised at the time of the last election. This Budget will stimulate more jobs by further creating a climate in South Australia that will make it more attractive for people to invest here. The Budget contains new initiatives in industrial and commercial training and incentives to industry.

In his Address in Reply speech on 19 August, the member for Adelaide acknowledged that it was the small business sector in our community that would create jobs. In this he is quite correct. It is a great pity that he and his then Government did not realise this 10 years ago. It is all very well for the member for Adelaide, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, to try to convince the public that the Liberal Party does not care about small business. It is the height of hypocrisy for the member to say that the State Government fails to realise that, unless small business is encouraged to grow, employment growth will fall behind and high levels of unemployment will be maintained.

The Opposition has a short memory, or at least it credits the public with having a short memory. Five years ago, before the Tonkin Government came to office, the private sector had stagnated because of political Labor Party philosophical reasons. South Australia was going broke because there was no opportunity for business survival. The Labor Party was committed to increasing levels of taxation because of its collectivist policy. The A.L.P. anti-business policies and attitudes had already slowed down the economy at that time.

How many business men remember the cost to their business when South Australian workers received extra holiday pay because an award was handed down that ruled that over-award payments, shift-work premiums, industry allowances, and some other premiums should be included in holiday pay packets! I certainly remember it. This decision flowed on. Another blow to the profitability of business came with increased long service leave, increased workers compensation insurance, doubts about the future status of contracts, difficulties with secured and unsecured creditors, and the possibility of class action. Then there was the massive hike in pay-roll tax, a disastrous imposition by the socialist Government on the private sector to finance its social programmes.

While still smarting from this onslaught, the small business man had to accept a lack of cash flow in South Australia which did not exist in other States, where industry was expanding, resources were being opened up and private sector money was freely circulating. In South Australia potential South Australian money was being invested over the border or hoarded in banks and building societies just in case the small business man thought he had had enough. At that stage along came the former Attorney-General (the member for Elizabeth), with all his consumer legislation, adding further costs to both business and to the consumer, then of course, along came Premier Dunstan and his plans for industrial democracy.

I could go on at great length, if time permitted, with examples to illustrate the lack of past concern that the A.L.P. had shown for the small businessman in South Australia and I could elaborate, I suppose, at great length on the effect the 35-hour week will have on small business in the future on their profitability and on the way that will affect their ability to employ staff.

This sudden interest in the welfare of our business men by the member for Adelaide is nothing more than cheap politicking by the Labor Party because, as the member for Adelaide has recognised, small business men have a strong political influence in our community. The Labor Party's new interest in small business is totally superficial because it can see votes at the end of the tunnel. Lord help the small business men in South Australia if the A.L.P. is returned to Government and it carries on with its pre-1979 policies, policies which showed little concern for the businessman other than to recognise that he was a source of employment, and therefore wages to his staff, and also a source of capital to the State's coffers from which a socialist Government could finance its social experiment.

Anyone who examines the Budget can see that the industrial incentive schemes administered by the Department of Trade and Development have received a significant boost. Surely, this is not the action of a Government that is totally disinterested in helping the small business man. I hope, also, that the Opposition has noted that the allocation to the Establishment Payment Scheme has now been doubled to \$2 100 000, which will not only attract new industry, but can be used to develop old currently existing small businesses.

The Government should also be congratulated on its increased allocation to the regional rebate of pay-roll tax and land tax scheme. The amount for the scheme, which operated for six months last year and cost almost \$2 750 000, has now been increased to \$5 563 000. The figure goes as high as \$9 300 000, if one takes into account the pay-roll tax rebate to encourage youth employment, continued support for the motor vehicle industry, bridging finance to assist the development of export markets, and the assistance for the establishment of industry generally.

While I am dealing with the line referring to the Government's increased commitment to the regional development programme, it is a good opportunity for me to examine the confused and negative thinking of the Leader of the Opposition on this subject. The Opposition has no firm policy on this very important matter of decentralisation of industry in South Australia. In fact, the Leader of the Opposition, and Labor Party speakers generally, jumped from support for an increased commitment to regional areas to criticism of support of industry to regional areas, depending on the political mileage that they could make at the time. This is the action of the irresponsible alternative managers of our economy.

For example, on 26 August last year the member for Florey criticised the Minister of Industrial Affairs in a question in which he challenged the Government for not extending the 50 per cent pay-roll tax rebate in the belt around Adelaide north to Port Wakefield, stretching south to Victor Harbor and Milang. He said:

These areas are hardly part of the Adelaide metropolitan area.

Of course, we agree with him; they are not part of the Adelaide metropolitan area. Both in that question and in the speech given by the Leader of the Opposition on the previous night, the Tonkin Government was castigated by the Labor Party for not extending the rebates into country areas. However, what do we find but a quote in the *News* on 11 September, under the headline, 'Government misdi-

rects aid to the country' from the Leader of the Opposition, as follows:

Leaked Budget figures showed the Government was planning a big increase in its decentralisation incentive scheme, according to the Opposition Leader, Mr Bannon.

Of course, that turned out to be correct. It was another leak that was correct. The quote continues:

The scheme provides land tax and pay-roll tax rebates for country firms.

Mr Bannon said \$2 800 000 was provided for the job incentive scheme in 1981 and a 'substantial increase' was planned in the 1981 Budget, to be brought down on Tuesday.

He said employment statistics indicated the spending could be misdirected.

It goes on, and members can refer to the article at length, but I will not quote it all. The Leader also said:

The State Government is not spending enough on industry incentives ... in the metropolitan area.

This was after castigating the State Government for not spending enough in the country areas. We are now criticised the other way around. He continues:

It would have been expected State Government industry and employment incentives would have been focused more on dealing with metropolitan unemployment.

In fact, the reverse appears to be the case ...

There is a need in the 1981 State Budget for funds for metropolitan employment creation.

Where do they stand? In one case, they want the benefits for the country people. When the country areas get decentralisation out in that area, we suddenly find that that is wrong, and we should then be looking at the city. The Labor Party cannot have it both ways, but it is easy to see that the Opposition's policy planning is in tatters on this subject, as it is in other areas, where it comes down to a clear policy of where it is heading in incentives for decentralisation of industry. Obviously, this total Budget shows that the Tonkin Government has a clear policy that it is following to assist in decentralisation of industry, and development of the State. I am sure that country people can see the writing on the wall if ever the Labor Party is returned to the Treasury benches in South Australia.

I also notice that the allocation to assist small businesses has been more than doubled, having been increased from \$80 000 to \$176 000. I trust that even these figures have not escaped the critical eye of the member for Adelaide. In recognition of the importance of the small business sector to the economy, and especially to the generation of employment opportunities, a Small Business Advisory Council has been established to assist and advise the Government on the best ways to maintain and develop the small business sector and to take advantage of these potential growth areas. I hope the Opposition has noted the decision by the Government to upgrade the advisory services available with increased staff, particularly in small business agency, and the additional funds now available for consultancy grants to small business.

When one reflects on the Budget, the consultancy grants will be very valuable in having this pool of experts available to give advice. The consultancy grants will create a scheme to provide assistance to small business on an individual or group basis. It is extremely important that this be available for individuals or groups. So often individual businessmen feel that they cannot approach the Government for help. Here we have a situation where a Government sympathetic to small businesses has bent over backwards to provide a service to be of benefit. There are no constraints on the type of advice for which grants may be approved, provided that the advice will lead to some real improvement in the managerial ability of firms being assisted.

I apologise for constantly having to refer to statements by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, but, unfortunately, he is the only member of the Opposition who seems capable

of putting up any argument on the subject of help for small businesses that is worth rebutting. I believe that he is quite sincere in wanting to help businesses, but the ideology of Trades Hall will never let him reverse decisions taken during the Dunstan era. His words for support for business men are hollow, as the member for Todd has pointed out, because he is shackled to the industrial wing of the Labor Party, on which he relies for endorsement, and hollow because all Labor Party policy is geared against the business man. On 19 August 1981 the Deputy Leader of the Opposition made the following statement to the House:

The challenge for a State Government is not to prop up small business but to remove unnecessary obstacles and provide proper assistance for those people requiring it.

If I had not been listening to that speech, I would have thought that the Premier, rather than the Leader of the Opposition, was making those remarks with prior knowledge of the Budget. It is quite wrong and dishonest for the Deputy Leader to keep hammering away at this Government and asserting that our programme to assist businesses has been downgraded. I am willing to read any material the Deputy Leader can send me to prove that I am wrong, if it can assist the lot of small businesses (although I doubt very much that I will hear from him). The Deputy Leader claims that both the Federal and State Budgets have utterly failed to develop the full job creation potential of small business. It is quite apparent to those outside the House, if not to those opposite, that it will take time to recover from the economic depression created federally between 1972 and 1975, and in South Australia between 1975 and 1979. Only now the Federal Government is seeing daylight at the end of the tunnel, and jobs are increasing once again. In South Australia it will take time before the economy is fully buoyant; only a fool would try to say otherwise.

This Budget, following on from last year's Budget, is an economic document which will provide firm, long-term and sound growth for the State. It certainly creates the atmosphere for industrial expansion. It is now up to the private sector to make the running by investing and getting in on the ground floor of the future development of this great State of ours.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): I rise to comment on the education line that we have seen brought down by the Premier in his Budget and to analyse the way in which education in this State is being wound down in contrast to the promises of this Government at the last election. During my half hour, I want to go through the promises that the Government made at the last election regarding education and the way in which its promises have been affected by this last Budget. The Government has made much of increasing spending on education in this State. It claims to have spent more on education in South Australia than has been spent by any other previous Government. True, the allocations last year were more in money terms than those made the year before. However, it is not true to say that the allocation this year has grown over last year's figure; it has declined.

If one looks at the sum allocated to education this year—to the Education Department, the Further Education Department and to pre-school education—and compares it to last year's figure and matches in both cases its relativities with the entire total recurrent Government spending, one can see that education has declined. Last year the Education Department received \$401 500 000. This year it is proposed that it receive \$411 450 000 which, after adjusting for the round sum allowances for increases in wages and prices, amounts to \$435 600 000. This means that last year the Education Department received 25.8 per cent of the

total recurrent outlay for education in this State. This year it is due to receive 25.2 per cent, a .6 per cent reduction.

A .6 per cent reduction may not sound very significant, but let us see what would actually happen if 25.8 per cent of this year's Budget was allocated to education, instead of 25.2 per cent. The figure would be \$419 740 000 on the vote and \$444 380 000 after adjustment for increases in wages and prices. This is an increase on the pre-allowance calculation of \$8 290 000 and an adjusted increase of \$8 780 000. Education is falling short by this amount. What justification does the Minister have in reducing education by \$8 780 000?

Mr Millhouse: Maybe he couldn't get any more money from the Treasury. That's the problem.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: I think that is entirely the case. I am told he received an amount from Treasury and was told he was to make do with it. There is no such thing as consultation. A Liberal back-bencher gave me an answer on this matter to the effect that the decline in priority of education in the Budget is due to the decline in student numbers. True, student numbers in the Government system have declined over the past year and will decline over the year ahead.

Let us see how that works out. Using figures contained in the various data provided by the Government (including the Keeves Committee and the report on school enrolment changes presented a few weeks ago), we find that between July 1981 and July 1982 it is predicted that the primary population will fall from 137 300 to 132 500, and that secondary population will fall from 74 900 to 74 000. By adding those figures, one sees that the total population drops by July next year to 206 500. People have queried the way in which those calculations are arrived at, but I do not wish to pursue that point here; that is something that should be debated on another occasion. However, the figures that the House should consider for enrolment in calculating the Budget should not be the end-of-year figures but an average based on a combination of the beginning and end-of-year figures. This would then give us primary and secondary enrolments of 134 900 and 74 450 respectively.

Using this information, it seems entirely realistic to take that average of beginning and end enrolments, since all the students do not leave on the same day (on 1 July 1981 or 30 June 1982) but leave progressively through the year; indeed, half the year will have a substantially increased number compared to the first half of next year. Combining those figures with the estimated costs of educating a child under the South Australian system—I use here the base data provided by the Public Accounts Committee in its report on the Education Department, when it said that in 1979-80 the cost of educating a primary child was \$1 132 per year, and the cost of educating a secondary child was \$1 813 per year, and allowing for a 10 per cent inflation rate in 1980-81 and 12 per cent in 1981-82 (I use the figures contained in the Budget papers) we arrive at a cost for this coming year of \$1 394 for primary students and \$2 233 for secondary students.

Combining the cost with the reduction in enrolments, we will see that a reduction in enrolments in the primary area should result in savings in costs to the tune of \$3 350 000 and, in the secondary area, savings in costs to the tune of \$1 000 000, a total of about \$4 350 000. Yet we find that the vote to education has been cut by much more than that, by \$8 290 000, or nearly double. If one adjusts for wage increases, the figure is \$8 780 000.

It is not adequate to say (as has been put by the Premier) that the decline in student numbers is a justification for a reduction in the vote to education. There has been an extra cut over and above that of the order of some \$4 000 000.

If one tries to work out how the Premier got to his statement, there is another method of calculating those figures. If you take the July 1982 enrolment figures as the figures applying for the entire 12 months preceding that, you encounter a cost reduction of \$8 790 000, the figure by which the Premier has effectively reduced priority to education.

That is a ludicrous form of analysis, because the students will not all have left at the beginning of the financial year. They will have left progressively. They will have been receiving education progressively throughout that year, and therefore the average should have been taken and, had that been done, the allocation would have been more significant.

The other point is with regard to capital allocation to capital works in the Education Department and the Department of Further Education. There have been serious cuts in the capital works programme—25 per cent in the capital works programme of the Education Department. Does that suggest that the number of schools needing to be built has declined, that the redevelopment of schools in the inner metropolitan or country area has declined, that the job has been achieved? I am sure, Mr Speaker, that you know in your own electorate of many schools that have waited for some years for redevelopment of their premises and are being told consistently to wait longer. Clearly, the need is still there.

What is really happening is not that the need is declining and that therefore the vote should decline, but that today's needs, today's requirements, are being put off until tomorrow. The response is to say that that has always happened; there has always been a case for putting off until tomorrow what you cannot do today: school works have not always been achieved immediately they are identified. That is correct. We all know of many instances of schools waiting upwards of 19 years, in some cases, for something to be done.

Mr Millhouse: Did you say 90 years?

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: I said 19 years. If the honourable member wants to know the school that has waited 19 years, it is Pinnaroo. It is fair enough that school works are sometimes deferred, but one can get a true reflection of the picture if one sees how much is achieved in any one year, how many of the new needs identified in any one financial year are responded to by Government spending. To follow this point up, I have compared the Public Works Committee data with the actual vote allocations for the last two financial years. I have gone through that committee's reports in 1979-80 and 1980-81 where they affect schools in this State. I have totalled what the committee has recommended should be done to redevelop, amalgamate, enlarge or build new schools, and then I have compared that with the percentage of those recommendations proceeded with within the same year.

There never has been a time when all recommendations have been proceeded with within the same year, but the level, the amount each year, gives some indication of the extent to which the Government is deferring until tomorrow today's obligations. The figures are most interesting. In 1979-80, the Public Works Committee reported on six schools within the Education Department. It recommended that works to the tune of \$9 300 000 should be proceeded with at some stage. For those recommendations the Loan funds for last year voted \$5 600 000, so of the \$9 300 000 actually proposed and recommended in that year, \$5 600 000 was proceeded with by Loan funds, representing 60.9 per cent.

What has happened in 1980-81? In 1980-81 the Public Works Committee made reports on seven schools within the Education Department. The total money to be spent on those seven schools, if all the recommendations were pro-

ceeded with, was \$9 900 000. Which of those schools appear in the Loan funds for this year to give a figure comparable to that of last year? Schools that appear are not all attended to in whole. Some have only one stage of their work done. That is fair enough; I would not argue with that, but the total amount voted to schools nominated by the Public Works Committee over the past year represents \$3 200 000 worth of capital works, or only 32.6 per cent of the committee's recommendations. That is nearly half last year's percentage recommendation.

That is a very telling indictment of what is happening. The Public Works Committee has identified, on the information available to it, the need for schools to be redeveloped, upgraded or added to within this State, and it has therefore testified that that need will exist next year and the year after, and as long as it is not met. Somehow that extra money, that shortfall or drop from 60.9 per cent last year to 32.6 per cent this year, will have to be made up, and it will have to be made up in the years ahead when the inflated cost will naturally be higher than it is now, when the building industry in this State might not be quite so under-utilised as it is at this stage and, as a result of that, it will not be able to offer the same competitive pricing to the Education Department as may be presently the case, and therefore it will cost more. It will also result in longer delays in completion, an entirely unsatisfactory situation not just for the State in general but more particularly for the individual schools involved.

The Minister will have received many approaches from schools throughout the State that have not been receiving their fair attention in this regard. They have been told for some years that they must wait, and keep on waiting, and yet they are now to be told that they must wait again. It is a catch 22 situation with many of them. There is not much they can do about it. One school in the Murray lands has been told for 19 years that it will have a new school. It has now apparently been decided that the new school will be some way off, since it has been so long in coming, and they are quite correct as far as this year's Loan allocation, and so approaches have been made for air-conditioning, because this school is very hot. The school has been told that air-conditioning cannot be paid for by the department because there is to be a new school, and it will be worthless to put in air-conditioning when a new school is imminent—19 years imminent. They have been told that, in any event, if they want air-conditioning they must pay for it themselves. The community does not have the capacity to entirely air-condition a school which may be rebuilt two, three, or four years from now. It cannot afford to throw that money down the drain, because that is what would happen.

If the Government is not prepared to come down with a definite date for when the work is to start, it should say so and give the community a clear indication of when that will be and whether or not to proceed with air-conditioning its own school. Since the community has had to survive for so long in substandard conditions, a reasonable case exists for the Education Department to provide air-conditioning in the school. An anomaly arises from this situation. In the Education Department there is a suggestion to schools that, if the temperature gets above 38 degrees, the students should be sent home because it is too hot to study in the classroom, that students cannot be expected to learn in those conditions—and that is correct. I think it is unfair to expect students to study for long periods in temperatures of that kind.

This school has a problem, because it gets so hot in the school in the summer time that, if the children were sent home when the temperature got to 38 degrees, they would barely be there in the summer. Their education would soon suffer. It has been suggested to the parents that, indeed,

while the right exists and children can be sent home in those temperatures, and parents are not being deprived of their rights in this regard to look after the welfare of their children, the school will remain open so that students can get their hours of schooling that otherwise they might miss out on.

What a ridiculous situation! How ludicrous that, on the one hand, a policy which acknowledges the difficulties of students studying in those temperatures cannot on the other hand be applied in this school because, if it was applied, the children would not be in school long enough. That is one of the many situations. There are many others, particularly in some of the more remote country schools, where appalling conditions have had to be put up with for far too long, because the philosophy has been 'out of sight, out of mind', and little communities all around the State are suffering as a result of that.

Now, of course, they have a new impact upon them, and that is the impact of school closures being threatened. There is a prospect that money will be saved in this Budget by the rationalisation of resources. I would like to know exactly the way those resources are to be rationalised. I know there are many schools in this State that would also like to know that, because they see a sword of Damocles hanging over their head, that they are about to be sliced off, removed or amalgamated into larger schools.

During the Estimates Committees the Opposition will be wanting more adequate information from the Minister than that provided in the school enrolments report tabled in this House some weeks ago. We will certainly want some understanding of the educational impact of that, not just the financial impact of that situation.

I want to deal now with some areas where the Government made promises before the last election. It made a great many promises. The Government's education policy statements, in fact, on the whole read quite well for those who were not aware of Liberal Party practice, for those who were not well aware of the track record. In the absence of that background, it certainly read quite well. In regard to pre-school education, the Liberal Party indicated that it regarded that as important and it said, 'The Liberal Party regards pre-school education as important preparation for primary school.' That is quite right, too. It is important preparation for primary school. It is not just baby-sitting, not just occupational therapy, not just keeping children out of parents' hair, but it is important preparation for the educational life of students in years ahead.

What is the reality? The reality is that pre-school education in this State is in a crisis situation. There are many kindergartens and child-care centres that write to me concerning the inadequacies of staffing available to them or the inadequacy of building facilities or funding. The response they received from the Government is 'We acknowledge your problem, we feel sorry for you; it is not right that you must suffer this way, but there are other communities that have greater needs than you, so just wait.' In fact, the whole situation can be summed up by saying that no planning and no educational foresight go into this area. It is, in fact, nothing short of crisis planning, crisis accommodation. I know that to be so, because the Minister, in reply to a letter addressed to him by one kindergarten, said:

In an ideal funding climate it would be highly desirable to provide facilities before the need becomes critical.

That clearly is a statement that this Government bases funding for pre-school education upon critical needs, upon crisis.

Mr Millhouse: Do you think the Minister drafted that letter, or a public servant?

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Well, given his general performance, clearly. In fact, pre-school education must be the result of as much foresight and planning as spending in the primary, secondary and tertiary areas. It cannot be left to be merely crisis spending. Similar situations exist in many other pre-schools centres and child-care centres. I do not have the time to relate them all now, but the Minister can be well assured that he will be informed of all the details at great length during the Estimates Committees, and I await with great anticipation the answers that he gives on that occasion. I now turn to the primary school area. We have just given the students of this State adequate preparation from the pre-school area. I will refer now to the primary area and see what happens there. The Liberal Party promise was that a Liberal Government would:

... give proper emphasis to primary education by [among other things] reducing class sizes as a matter of high priority, particularly in the first two or three years of primary education. We will progressively appoint additional staff to help achieve this aim.

That was the promise, but the reality is entirely different. The Premier has acknowledged that, over the entire primary and secondary areas, there will be 300 fewer teachers at the end of this year. I do not know how you fit that into giving a high priority for staffing—it just does not work. Likewise, in regard to the question of remedial education, the Liberal Party made many grand promises about the support that it would give to remedial education. I have already tackled the Minister on this point in this House. In my opinion, there is inadequate support being given to support and encourage the integration of students in the ordinary school system.

Another promise made was that the Liberal Party would return to the basics; it would educate our children again in reading and writing; it would teach them the three R's and numeracy, which, it implied, students were not being taught at the moment, and it chose to make it a beat-up campaign. The reality is that studies of this matter do not prove the contentions made. Certainly, improvements could be made, and during the Estimates Committees I will want to know what support is being given to curriculum development in this area so that improvements can always be made.

However, the state of play is not as disastrous as the Minister would have us believe. A paper was published by the Australian Council for Educational Research on 7 August 1979, only a month before the then Government lost office, to the regret of South Australians. The paper was titled 'Literacy, Numeracy and Education Achievements in Australian Schools', an interesting topic. More interesting was one of the authors. The authors were a Mr Keeves and a Mr Bourke. Members will remember that Mr Keeves is one and the same as the person who is chairing the committee of inquiry into education appointed by this Government, so, obviously this Government pays due credence, and rightly so, to the ability of Mr Keeves. His report on literacy, numeracy and allied skills in South Australia was very favourable. His findings were as follows:

The findings from studies conducted by the A.C.E.R. indicate an above average level of achievement in South Australia relative to other States. The evidence of the I.E.A. science project suggests very convincingly that this superior achievement relates to the time spent in learning and the opportunity consequently provided for learning the material presented in each subject.

I might say that that last sentence is clearly related to the adequate support and resources that were made available to education at that level and clearly begs the question of what will happen as a result of the reduction in allocations being made in this year's Budget.

The Hon. H. Allison: There has been further improvement in his latest report released a week ago.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: In fact, regarding the further improvement mentioned two weeks ago, it is quite correct

that the Minister mentioned that. What is interesting, though, was that many of the beat-up merchants, who were beating up the back to basics campaign, when that report was issued, fled under the nearest rock and were not available to comment on it, because they were not able to challenge the facts presented to them, namely, that education in this State was being unfairly denigrated by some who had ulterior motives. Another question worth looking at is that of school autonomy. The Liberal Party made this promise:

A Liberal Government will give increasing autonomy to school councils both in decision-making and in financial matters. School councils will be consulted regarding the nature of staff appointments.

That statement is most interesting, particularly in the light of the many letters I receive from many schools around the State, who have suddenly had a staff member whipped out of their schools without consultation and they then want to know why. They want to know what they are supposed to do. What consultation do the school councils get from the Minister—absolutely none. At best, a school council will get an inadequate reply that comes very late, or at worst the school council will get no answer at all. So much for the increasing autonomy and the involvement of school councils in this matter.

This Budget will not answer the questions that have been raised in education this year. It merely raises many more questions. We will need much more time than that which will be available during the Estimates Committees to pursue those points and to thrash out all the issues involved, and I believe we need to encourage in the community at large the provision for debates about education. In that regard I was very heartened when I received a letter from a school in the Iron Triangle. The school contacted me and invited me to be there to speak about education. The letter they sent to me said:

Dear Mr Arnold, this is a letter to confirm arrangements for the public meeting at which you and Mr Allison will be speaking. Our staff would like the format to consist of 10-15 minutes of speaking time and then one and a half hours of question time.

That's a good priority. The letter continues:

Each speaker will have the opportunity for a short summary. The topic for the evening will be 'Does into the eighties mean progress?' We expect the first part of the question time to devote itself to the 'Into the eighties document.'

in other words, to concentrate on educational matters, and rightly so—

We would like the second part of the meeting, if it desires, to address itself to broader issues which may include: housing, country incentives, promotion issues, non-contact time, teacher in-service and the individual child.

The letter went on. That was a very positive initiative. I was very pleased to receive that confirmation and invitation and I made myself available. As I understood it, so did the Minister. I wrote back to them and indicated that I was quite happy to be present that night. No sooner had my letter arrived at the school than I received a telephone call to say, 'Look, sorry about that; it's all off. The Minister is not available on that night.' When I suggested an alternative night, he said, 'No, the Minister is just not available. He won't make himself available.' When I suggested an alternative date I was told you would not make an alternative one available to debate with me in front of those people. Is that correct or not?

The Hon. H. Allison: They were told my diary was full.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: You gave them 3 November. Is that true? If it is, I will be with you on 3 November.

The Hon. H. Allison: We didn't give 3 November. I will be there on 3 November during the day.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Are you happy to debate with me on 3 November at that school?

The Hon. H. Allison: No. I'll be visiting schools during the day.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: If a debate is made available, are you happy to debate with me on 3 November?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: I am sorry, Mr Speaker. I am not supposed to be addressing across the Chair and I seek your indulgence. I will not proceed in that manner, but I hope the Minister has taken the point and that we will have the opportunity to debate these matters before school communities throughout this State. Apparently the school is under the misapprehension that he is not prepared to debate with me. I am glad to inform them that it may be that those people are wrong. I will let them know. Now, Sir, there are a number of—

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

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): I rise to support the motion. Initially in my remarks I would like to address myself to comments made by the member for Gilles in relation to the Industries Development Committee. Obviously, I am addressing myself to that line in the section of the Budget for the Minister of Industrial Affairs.

The statements by the member for Gilles in his Budget speech must be regarded as significant and obviously putting forward the viewpoint of the Labor Party in relation to the role which it sees the Industries Development Committee as playing and which it should play in the future. I think it is doubly significant because the member for Gilles is a shadow Minister and he is also one of the two Labor representatives on the Industries Development Committee itself.

He made a number of statements in his speech that are very much open to challenge. For example, he has stated that in South Australia we have a significant population decline, and this, of course, is belied by the most recent figures that have been released that show, in fact, that over the past six months there has been a reversal of the trend and the movement into South Australia is again increasing. He said:

However, the population decline has been more significant in the past two years than it was on that occasion.

He was referring to when the Labor Party was in Government. I would suggest that he should have a look at the figures and he will find that is not the case. In fact, as the member for Newland points out, March 1979, when Labor was in office, was the time South Australia had its worst movement of population ever. The member for Gilles goes on to say:

I claim that the decline in population in the past two years has been significantly greater than that of the last two years of the Labor Government—

I suggest that he look at the accurate figures that have been released on that matter. Having made those points and perhaps indicated that his word really does need checking, he then goes on to say:

We say that every aspect of public expenditure in the Budget has been reduced—

I certainly would like to point out to him the actual figures and to show that nothing could be further from the truth. He goes on to say:

The significant factors affecting the community generally, such as welfare, housing—

and he mentioned others—

have been significantly reduced.

I suggest that he should look closely at the lines in the Budget relating to those aspects and he will find they have both been increased in real terms. He then continues on with his attack on the performance of the State Government

before he gets to the Industries Development Committee. He quotes, the Manager of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, who said:

The main thrust has been towards continued growth and development in South Australia, in times of difficult economic circumstances.

He says that this is not the case. I would refer him to the recently released report of the State Bank, which shows quite clearly that, in fact, there is a gain in the economic growth of South Australia and that has been most noticeable over the last two years. Surely he is not going to query the points put forward by such a worthy institution as that. He goes on to say that he is critical of the fact that this Government is going to double the funds to the industry establishment payment schemes. He made that statement and there was an interjection from the Minister of Agriculture, who said:

You haven't got any argument with that, have you?

To this the member replied; 'I have an argument with that.' In other words, the member, who is a member of the Industries Development Committee, is critical of this Government because it is going to put more money into investment to attract industry to South Australia. The point is that he is against that sort of money going to the worthwhile job of creating employment and building industry in South Australia. He then goes on to say:

But we must consider taxpayers' money and how many jobs are created through this incentive scheme to industry.

I am delighted to provide the member with some figures I have extracted as far as the proposals that have come before the Industries Development Committee since this Government has come into power are concerned. Those projects that have been brought forward, have resulted in 2 110 new jobs in South Australia. Is he criticising the fact that this Government has increased employment in those areas to that extent? Is he suggesting that we should not be attracting industry? Is he suggesting that we should not be seeking jobs for South Australia? When I read his comments, that is the only inference I can draw.

Let us have a look at the industries that we have attracted to South Australia because of the Industries Development Committee and the money that it has recommended be spent by the Government to attract industry and to expand existing industry in this State. I am going to name some small and some large industries, to show what the Government is doing to attract an across-the-board type of industrial expansion in this State. We have seen small companies like Barossa Ceramics provided with funds to enable it to compete interstate with a new product line. We have seen assistance provided to the South Australian Development Corporation to ensure that G.M.H. would be able to set up a plastics plant in South Australia. We have seen assistance provided to a country firm by the name of Kentish Potato Company.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: That is an interesting interjection. He says that it has cost jobs. Those jobs would have gone anyway and, had this Government not competed to obtain that expansion, the point is that that employment would not have been regained for South Australia. Why is it that members opposite have been so antagonistic when this Government spends money to attract business like General Motors-Holden's to expand their industries and provide employment? They are so anti-multi-nationals that they cannot see the good that they do.

An honourable member: They don't want jobs.

Mr ASHENDEN: They do not, because they realise that this Government is building this State and that any hope that they had of winning the next election is quickly going out the door.

Let us have a look at other companies, small companies in the country like the Kentish Potato Company. We have seen Brigitte Pty Ltd provided with assistance and the South Australian Housing Trust provided with assistance to ensure that John Shearer could come back to South Australia, and let us remember what John Shearer did when the Labor—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I am sure the honourable member for Florey will want to answer the call when I give it to him later.

Mr ASHENDEN: John Shearer diversified to Queensland because it would not expand in this State during the term of the Labor Government.

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

Mr ASHENDEN: Before the dinner adjournment I referred to some of the industries that had been granted funds, because of the work of the Industries Development Committee, to either set up their business in South Australia or expand their activities. I referred to John Shearer Limited and pointed out that, during the period of the Labor Government, that company diversified into Queensland, where it set up a large manufacturing operation.

Following the election of the Tonkin Liberal Government and its positive attitude towards business investment in this State, John Shearer closed its activities in Queensland and returned, with all of its investments, to South Australia, where it had operated before the election of the Labor Government, despite the fact that its Queensland plant manufactured equipment predominantly for either Queensland or New South Wales. In other words, it would have been much more convenient for the company in a logistic sense to continue its operations in Queensland, but, because of the positive contributions of this Government, the company returned to South Australia, where it was based prior to its diversification.

Other companies, such as Taminga Furniture, which is a small business, have been assisted by the Industries Development Committee and the Government. Grundfos Pumps, which represents a completely new industry for South Australia, came to this State only because of—

Mr Slater: That was one of our projects. What are you talking about?

Mr ASHENDEN: This Government produced the initiatives to encourage that company to set up in South Australia. Had we not done so, it is most unlikely that that company would have commenced its operations here. Many other industries, both large and small, have been attracted to South Australia. In fact, I have five foolscap pages setting out companies that have set up in South Australia because of the work of the Industries Development Committee and the South Australian Government.

I believe that the member for Gilles, as a shadow Minister and as a Labor representative on the Industries Development Committee, is piloting a change in Labor Party policy in regard to investment strategies in South Australia. I believe that the Labor Party intends to ensure that it does all possible to prevent investment in South Australia and, therefore, to belittle the work that this Government and the Industries Development Committee are doing.

Let us consider some further comments made by the member for Gilles in his recent speech to the House. The honourable member stated that he did not believe that the money that this Government was spending was being well spent. As I pointed out earlier, more than 2 000 jobs have been created in South Australia because of the policies of the Industries Development Committee and the financial

support that that committee has been given by the South Australian Government. The member for Gilles has said:

There has been a significant increase in that field in the past 12 months.

He was referring to the increased investment that this Government ensured was made. He further stated:

I doubt whether the scheme has fulfilled the ultimate aim of being entirely in the public interest and creating jobs.

Over 2 000 jobs have been created. I have five foolscap pages setting out new or expanded industries, but the honourable member does not believe that this Government has the State's interests at heart.

Dr Billard interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: As the member for Newland says, I wonder whether the member for Gilles, during the election campaign in 12 to 18 months, will let his constituents know that he disagrees with the work that this Government and the Industries Development Committee are doing.

Mr Slater: Yes, I will. I'll be up in your electorate to make sure you don't get back.

Mr ASHENDEN: I will be delighted for the honourable member to come to my electorate and speak along these lines. I will point out to my constituents the negative attitude that Labor members have towards business investment in this State, and, of course, the concomitant jobs that go with it. Let us look at what else the honourable member had to say. His remarks finish with a question, as follows:

I ask how the Government can consider doubling that aspect—he is there referring to the funds that the Government is providing to the Industries Development Committee to attract industry—

in anticipation of what may occur in the next 12 months.

For the enlightenment of the honourable gentleman, business confidence in this State is growing because there is in control a Government that goes out actively to encourage both small and large industry to develop and expand in South Australia. In today's *News* on page 3 under the broad headline 'Bright outlook for South Australia, says Schrape', it says:

South Australia's economy had 'turned a corner' . . .

This is part of the corner that this State has turned because of this Government's positive attitude to attracting industry and its investment, and to the creation of job opportunities in South Australia. This Government is planning for an expansion of new industry and new job opportunities. Of course it will double that line in the Budget, because it realises that the work that has been done has just commenced. If it can continue in that vein, obviously the opportunities for South Australians, in both investment and job opportunities, will grow in line with that doubling of investment.

I certainly hope that the honourable member comes into my electorate of Todd during the election campaign and tells my constituents that he is against this Government's spending money to attract industry and create jobs. I will be delighted at any time to fight that issue within the electorate of Todd.

The next aspect to which I turn in my discussion of the Budget relates to the line of over \$8 000 000 which, the Minister of Transport says, will be spent in the development of the O'Bahn system to service the north-eastern suburbs, over the next 12 months. I was delighted with the statement made by the Minister to the House this afternoon.

I have some information that I am sure will interest members opposite, who have steadfastly refused to accept that the O'Bahn technology is proven and the best for South Australia. I will quote from a magazine called *Modern Tramway and Light Rail Transit*, which is the official organ of the Light Rail Transit Association.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Of where?

Mr ASHENDEN: It is from the U.K.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: A long way from South Australia.

Mr ASHENDEN: They are a lot closer to technological advancement. These people prepare a magazine purely and simply to push the benefits of light-rail. Let us see what they have to say about O'Bahn technology. The article states:

This issue of *Modern Tramway* carries details of a remarkable hybrid. Produced by one of the world's most successful bus manufacturers, it looks like a bus and runs on rubber tyres, but in all other respects resembles a modern electric light-rail vehicle. It is the ultimate guideway bus.

It then goes on to say:

What should our reaction be to this? Some purists will bury their heads in the sand and hope that it will go away.

That is the members opposite. The article continues:

But Daimler-Benz does not invest in programmes like this lightly.

Then it goes on to make the point:

The number of cities that can afford the gold-plated approach to light-rail transit is bound to be limited.

This is from a magazine which is sent to members of light-rail activist groups and which is designed to push the light-rail and support light-rail technology. This article in *Modern Tramway* of July 1981 further states:

Down the years flexibility has again and again been cited as the prime advantage of the bus over the tramcar. Combining bus and rail technologies offers undeniable advantages. Chief amongst these is the cost advantage.

I am sure members opposite would acknowledge that both the member for Newland and I have repeatedly stressed that O'Bahn will cost less than one-half of the plan that the previous Minister of Transport was going to inflict on this State.

Mr Slater: Which one are you referring to? There were several of them.

Mr ASHENDEN: I am referring to the one which he put to the public before the last election and which included the glorified tunnel under King William Street. With election strategy, they had him digging a nice little hole just before that election. Let us go on and see what *Modern Tramway* has to say, as follows:

One of the operating qualities of the bus is that it shares the roads as a common infrastructure with other traffic. This means that a number of routes can share a common trunk section and then branch out into housing estates without the need for heavy capital outlay. . .

That is exactly what this Government is planning for the north-eastern suburbs. The report further states:

Passengers per hour per direction capacity claimed for dual-mode O'Bahn with 150-passenger articulated vehicles is upwards of 14 000 per hour.

If we go on to the new three-section vehicles which have been developed it is 35 000 per hour. In other words, we could virtually move the city of Tea Tree Gully in an hour or two. We all know that the whole population at no time is going to utilise such transport facilities. For less than half the cost we have the facilities to move virtually the same type of population density as the light-rail, if we were going into that type of three-section vehicle. At this stage the Government intends to use only the two-section vehicle, because there is no doubt that we do not need to move the numbers for which the light-rail or a three-section bus is designed.

In case members opposite are about to have a heart attack, I point out, having travelled overseas, that there is no doubt that light-rail technology is first class. Where it is needed it obviously suits the purpose, but it is required only where very high densities of population require movement. We do not have these densities of population in the north-eastern suburbs and it would therefore be extremely

wasteful, if this Government was to spend more than double the money that it intends to spend on O'Bahn, just to have a light rail system. It goes on to make further points and, in reference to the O'Bahn system, states the following:

There appear to be no great mechanical problems.

It then goes on to mention how easy it is for passengers to board and leave the buses. It also refers to the further developments that O'Bahn technology will allow in future, including the linking of vehicles together in a light-rail or heavy-rail type of train arrangement. The magazine further states:

... O'Bahn could be seen as a way through the jungle of inflated construction costs for transport undertakings committed to tramway upgrading, but wondering where the finance is coming from. That is the major reason why we have moved to O'Bahn technology. It makes the point that many cities throughout the world are turning to bus technology because of the cost of light-rail.

As a result of my recent visit overseas, I can name key American and European cities that are moving away from light-rail into the bus-type system because it is a much cheaper operation and capital outlay—

Mr Mathwin: And it's more flexible.

Mr ASHENDEN: As the member for Glenelg points out, it is much more flexible. In Los Angeles a busway system has been devised; that is identical, except for the fact that it is a conventional busway rather than a guided busway, to the system that we are going to implement here. It uses ordinary road systems in down-town Los Angeles without any problems; it then moves on to a busway and finally radiates out from a central point like Tea Tree Plaza. It works extremely well.

Let us also look at Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. There we find two present light rail tracks are being replaced with busway technology. Not only that, but I saw graphs over there which showed quite clearly that, with the opening of the first busway, passenger usage along the route grew remarkably. They have tremendous political pressure on them to open their second busway. We find that 60 per cent of all workers in down-town Pittsburgh utilise public transport to get to and from work.

We come to Essen—again, light rail is being replaced, but this time with a guided busway. The length of busway is to be more than doubled very shortly. This Government has weighed up the cost to this State, and has said that we can offer a system which is not only equal to but in some areas is superior to light rail at less than half the cost. There are figures which I can show honourable members opposite at any time they like to see them which show quite clearly that the guided busway is quieter, inside and outside, than are light rail vehicles, and is smoother.

As I have indicated previously, although the busway was not the best system of public transport that I used overseas, it was superior to light rail but inferior to the most modern heavy rail systems now available in the United States of America. There is no way in the world that this State could afford to set up the BART system, as in San Francisco, or the Metro system, which presently operates in Washington, D.C., another city that is also implementing busways to move the population very quickly.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: What is Derek Scrafton saying about this?

Mr ASHENDEN: He has always indicated to me that he believes the system is not only workable but an ideal answer to the problems we have in the north-east with moving the population.

Dr Billard interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: I point out, as the member for Newland said, that when Dr Scrafton returned from his overseas

study he was convinced that the Government was moving in the right direction.

Mr Trainer: You'll be able to defend it at the next election.

Mr ASHENDEN: I assure the honourable member that I should be delighted if he were to come out to my electorate, and say that the Labor Party would remove the O'Bahn, along with the member for Gilles telling us that in no way will Labor encourage industry to come to South Australia. I ask those honourable member please to come to my electorate; I shall be delighted to accommodate them.

The Minister of Transport made many excellent points this afternoon in relation to the advantages of the system we are to implement. I am extremely pleased that it is to be a guided busway for the full length of the distance from adjacent to the inner city area to Tea Tree Plaza. Undoubtedly, it will offer a quieter and smoother ride than would the conventional busway. It will also offer, according to Zublin engineers, 30 years of maintenance free operation, which will be a tremendous saving for the State. We will have initial costs way below those for light rail, and we will have for less than half the cost a better and more modern system than that which was proposed by the previous Government, with much money left over so that this Government can improve public transport systems to other sections of the metropolitan area of Adelaide.

Mr Slater: A great big white elephant.

Mr ASHENDEN: I refer the member for Gilles to *Modern Tramway*, volume 44, June 1981, and the following edition of July. He will find that even persons who are pushing the benefits of light rail admit that the busway has got advantages. There is one thing which members on this side will admit that members opposite will not. We will state that light rail is undoubtedly a very good public transport system, but so are buses and so is heavy rail. Why is it that members opposite have their heads so deeply buried in the sand that they cannot accept that modern technology could come up with a system which is superior to light rail, which has been around for many years? I thought members opposite were always telling us that we were the conservatives and they were the progressives, and yet when this Government has come up with a progressive scheme they say it will not work. Members opposite really confuse me in relation to their attitude to development in this modern world.

Mr Mathwin: They leave a lot to be desired.

Mr ASHENDEN: There is no doubt about that. The third area to which I will devote myself (and, unfortunately, time is running out) is one which concerns me greatly—the growth of industrial disputes in South Australia that has occurred over the past few months. I believe that, just as the member for Gilles had indicated to us that the Labor Party will do everything possible to stop the development of industry in South Australia and the development of jobs, it also appears that the Labor Party, in conjunction with the union movement which controls it, anyway, will set about trying to do all that it can to bring the economy of South Australia to a rapid halt.

Members interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: Members say that, if there is a dispute between management and unions, it cannot all be the fault of unions. True, but I have been addressing myself to the disputes that are occurring between union and union. These are demarcation disputes. When I was quoting earlier I was not only quoting words from this side of the House, but also pointing out that Mr J. P. Mange of the Federated Clerks Union states:

We are just wasting time. It is happening repeatedly.

That was said in relation to demarcation disputes. He went on to make many other points and stated further:

The A.C.T.U. should be moving to protect unionists from unionists. What we are finding is that repeatedly unions are being disadvantaged by other unionists going on strike.

This gentleman was a member of the A.C.T.U. congress, so obviously he must be representing the unions. He went on to make many other points, including the fact that there should be a reduction in the number of unions in Australia—a point I have made many times. There is no doubt that we should not have trade unions in this country. We should have industry unions so that we do not have the problems created by demarcation disputes.

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

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Adelaide): Thank you, Sir. After that very enlightening speech by the member for Todd, whatever it was he meant (I suppose if one examines it tomorrow one might make some sense out of it), I would like to speak about the Budget brought down by the Premier on the second birthday of his Government. It leaves me cold when I think of the effect it will have on unemployment in this State. It is further evidence that the Premier has nothing but his own blind faith to guide him along his path. It is the same blind faith in his philosophy and policies that led him to make so many badly costed and ill-considered promises at the last election. Enough time has now elapsed to demonstrate the Government's inability to produce results. I do not see how this Government can go on blaming the previous Government for the ineffectual attitude this Government is now adopting. In fact, this State's unemployment situation has worsened, not improved, as a result of this Government's policies.

The Premier is now quite willing to admit that many of South Australia's economic problems are a result of the prevailing national and international economic climate. I do not dispute that particular statement made by the Premier. However, this is in direct contradiction with the unrealistic, parochial and political opportunist position he adopted before the last election. This is one part of a campaign he is now mounting to try to divert attention from his Government's lack of performance. I remind members that, over the past 2½ or three years, the Opposition, as it was then, the Government of the day, did nothing but knock the policies of the previous Government. Another part of the campaign is to find scapegoats, to single out others as being responsible for South Australia's problems. I will come back to that matter later. The final part of the Premier's campaign is to play for time. To do this, he is using the long lead time to resource projects, on which he is placing his reliance for economic development, as an excuse for his Government's present lack of effectiveness.

Tonight I want to focus everyone's attention on those aspects of the State's economic performance for which the Premier and his Government are responsible. I point out that his policies are in fact worsening the situation, particularly with regard to unemployment and its effects on small business. The first thing I point out is that the Premier's assumptions about the economic outlook are unrealistic, to say the least. He has this blind faith that his policies will work, but he is also waiting for an improvement in general economic conditions. For evidence that the economic situation is substantially improving, he is really clutching at straws and so is his Government. He points to the fact that Australia's rate of growth in gross domestic product is faster than the O.E.C.D. average, but he fails to recognise that that average is affected by some countries that are very poor indeed.

The Premier should also realise that the O.E.C.D. projections for Australia's growth rate have frequently been exaggerated, and of that there is proof. They have been

based on the optimistic assessment of the contribution of Australia's resource-based industries, a contribution that is by no means reflected in their present contribution to the South Australian economy. In addition, they have failed to take proper account of the contractionary effects of the Federal Government's unnecessarily harsh fiscal and monetary policies.

Similarly, the Premier pointed to the fall in Australia's unemployment rate, which in the latter part of the 1980-81 financial year was lowered to 5.2 per cent. Again, this is not mirrored by the South Australian economy, where unemployment currently stands at 8 per cent. The Premier did not take account of the Federal Treasury's forecast for unemployment during the coming year. Last year the unemployment rate fell largely because there was a reduction in the work force participation rate during the last part of the year. This was unusual. Normal expectations in the event of an economic up-turn are that the participation rate will increase, as previously discouraged workers re-enter the labour market to look for work, thus reducing any reduction in the unemployment rate. The fact that this did not occur represents only the hardening of a long-term unemployment situation.

The Federal Treasury's forecast uses the assumption that the participation rate will remain at this depressed level and it still predicts a worsening of the unemployment situation in 1981-82. In those circumstances, God help South Australia with this Government's present policies. The conclusion that can be arrived at from this is that not only is South Australia lagging behind the rest of Australia, but also that the national economy is not expanding fast enough to provide any real relief for the unemployment situation. The Premier is relying on resource projects for any real up-turn in South Australia's development. He tries to compare South Australia with Western Australia and with Queensland by saying that their development is simply a matter of being years ahead of our own. The Premier seems to expect that we can match those States if there is sufficient exploration. This is the article of faith that underpins the whole of the Premier's economic programme. To assume that exploration means a certainty of development is irresponsible: to rely on it is absolutely absurd.

While we welcome some upsurge in exploration activity as a result of the resources boom, that does not give the Premier the right to ignore the need to pursue other economic opportunities or to undertake a ruthlessly contractionary programme in regard to the public sector when he cannot guarantee that there will be any new jobs to replace those he has taken away. South Australia has some very fine resources, but only a handful has reached the stage where development is likely during the next five years, and several of these are very small indeed.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Like Roxby Downs.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Roxby Downs is so far away that it is very difficult to see it on the horizon. It is at least 10 years away, and the Minister full well knows that.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Absolute rubbish!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The development of Roxby Downs is 10 years away before it has any significant effect on the employment prospects in South Australia, and the Minister well knows it. Every person who understands and looks at that knows it as well. It is a shonky deal that this Government is trying to sell the public of South Australia because it knows that development is at least 10 years away.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Leader has the floor.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: South Australia's known prospects simply do not compare with the number of projects which Queensland, Western Australia and New South

Wales currently have under development or operating, particularly in the coal and aluminium industries. Most Australians have a healthy scepticism that resource development can ever provide the number of jobs that Australia needs to create to alleviate the present unemployment situation.

I only wish it did, but it certainly has not. South Australia's finest resource, the Cooper Basin, is only expected to provide an additional 400 jobs in the next three to five years. If the Premier thinks he can perform a balancing act between his contractionary economic policies on the one hand, and on the other his assumption that present levels of exploration will result in enough new projects to let the State catch up with Queensland and Western Australia in mining revenue, then his plans are based on dreams and nothing more.

Mr Lewis: Piffle!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The proof of the pudding will be in the eating. Time will tell whether my projections are right or wrong. I want to turn now to consider those areas that the Premier has cited as jeopardising his economic programme. The first of these is what he refers to as 'excessive wage demands'. He referred to the Government's allocation of \$79 000 000 in 1980-81 for wage and salary increases having been exceeded by \$13 000 000 in actual expenditure. Yet he made no effort to actually explain the discrepancy, a large part of which was probably caused by the fact that the last c.p.i. adjustment for 1979-80 was effected in 1980-81. The Premier's misrepresentation of ambit claims currently before the commission is just cheap trickery, particularly when it is seen in the light of the national pressures which have affected the arbitration system this year.

For the Premier and the Minister of Industrial Affairs' education, I would like to diverge for a moment to consider these so that they may learn from the mistakes of their Federal counterparts in being over-zealous in their efforts to impose wage restraint. The practice for a number of years of providing only partial wage indexation has eroded the value of real wages by so much that in 1980 there was an increasing number of wage demands based on other considerations. Why would there not be, when the Federal Liberal Government and all of the State Liberal Governments right throughout Australia were putting up cases to the Arbitration Commission supportive of Federal Government asking for a lesser increase than the c.p.i. carried?

In those circumstances, it could only have one consequence. Over a period of years (I am not talking about last year particularly) there had to be a falling away of real wages. There could be no other answer to that particular problem. If that were the situation, quite clearly, in my opinion, there had to be wage demands, and there were. I support the right of those people who were not getting the full c.p.i. index at that particular time to ensure that they did through direct action, and that is what they did.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: They got 15 per cent last year even though the c.p.i. increased by only 9 per cent.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I was referring to the last five years. I am not talking about what happened last year. I know what happened last year. I am as *au fait* with this situation as the Minister is. I am talking about the period of time over which the Federal Liberal and State Liberal Governments exercised some authority in this case and reduced real wages in this nation. That is what caused the problem. Conflict over national wage case increases and agreements in some areas for reductions in working hours caused the Arbitration Commission to hold a public inquiry into the principles of wage determination.

The new principles it introduced in April were directed at restricting wage increases outside national wage cases

and eliminating productivity bargaining for reductions in standard working hours. These principles were so out of touch with the actual pressures acting on the Arbitration Commission that they failed to get the support of the parties involved and it had to be abandoned by the Commission only three months later. That was where I believe the fate of indexation was sealed. As I have said (and I will say it again in this House, and I have said it publicly and will say it again probably over the next 10 years), I believe in wage indexation.

Mr Lewis: Why don't you come up with something constructive?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: If the honourable member looked at the speech I made recently in the House, he would see that I made a suggestion about the restoration of the wage indexation system that operated back in the 1950s. However, I am quite sure that the member for Mallee would not support the proposition I put forward. It is obvious from this lesson that excessive wage restraint produces blatant wage demands which eventually must emerge as a serious pressure on cost and inflation.

How can the Premier be taken seriously on this issue any more? Last week, quite rightly, he was being held up to ridicule because of his refusal to appear before the State Industrial Commission to explain how a wage increase would damage the State's economy on the grounds that, despite his being the Treasurer in the South Australian Government and his many lengthy discourses before this Parliament on the subject, he tells us he is not an economic expert. At least the Premier is now being honest about his abilities. I understand now that he will appear and give some evidence next Friday—I might go along and listen to that. I look forward to the day when the Minister of Industrial Affairs makes a similar confession about his abilities. For the first time, I am forced to commend the Premier for his truthfulness.

The second factor to which the Premier pointed as jeopardising his economic programme is increasing interest rates. He is obviously quite prepared to accept the shallow explanations of the Fraser Government, with his talk about inflation and strong demands for capital funds as its causes. He chose to ignore the facts that these increases were as much a deliberate action to control the rate of growth in the money supply as the result of market forces. This is the most damaging and inefficient means of attempting to control inflation. It has had so little effect that this year the Commonwealth Treasury forecasts that inflation will again cross the threshold into double figures and reach 10.75 per cent. The Premier has chosen not even to protest although the Prime Minister has sought to sheet home to the States a substantial part of the blame, by accusing them of contributing to the demand for capital, with what he refers to as their excessive borrowing programmes.

This is a dismal performance when we consider the implication for South Australian families and businesses. Families face rising mortgage payments, many to the point of losing their homes, and that is happening in my electorate now. I have not seen many Liberals getting into this particular area at any of the meetings I have attended. They do not seem to care about the social and economic conditions and about what is happening to people. They represent people of a different type from the people I represent; they represent people who do not have to be concerned about high interest rates and having to vacate their homes. That is the fundamental difference between the two Parties.

The demand for consumer durables usually purchased under finance, such as cars and whitegoods, is reduced with obvious repercussions on the general level of economic activity. High interest rates act as an hindrance to investment, thus slowing any trend towards recovery, and cost

structures are worsened when companies are forced to refinance. Both these factors put pressure on prices through costs. Small business is least able to adapt to such conditions. Yet the Premier not only sat idly by, but he agreed with the Federal Government's policy. You would probably expect that, given the enthusiastic support he gave it at the last election.

One only has to recall the attitude of members sitting opposite at the time of the last Federal election, when there was unequivocal support given to the then Fraser policies and to the return of the Fraser Government. It did not take very long for them to turn around and start to criticise. Today, we see a great deviation from the policies of the Federal Government, from the philosophical standpoint. I am not quite sure where this Government is going, but it was getting to the stage of protecting South Australian industry, although there is the sham put forward today. If it is half fair dinkum, it will always get support from the Opposition benches.

I doubt the veracity with which they approached that problem today, and I believe that the evidence was clearly indicated in the Government's voicing its opinion to the amendment. I believe that the Government will rue the day that it did not support the amendment.

The third factor that the Premier cites as jeopardising his economic programme is the Federal Government's impending decision on protection for the motor vehicle industry and its general reference to the I.A.C. on reducing protection. While he expresses some hope that any substantial reductions in protection will not take place until the economy is expanding vigorously, the Premier's statement that his Government accepts that in the long run there must be some reduction in protection signals his future acquiescence to the decision by the Federal Minister for Industry and Commerce, whenever he may make it. That is another point that needs elaboration. When will the Federal Government make a decision? When will it get the component manufacturers and the workers of this State off the hook? When will it tell them where they stand and what their future is?

Mr Lewis: We are doing all we can about it.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: You are not doing very well, because the Government has been sitting on it for some time. The Government should come clean and tell the nation what it is about. The Premier did not foreshadow any action that the Government may be considering to reduce the dislocation that will result. I would have preferred to hear something of that rather than of his hopes for gradualism in any changes.

Another serious problem that the Premier refused to face squarely was that of State charges. The Premier has raised some 60 of these in the last year by margins ranging from 10 per cent to 2 000 per cent. There are two reasons why the Premier has made these drastic increases and will make even more in 1981-82. The most important is those badly costed promises of tax cuts that he made at the election. The guesses that the Premier made then amounted to only about a third of the actual reduction in revenue that those promises involved.

To remove \$30 000 000 from the State's receipts seriously erodes our financial base in the long term. These financial sources cannot be replaced. The Premier has left himself in the position where he has no room for flexibility and must raise revenue through channels. This means the back-door taxation of State charges. The additional pressure this year is that Commonwealth payments to the State have grown by an amount that is less than the expected rate of inflation.

Rather than being an excuse for the problems faced this year, this reduction in Commonwealth funding is further

evidence of the foolishness of the Tonkin Government's tax cuts. At the time that the promise of those tax cuts was made, it was already clear that the States were in for a much leaner time with Commonwealth funding after the expiry of the Whitlam guarantee.

South Australia still has the threat that relativities will be altered against its favour in an adjustment of the railways transfer agreement. A responsible Government would have considered these possibilities before handing away its own sources of revenue. I was interested in a report by the financial media a few weeks ago that put the proportion of State taxes and charges, such as power, water, land tax, freight charges, stamp duty, mining royalties, pay-roll tax, motor vehicle registration, and licence fees at 10 per cent of industry's overheads. It suggested that the hidden tax slugs, as the State Government tries to find revenue, would amount to a 2 per cent to 3 per cent increase in total overheads in 1981-82. When one adds this to increases in the cost of capital as a result of rising interest rates, the effect on the cost structure of most businesses is serious and, again, small business is least able to adjust.

The other great programme about which the Premier boasted so loudly in his election campaign and which has failed, is his plan to create 7 000 jobs through his pay-roll tax rebate system. The Premier in his first Budget allocated \$2 000 000 to pay-roll tax rebates for youth unemployment, but the system was so ineffective that only \$129 000 was used. In the following Budget, the allocation was halved, but still only \$371 000 was spent. This year the allocation has been halved again, which suggests clearly the failure of this scheme. It has been the best example of the Government's utter failure to deliver on its election promises, and the Government felt prepared to keep some money for it.

As nearly as we can estimate pay-roll tax rebates could only have been paid in respect of a maximum of 1 000 jobs. This is between 6 000 and 9 000 short, depending on which of the Premier's election promises you might have chosen to believe.

The Government must be criticised for more than the ineffectiveness of the pay-roll tax rebate scheme. It would have abolished it this year had that not been too embarrassing a reversal. The real issue this year is increases in the amount of pay-roll taxation. For the first time in a number of years, exemption levels on the size of pay-rolls have not been revised to take account of inflation. This reliance on fiscal drag to raise revenue is yet another example of the Premier's scrambling to raise funds in any way that he can get them. What are the consequences of this action? Pay-roll tax is a tax on jobs. This year many more small businesses will have to pay pay-roll tax for the first time. About 2 400 South Australian businesses employing 36 000 people will be affected. This decision has put South Australia at a comparative disadvantage with the Eastern manufacturing States.

New South Wales and Victoria now offer higher exemption levels for pay-roll tax, and a South Australian company will pay more pay-roll tax for any annual wage bill up to \$250 000 than will a Victorian company. With the Premier taxing jobs in this way and reducing our competitiveness with other States, it is appropriate to look at his record on handling unemployment after two full years. In August 1979, before he took office, there were 39 900 South Australians looking for full-time employment, and 5 400 looking for part-time work. At that stage there was an unemployment rate of 7.6 per cent.

Provisional figures for August 1981 show that there are now 44 200 South Australians looking for full-time work and 4 500 looking for part-time work. That is an increase of more than 4 000 people looking for full-time work, with an unemployment rate of 8 per cent. This compares most

unfavourably with the average Australian unemployment rate of 5.6 per cent. That is the Premier's 'job rot'.

Before concluding, there are four matters I want to discuss which arise out of the Estimates. The first relates to the Small Business Advisory Bureau. While allocations for its operation have been substantially increased from the meagre level of spending of the last year, I believe that a total commitment of \$154 000 is insufficient. This is particularly so when one considers the contribution this unit could make in developing the potential of the small business sector to generate economic activity and create employment. I would be interested to know whether the Minister has given any consideration to the suggestions I made in my Address in Reply speech in August on means of improving the availability of finance to small business and the need for more suitable education programmes to assist small business operators in improving their managerial skills. On a Budget of \$84 000 for salaries I cannot see the unit being able to properly carry out its day-to-day advisory function, let alone any useful research into such important matters as the pricing policies of wholesalers which threaten small retailers. There is little doubt that this Government only believes in a free market which allows big business to do whatever it wants, not a free market which allows free competition.

The next matter of alarm is the abolition of the home handyman scheme. Last year it was allocated \$385 000; this year only \$15 000. I am particularly interested in this scheme as it was one of my own initiatives. It provided funds to local government to pay tradesmen and council workers to carry out repairs on the homes of the elderly who were unable to carry out the work themselves and unable to pay someone else to do it. Naturally, there was enormous need for such a scheme in the community to assist people whose homes would otherwise gradually fall below standard, while at the same time providing some employment. It is a measure of the Government's real priorities that it has chosen to abandon this much needed and popular project.

The next matter makes me very angry. A few weeks ago I brought to the attention of the media the crisis which currently exists in South Australia's Industrial Court and Commission. The place has far too few judges to carry out its work, and the quality of justice dispensed there is indeed suffering. Yet the Government has chosen to make a small decrease in real terms in allocations for the salaries of the President, Deputy Presidents and magistrates, indicating that nothing will be done to alleviate the situation.

In addition, there will be a cut in resources of some 10 per cent in real terms for the provision of support staff. If that makes me angry, the final matter with which I wish to deal makes me furious. This Budget sees a further cut in real terms to resources for the Industrial Safety Division in the Department of Employment and Industrial Affairs. The division, it must be noted, is presently so understaffed that it cannot properly carry out its duties. This cannot be seen in any other way than a deliberate programme to reduce its effectiveness.

Even now it does not have enough inspectors to carry out spot-checks, and that means it is only acting on complaints. Without spot-checks, workers are unwilling to lay complaints because they risk various forms of retaliation from their employers, such as dismissal on trumped up grounds, denial of promotion or being assigned to exhausting and dirty work. Safety standards will inevitably suffer from such inattention. It indicates that the Minister and the Government have nothing but contempt for the welfare of the working people within South Australia's industries.

There are two matters with which I finally want to deal. I criticised the Minister of Industrial Affairs three or four

weeks ago in relation to pending cases before the Industrial Commission. I will not go over that ground but I would like to know from the Minister, if he is prepared to reply in this debate, what action, if any, he has taken in replacing a judge to accommodate the cases that are lagging behind in that jurisdiction. The second matter on which I would like to hear from the Minister is whether or not or how he is going to accommodate the Safety, Health and Welfare Division of his department with what I estimate to be a 5.4 per cent reduction in real terms. There are difficulties at the moment because I am getting complaint after complaint about them, not only in the Safety, Health and Welfare Division but also in the wages section and almost right throughout the department.

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

Mr O'NEILL (Florey): It is a sad time of the year for the State of South Australia, with the introduction of the 1981-82 Budget. It will have to go down in history as one of the worst economic fiascos in the history of South Australia. We saw in 1979 a Premier who became Leader of his Party more or less by default and who came to power as a result of wild promises hurled about at the time as to what he would do to improve South Australia. He has been in office for two years now and has had the opportunity to do so but has failed abysmally to deliver the goods. In almost every quarter in which he criticised the previous Government he has failed to make things better. He prattles on about electoral promises fulfilled, but what were those promises? They certainly have no relevance to the larger number of South Australians—the people who make this State tick.

He now resorts to blaming international factors and the Federal Government for the plight in which he finds himself—factors that he claimed in 1979 were not relevant to the problems of a State Government. One amazing aspect of the performance or lack of performance of the Premier is the restraint being exercised by the industrial and commercial sectors in their public appraisal of his operations.

We do not see the response from those sectors that we saw in 1979, when the Labor Administration was in power, but quite clearly the situation is far worse now than it was then. On previous occasions I have dwelt on the way in which the situation was misrepresented in 1979, and I do not propose to go over that at this stage.

Everyone in South Australia knows that we are now confronted with a Premier who is a walking disaster area so far as the economy of South Australia is concerned, but the media is most restrained in criticism of that honourable gentleman. Nevertheless, he is so much a disaster area that that does not stop him from giving the game away himself, as was referred to earlier by previous speakers, but it is quite amazing that the Premier and Treasurer of the State would send legal representation into a court of law in South Australia to say that the Premier 'could not be taken as an expert technical witness on the economy'. Goodness knows who could be taken as an expert if the Treasurer could not be. The Premier got on the horse, and he has to ride it. If, in his own words, he cannot be taken as an expert technical witness on the economy, surely he should give some serious consideration, for the sake of South Australia, to vacating that position. The man himself has been gracious enough to put on the record that he is not an expert, so I guess it rests with his conscience and his Party as to what is done about a replacement.

There is no doubt in the minds of thousands of South Australians that the money they are forced to pay in increased charges is as a direct result of the Premier's budgetary ineptitude. Whilst there is considerable truth in

the argument that Federal Budget policies have been responsible for much of our trouble, let it not be forgotten that the Premier and his colleagues have consistently campaigned to ensure that a Liberal and Country Party coalition stays in power in Canberra. Let it not be forgotten that last year the Premier was appealing to South Australian voters to vote Liberal for South Australia's sake. The truth is that the Federal Government has forsaken South Australia, and the Premier is incapable of inducing it to provide any relief for our ailing State.

In the area of transport, to which I wish to address some remarks, the Federal Government has taken steps which will have detrimental effects on employment in South Australia. The Federal Government, in allocating the money for road grants in 1981, has placed tender requirements in the Act, namely, that all national highway construction projects from 1 September 1981 must go to public tender, whereas previously it was up to the discretion of the States as to which work could be open for tender, which would be performed by State road authorities, and which would go to local council employees.

This requirement will cause retrenchments, red tape and inefficiency. Rural areas will lose jobs and income, as most successful tenderers will import their own work force. Large companies will not purchase the sophisticated road equipment required unless a continuity of work is guaranteed—itself a denial of competitive tendering, hence advance funding of Commonwealth national road grants.

The background of the decision is that construction giants are heavily dependent on Government contracts for their profits. Public capital works are declining and so, to sweeten the pill, the Government passes tender proposals to give companies, the Australian Federation of Construction Contractors, a larger slice of the diminishing cake. The losers are the Australian motorists, who are getting less for their fuel related taxes spent on roads, public sector labour, which faces retrenchments, and rural areas which face declining employment income.

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

Mr O'NEILL: The situation is that honourable members opposite, from whom we saw a remarkable performance this afternoon, have the cheek to interject when they should be standing up and demanding of the Federal Government that it continue the previous funding arrangements, which at least would give some employment to people in the rural areas who are compromised by the current decision.

The State Government, however, although it may blame the Federal Government, is certainly not in the clear, because when one looks at the approach that it had to the employment situation, it is well known that in the last Budget the Government decided to effect a 3 per cent across-the-board reduction in Government employment, regardless of the consequences to the departments involved. One of the problems that arose from that, of course, was that the Government set out on a deliberate course to run down the Highways Department in favour of private enterprise. I think we will find in the Budget papers that we are looking at a movement of \$13 400 000 this coming year for contract expenditure compared to \$8 000 000 last year.

Along with many other Government departments, the Highways Department is suffering from a severe morale problem. I presume that this is part of the Government's plan to run down the fine Government work force that was built up under the previous Administration. I understand that one of the problems facing the Highways Department is that no apprentices will be taken on at the Northfield workshop this year. Apprentices completing their apprenticeships are being told that they finish on the day that their apprenticeship is completed. Of course, there is the run-down, or what is known as 'natural attrition' or 'natural

wastage', whereby people who retire are not replaced. This creates the unfortunate situation in the long-term best interests of the State that, as a result of a deliberate ploy by this Government, the people with the expertise (there is no doubt that the South Australian Highways Department had a highly expert work force, built up over many years) are being wasted.

The older employees who have the expertise are not being afforded the opportunity of passing that expertise on to young people. So, at some time in the future, we will not have the expert work force to carry on the job. I imagine that this is unfortunately probably a deliberate Government strategy. This is extremely short-sighted and detrimental to the best interests of the State. Not only is there a run-down in the supply of skilled workers but also the Highways Department is, I believe, selling off machinery and other assets. I understand that a well set up and expensive camp in the Upper North of the State known as the Bon Bon camp was sold to Santos for a fraction of its worth. The department has also been selling off machinery.

We know that earlier in the year there was a stoppage of workers at the Northfield depot, and some arrangements were reached with the Minister. We can only hope that the Minister of Transport is more reliable in his dealings with unions than is the Minister of Industrial Affairs, who is well known for his capacity to talk to unions, to talk and talk, and then to go on with what he was going to do in the first place, regardless of the opinions of the unions involved.

The Highways Department has, I am told, sold machinery to private enterprise operators and is now hiring that same machinery back from those who bought it at much reduced prices. Quite frankly, I find it very difficult to understand the economics of that. I am informed that there are a number of machines known as bitumen finishers, which put the topping on roads in the metropolitan area, or which used to, and which are now held up by the bureaucracy in the department. These machines, designated Nos. 427-15 and 427-16, are in need of repairs that would not take very long. However, paper work has been held up at the head office of the Highways Department for about six months awaiting approval for that work to be done. Machine 427-17 is also awaiting approval for repairs, and out of an original complement of 12 machines the department has only five left. I understand that two private enterprise companies in the metropolitan area, namely, Bitumax and Hot-pave, have bought the other machines, and undoubtedly those companies will be tendering for contracts for Highways Department work.

Another rather strange situation concerns the bitumen plants. We all know that last year the Northfield bitumen plant was sold to private enterprise on the grounds that it needed considerable maintenance. My information is that the plight of that plant was not as bad as reported. Nevertheless, there is still a very efficient plant at Marino capable of turning out in excess of 100 000 tonnes of road topping material.

I understand that this year the department's programme calls for 90 000 tonnes during the forthcoming financial year, 40 000 tonnes of which is to be produced at Marino and 50 000 tonnes of which is to be supplied by tender. The interesting thing about this is that, given the Government's professed concern for obtaining value for the taxpayers' dollar, the Highways Department was doing Hotmix for \$26 a tonne, and the department is charged by private enterprise suppliers at \$34 a tonne. Perhaps the Minister or someone else can explain the economics of that. On the surface, it would appear that that is not particularly economical from the point of view of the taxpayers of South Australia.

I am also concerned that over the years we in South Australia have had a very efficient line-marking operation run by the Highways Department. I understand that some of its developments have attracted interest on a world-wide scale. Some extremely skilled men were operating in that area. Earlier in the year I wrote to the Minister regarding a contract that had been let to a Western Australian firm in respect to line marking. I was told that, in fact, a small contract of some \$70 000 had been let to a Western Australian company but that the department would retain 75 per cent of the work.

It came to my notice and that of others quite recently that the South Australian Highways Department was offering in the press in the Eastern States a contract for line marking in South Australia worth considerably more than \$70 000. In fact, I am informed that the contract is worth about \$400 000 and that it has been let to an interstate contractor who will employ no South Australians but will bring in his own work force from interstate to take over work that was being performed very professionally and very economically by the line marketing section of the Highways Department. I think that that is disgraceful, given the situation that presently prevails in South Australia where, as has been pointed out by my colleagues, we are disadvantaged in relation to unemployment compared to other States.

This Government, as a matter of deliberate policy, is going outside the State to obtain workers to do work that could well be done by Government departments. I can find no other reason for it other than that it has an aversion to operating Government departments efficiently. One could be forgiven for finding that to be rather strange, given the performances by members opposite earlier this afternoon in relation to the first matter before the House.

Another matter involving the Highways Department that has been reported to me relates to the engineering workshops at Northfield and the maintenance of machines there. I understand that instructions have been issued in the department that, if a job is going to take more than three months to complete, it must go to the private sector for tender and letting out. We have a vicious cycle developing. The department is disposing of young tradesmen who have been trained in the department when they finish their apprenticeships. As I said earlier, they are told that their employment finishes on the day that their indenture is completed. Older workers are being dispensed with through so-called 'natural attrition'. It is interesting to note that the word 'attrition' means 'to wear out'. I do not know the significance of that, but nevertheless many older employees are being dispensed with on that basis. Whether the department considers them to be worn out, I do not know.

Therefore, we have a severe downward spiral developing. It may not be recognised by people yet, but when Government departments are sufficiently run down they will gather so much downward momentum that they will disintegrate under this momentum. Goodness knows what will happen in that situation. We will probably go from having some of the finest State Government departments in Australia to a situation under the present Administration where the whole of the Government work force will just disintegrate.

Another area involving transport is the Motor Registration Division. Whilst there was considerable criticism of the way in which recent arrangements in relation to petrol rationing were handled, no criticism was intended of employees of the Motor Registration Division. Under the circumstances, I think they did a tremendous job, having it dropped on them in the way that it was. I now wish to refer to something that was brought to my attention much earlier in the year, when I became involved in the slightly complicated transfer of a motor vehicle. I spoke on the

telephone to someone who apologised for the problems that had occurred. I was told that, because of the run-down in staff in the department, there was a six weeks lag in handling business on the computer.

I think that, if that is the case, the Government should do something about it. If this is the end result of its so-called smaller government policy, I think it is a disgrace and, if that sort of thing continues, we could finish up with the bad old days when, Mr Speaker, you may remember, as I do, we used to see four-hour queues outside the Motor Vehicles Department in Flinders Street, not trying to get a ticket to get some petrol, but trying to register a car or get a licence. I would hate to think we would go back that far under the policies of the conservative Government that we have today.

There were many other things I wanted to mention in respect of the Budget, but in view of the announcement of the Minister of Transport tonight in respect of the O'Bahn, or the north-east busway, or whatever current terminology is being employed, I feel I must say something about that. The situation is quite contrary to what the Minister says about the technology being well-established and proven in operation in Essen, Germany. I do not think the situation has changed much from what was reported last year, when I think it was said there was 1.2 km of track—

Mr Ashenden: Presently being more than doubled.

Mr O'NEILL: Here is the voluble member for Todd, who seems to be pressing the O'Bahn system out in the north-eastern suburbs, where my understanding is that he is in conflict with the Tea Tree Gully council and many people in the area who would much rather see an l.r.t. I will go on with the situation, as I understand it, and that is that there is 1.2 km of track in Essen. Right next door in Duisburg the community has decided that they do not want to be lumbered with the O'Bahn system, and they have opted for a light rail transport system.

It is interesting to note the terminology of the Minister with regard to this proposition. He said, 'The House will know that it was this Government's aim to provide an improved rapid transport system in the north-east suburbs at a cheaper cost than that proposed by the former Government.' I can well understand the point made about an improved rapid transport system. The north-eastern suburbs have had a problem regarding transport for some time. I think the operative word, so far as the Government is concerned, is 'cheaper'. It made great play on this, and I suggest that what we are getting for the money we are paying will be cheap; it will be cheap and nasty.

The situation is far worse than that. It would appear now that the Government has decided not only to put in a 2.3 km or 2.6 km section, as was originally planned, but it intends to do the lot, that is, from the Gilberton area right through to the Tea Tree Plaza area. That raises a very important point as far as I am concerned, given the connection of some of the members of this Parliament with businesses in South Australia. I would hope that before long we follow the lead of Victoria and New South Wales and reach the stage of having a declaration of pecuniary interests of members of Parliament.

What is required with the Zublin system is concrete, and concrete, gravel, sand and cement are involved in concrete. The two north-eastern suburbs back-benchers are chatting amongst themselves over there; I would not suggest they were involved. If they are so foolish as to think there are not people in their own Party who have very direct connections with these industries and with the Mercedes-Benz Corporation, they are not very smart.

We are about to spend \$68 000 000 of the taxpayers' money, and I am concerned that we are being rushed into it. We have had two years of procrastination and talk about

the O'Bahn system, and now we find that we must dash in and sign contracts. If this Government had any decency at all it would refrain from any long-term commitments until after the next State election, which it is sure to lose. That move would give the people of Tea Tree Gully a right to exercise an option for a system that they prefer, namely, the light rail transport.

What is proposed seems to be highly irresponsible action, although I will concede that the Minister may have some information that I do not have. I imagine that, to overcome some of the objections of environmentalists, the Government has decided, on the basis of a report that has been received by the Minister of Water Resources, that it will lower the level of the track so that the track can run down the Torrens Valley and under some of the main arterial roads and bridges in the area. This may be fine: I do not say that the Government is wrong, but it had better be right, because if it is not right, we may be faced with the situation some time in the future where the rapid transport system (the O'Bahn system) will not be able to operate because of flooding of the Torrens River.

Mr Ashenden: What?

Mr O'NEILL: Look at what happened to Noah, and he was a lot smarter than the honourable member. If the Liberal Party wants to be so categoric as to place \$68 000 000 of the taxpayers' money in the bed of the Torrens, it had better be prepared to account for it to the taxpayers at a later stage. The member for Todd seems to spend a lot of time laughing about the north-east transport situation; perhaps he can afford to laugh. As I said before, he may know more than I know about the situation.

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

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): Last week in this House I was told by a Minister to have faith. After studying the Budget documents—

Mr Slater interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: Yes, he is in the House at present, and I am pleased to see him here. After studying the Budget documents, I can state that even the most devout supporter of this Government would be hard pressed holding to his belief that this Government has the answer to the problems facing South Australia at present. The Budget is a clear statement that the Government's policies are not working. I suggest that the rush of industries that the Government anticipated has not materialised, and the belief in and attraction of the Government's philosophy has not been borne out by the results. Clearly, the Government demonstrates with this harsh Budget that the bonanza that it expected has not materialised and that it does not have the ability to guide South Australia successfully.

The promises that the Government made to win office have not been met. There is great disillusionment in the community, so much so that people are leaving the State. South Australia has a net population loss. That is hardly the mark of a confident, hopeful community: it is more the mark of disillusioned, disheartened people, who are prepared to risk pulling up roots and trying to establish their families somewhere else. I urge all members to consider what is involved in such a move. To leave everything one knows, family, friends and, in most cases, the place where one spent his whole life, is reminiscent of the population moves of the great depression, at a time when a depression was called a depression. The question that must be answered by this Government and the question that should be examined by those on the Government benches is, 'What is the reason for this outflow? Why are these people leaving the State?' The answer is lack of faith in the Government and

the lack of confidence to deliver the promises that were made.

What of those, then, that stay? If they are employed, they are facing increasing State taxes and charges. Some 60 or 70 State charges have been increased in the term of this Government; water rates, electricity, fares, drivers' licences, motor vehicle registration, even beer and wine have all had their taxes increased. Added to this is the increasing apprehension over the discontinuity of employment. Many industries are not operating at effective levels. Others are placed in great risk by the policies of the Federal Government, not the least of those industries being the motor vehicle industry in this State. Anyone who doubts the concern felt by workers in that industry must be deaf and blind. The rally that took place last week can only be taken as a warning to any politician. Judging by the resolution put forward today, possibly some notice has been taken.

The Government of this State, which should surely be the most optimistic and hopeful employer in the State, has a policy of no replacement, a policy that effectively denies jobs to many people. The effect of the Government policy on the Public Service was clarified by Mr Ian Fraser, the General Secretary of the Public Service Association. When commenting on the Budget, he said:

A further 600 public sector jobs have been cut and, along with 800 jobs estimated to be lost in the building industry, this is expected to add 2 500 to the already record unemployment levels in this State.

If you are unemployed in this State, the situation is much worse. The Budget explanation referred to 65 companies that have been established or have expanded their operations in South Australia in the past two years. Despite this, migration from the State continues and unemployment continues to increase. It is frightening to contemplate what is going to happen when school leavers come on to the labour market next year. We must increase employment somehow. Where are these people to be employed? Where are the jobs they were promised? The Government and Opposition know that they just do not exist. What can the Government promise these school leavers? How are they to obtain the elements that make for anything more than just a bare existence? People need a job, car, home, and a family reasonably insulated from the worry about where the next dollar is coming from. As a background to this situation, it is interesting to compare the differing opinions on the economy of the State. The Premier was recently quoted as saying, 'South Australia is a pretty sick State.' He further said:

In having reversed the trend, having spent the first two years in Government tidying up the mess of the 1970s I now invite and encourage you [the South Australian Chamber of Commerce] to help South Australia climb faster.

Mr Schrape, the General Manager of the chamber, responded that South Australia's economy had turned a corner and that prospects for growth and employment in business activity were bright. It is certainly not clear to the people of South Australia where the prospects are or that they are bright prospects.

A member of the Government in another place, Mr Laidlaw, who is also Chairman of Adelaide Brighton Cement Ltd, apparently in reply to the Premier's request to help develop the State, said that Adelaide Brighton Cement was trying hard to promote the use of cement, concrete and ancillary products in South Australia. He went on to say that, as a result of the wet winter and high interest rates for new housing (which I emphasise) and low Federal funding for road and other usage of cement locally, for the first quarter the results are lower than for a comparable period in the previous financial year. This man is involved

in the Government and in business in this State. He clearly records the down-turn in the use of what must be considered a basic commodity in any development, and this is a sure indicator of any expansion in the economy. He also commented that the prospects for cement sales in South Australia were very poor, which is hardly a heartening thought.

In the current economic climate in this State, it is not only the unemployed who are deeply worried about the future. I mentioned previously the apprehension felt by many workers in the State. This apprehension, coupled with the sharply increasing disparity between wages and costs, is placing many people and family relationships under extreme pressure. It is a recognised fact that money worries are the major underlying cause of most marriage breakdowns.

No single financial commitment is causing as much heart-ache and despair as the purchase of the family home. This purchase is the largest single purchase that most people make in their lives. The purchase of a house is the great Australian dream and the goal of most couples when they marry. It is a statistical fact that some 72 per cent of Australians own or are buying their own homes. This element of the Australian character is being erased. It will, from now on, be an impossibility for many to even contemplate such a purchase, as it will become more and more difficult for many with contracts to meet their payments.

I heard a report on the radio, I think today, which stated that the requests for re-arrangement of home loan contracts have been minimal. I take that as a mark of the degree of determination shown by the people with contracts rather than a sign that people are not having difficulties with their contract. In the *News* tonight there was a report by Mrs Glenys Lane, a noted home loan protester, who is quoted as saying:

The Liberal Party policy speech promised to protect the weak, keep families together and homeowners in their own homes.

At the moment, with spiralling interest rates, this policy does not seem to be ringing true. A severe imposition is being caused by high interest rates that affects people across the spectrum of our community. It creates hardship to people at all levels of income and it is a situation that will have a massive effect in the ballot-box when next the people of this State have to make a choice of Government.

Workers of this State have had their earnings and, consequently, their spending power seriously diminished over the later stages of wage indexation. Only six of the 18 pay rises awarded over the last few years have matched the Consumer Price Index and as a result a 20 per cent gap has opened between wage and price increases. This was before the savage increase imposed by the Federal Government in the previous Budget. This creeping inroad to spending is reflected in a study by a Mr Turner, of the economic research department of the Commercial Banking Company. He is quoted as saying that the average worker has a debt of \$5 174.

The study has also found that householders are twice as deeply in debt as they were 20 years ago. The average householder used 43.4 per cent of his disposable income to pay off debts compared to 22.8 per cent in 1960. The average debt for a member of the work force was \$5 174 at the end of 1979-80 financial year, an increase of 63.3 per cent since 1969-70. The largest cause of debts today is housing mortgages. It should be remembered that housing loan interest rates have increased significantly since that report, and the situation is now much worse. Added to this already heavy impost are the far from encouraging opinions from the Real Estate Institute of South Australia, which is reported as saying that it believes that interest rates will go as high as 16 per cent.

Mr K. D. Wills, Chairman of Beneficial Finance Corporation Ltd, said recently that he believed that local interests would be drawn more into line with international interest rates where U.S. levels can be expected to remain high. Currently the United States are 20 per cent. Vicious sales tax increases will add some \$600 to the average house while the increases to furnish and fit the house out are not known.

Builders have said that feelings of insecurity brought about by the current situation will adversely affect the home building industry in this State by, they suggest, as much as 50 per cent—that is, all of those who do not qualify for State Bank loans. As the demand and the waiting time for State Bank loans increase, more and more couples on low incomes will be forced to use bridging finance, at extremely high interest rates.

In the past 12 months, to August of this year, the price of home building materials rose by 9.1 per cent in Adelaide. Industry sources assess that this would increase a \$30 000 home by some \$1 300. The results of these increases and unknown increases obviously make people reluctant to commit themselves to an indefinable debt. This uncertainty is reflected in the considerable downturn in building approvals.

The increasing cost of building has been under investigation for some years. A recent report by the Building Research Division of C.S.I.R.O. revealed that, before the Second World War, it took 18 months pay for the average family to buy a house. In 1981, it takes four years pay, and this is increasing all the time. The report comments that the problem with the affordable home, which was once affordable by about 80 per cent of eligible Australians, is that most of us cannot afford it any more. In this State, the critical situation was clearly spelt out by the General Manager of the South Australian Housing Trust, when he reported that the trust had received a record 11 500 applications for rental accommodation in 1980-81, as compared with 10 258 applications the previous year, which was also a record.

The changing face of the home loan situation was revealed by a New South Wales Parliamentarian. In that State, breadwinners earning an 'average' weekly income of \$290 or less are receiving less than a quarter of the total housing loans. In 1977 in New South Wales, families whose breadwinner earned the average weekly income or less, which was under \$200, were getting 44 per cent of home loans. I was not able to get comparable figures for this State, but I am sure they would be similar.

It is intriguing to see how interested is the Federal Government in the plight of home owners. For some years an inquiry has been under way involving master builders, Government representatives, and C.S.I.R.O., investigating ways of lowering prices. The President of the Master Builders Federation of Australia (Mr Reg Keast) said that after three years and millions of words the inquiry had halted because the Commonwealth and State Governments had no real intention of trying to cut costs; so much for the concern of Governments for the plight of the home buyer.

What are the sources of funds for the prospective home buyer? Banks and building societies are all subject to pressure to obtain funds, and it might pay to look briefly at those organisations and how they are trying to attract funds. It must be remembered that every inducement being offered to prospective lenders must in the end be paid for by the borrower. Building societies offer a 3 per cent bonus on yearly savings accounts in addition to normal interest as one way of attracting funds. Banks are offering 9 per cent on cheque accounts, and ever increasing interest rates on all forms of accounts. In this rush for funds a new contender for money has emerged. In the *National Times* of 6 Sep-

tember, a report headed 'Trusts vie for household dollars' states:

The recent introduction of cash management trusts in Australia threatens the positions of both the huge banks and the building societies in the market for household and small business funds. The trusts simply offer the small investor a better return. And while new cash trusts are now appearing each month there is little the banks and building societies can do to match them.

It goes on, later, to state:

The market is as yet still undeveloped in Australia. QBE Insurance Limited opened the Equitable Group Cash Management Trust a couple of months ago. With a lower minimum investment of \$2 000 this is clearly aimed to include the smaller investor.

A little further down it states:

In these conditions cash trusts will follow the United States pattern and draw large amounts of household savings away from their traditional repositories.

Already the amounts tied up in cash trusts represent over one per cent of the fixed deposits held by trading banks, and well over this proportion of similar categories with savings banks and building societies.

These proportions can be expected to grow very rapidly, particularly as banks and building societies are still effectively prevented from setting deposit rates appropriate to the market.

As banks and the societies lose funds, they will undoubtedly press even harder for complete freedom in setting their interest rate structures.

The article continues, later:

It would not be surprising if interest rates on home loans, and the deposit categories supporting them, continue to be well below true market levels at least until after the 1983 elections.

Three points emerge from that article. One is that building societies and banks will have to increase interest rates to attract funds. Secondly, home loans will be dearer. Thirdly, home loan interest rates are set to increase in 1983. All of this, when a typical householder has to work for more than one week a month to pay back his monthly instalment of \$327 on his \$30 000 mortgage taken over a 25-year period. At the same time, a Victorian social worker reported (and I assume the same situation may exist in this State) in the *News* of 3 September, under the heading 'Families to look to death as solution', the following:

Families unable to afford soaring interest rates were considering drastic action, including death, to keep their homes, a social worker has claimed.

Mrs Carol Williams, a financial counsellor at the Dandenong Valley Family Care Centre, said many local families were sacrificing food, clothing and insurance to meet mortgage repayments.

Mrs Williams said at least one family a week was losing its home.

Some families had threatened violence against themselves or the community.

One man had planned to smash his car into a pole and kill himself so his wife could collect the life insurance.

He wanted to know if I could counsel her on how to handle the money, and he was not joking, Mrs Williams said.

Another family told me they would burn their car and pay out their credit commitments with the insurance, she said.

Mrs Williams and other members of the Financial Counsellors Association of Australia said rising interest rates had put intolerable financial, social and psychological pressures on families.

Mrs Williams said the trauma of losing a home through mortgage pressures had contributed to marital and health breakdowns.

She said: The home is the most stabilising influence on a family—if you take it away the family is at risk and they just can't take any more.

I know of no similar situation in this State, but perhaps we should all take notice of that article. An article in the *National Times* of 9 August relating to borrowing money told of loan companies interstate forcing women to be sterilised before they were eligible for a loan. That appeared in the *National Times*, 9-15 August, at page 3 under the heading 'The unkindest cut spreads'. That is followed up in the next edition when building societies were included in the report. The effect of this type of mismanagement is appalling to contemplate, but apparently it does occur. There have been several schemes put forward to ease the plight of the home buyer. The Minister of Housing in this

State announced a scheme whereby the weekly rent on a Housing Trust purchase home would include \$5 a week compulsory saving, which would qualify the customer for a Commonwealth home savings grant.

Mr Slater: They'd be saving for a long time.

Mr PETERSON: It would probably help a few people, but the effect on the overall demand would be minimal. However, that is an additional \$5 a week which a family in those circumstances can ill-afford, but which it has to find.

Another proposal was put forward by Senator Haines, the Democrat, to freeze interest rates for the first five years, but to date I have heard nothing of that situation. It was thought that there might be some tax relief in this year's Federal Budget, but Mr Howard dashed those hopes when the Budget was presented. Should we be looking at tax relief at the end of a financial year, or should we be lessening the weekly load, because that is where the pressure is on people who are buying homes and repaying loans? A tax rebate at the end of the year would be very attractive and would obviously help, but it is the weekly load and the effort of finding the necessary money every month where the pressure is.

We need to look very seriously at any system which forces families from their homes, which prevents others from ever obtaining a home, which draws others to consider killing themselves to get their families out of debt, and which forces young women to pay for the privilege of a loan by sacrificing any hope of ever bearing children by undergoing sterilisation. We need to look at new sources of funding for housing, other sources that are not affected by overseas influences. Even if such new sources only partially assist people with home loans, they must help in the overall situation. They would have the effect of tempering the overall load upon families, and the end result would be to temper the interest bill on home loans.

Of course, these things depend very much on the attitude of Governments towards the provision of housing and on the State Government's and the Federal Government's appreciation of the worth to the country of the house building industry and, in the State Government's case, the question of whether South Australians should have the right to own their own homes. If the answers to any of those questions is in the negative, I do not know what the purpose of our being here in Parliament is. We are sworn to protect people and look after their interests. If we cannot do that, all of us should consider leaving this place.

There are several sources that I suggest could be investigated. If this mineral boom that we have been promised should come about, then a resource tax could be used purely in a housing context. Another source of aid that comes to mind is one that was touched on the other day by the member for Mallee. This point has been raised previously across the country, but has not even been considered yet by the people who make decisions, namely, that untapped financial pool of pensioner savings held in non-interest bearing accounts by banks and building societies. In a recent edition of the *National Times* an article appeared concerning the investigation of those funds. Part of the article stated:

Banks and building societies are making large windfall profits by borrowing money from pensioners and not paying them any interest.

With the record interest rates now applying for most lending, getting money from pensioners interest-free has become big business in Australia.

According to senior banking sources, banks and building societies are holding several hundred million dollars of pensioners' money in special savings accounts that are free from normal interest payments.

A senior Department of Social Security official who has been working in the area for 12 years told the *National Times* that the

no-interest schemes started a couple of years ago and since then they have caught on like a rash.

The article further stated:

Six banks—the Commonwealth, National, New South Wales, ANZ, Commercial Banking Company of Sydney and the Commercial Bank of Australia—all told the *National Times* that they were holding pension funds in savings accounts.

None would reveal how many people had these accounts or the total amounts involved.

But a reliable source in one big bank told the *National Times* that the amount of money being held in special bank accounts without interest in Australia would be more than \$500 million.

I have seen other figures on this subject, and one estimate is as high as \$800 000 000. If we work on \$500 000 000 and 10 per cent, which is basically the South Australian component of the Australian population, \$50 000 000 should be available in this State. If we link that \$50 000 000 to current sources and to part of the loans for housing at very low interest rates, it would modify the interest payments on homes and make a much more acceptable level of repayment for families. It is a situation that should be tackled by the State Government. Let it make a name for itself, and let it be a bit progressive. We have heard all about the benefits that it will create for this State. What about doing something for the home buyer? Here is the chance—stand up and get stuck into the Federal Government. Get it to give these pensioners a go.

Pensioners are frightened of losing their savings. Give home owners money to buy houses, and that will solve two problems in one action. The action of removing the risk from pensioners will also remove the risk of what I will call an anti-vote, because, if you get stuck into the pensioners, you are gone, Federally or on a State basis. Back-benchers in Canberra are threatening the Minister that, if he does that, there will be a revolt on his hands. Why does not the State Liberal Government have a go at this and give both these groups of people in this country some relief? The pensioner worried about his future could invest his few dollars in a special 'no interest' account and, at the same time, create low-interest loans for home buyers.

Mr Becker: That is tax evasion.

Mr PETERSON: It is not tax evasion: it is using the resources of this country, which are currently being wasted. The bloody banks are screwing the guts out of the pensioners. There is \$500 000 000 in 'no interest' accounts. Would the honourable member tell them to leave it in a tin in the vault?

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

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

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

Motion carried:

Mr RANDALL (Henley Beach): My short speech tonight is based on an article which appeared in the *Advertiser* on Tuesday 1 September 1981. It was written by staff writer Alex Kennedy and it states:

Women are doing it more, men are losing interest in it. And research has shown men can do without easier than women. And when they do indulge, it is from habit, not emotional need.

The subject is smoking.

The 'habit' is estimated to cost teenage girls and housewives three times what they spend on confectionery, and 1½ times as much as cosmetics.

As the number of male smokers in the Western world continues to drop steadily, the latest figures for women show a steady increase in most countries. Lung cancer is now listed as the third cause of death among Australian women. Within the next 10 years it is expected to overtake breast cancer as the major cause.

Why are women smoking more, why do they feel they need to? *The Ladykillers: Why Smoking is A Feminist Issue* is a book which believes it may have some of the answers.

That is the basis on which I bring my concern to the House.

An honourable member: Do you oppose smoking?

Mr RANDALL: The Minister of Health has announced our Government's policy, that we would encourage people to look at ways and means of formulating preventive health measures within the community. In other words, we are prepared to put some more money into the area whereby, through education and through media information, etc., preventive health measures can be encouraged in the community. So, to answer the interjection, 'Am I opposed to smoking?' obviously I am not opposed to smoking because I believe that one has the right, as an individual, to decide what he or she should do within a community. The problem occurs when that individual's actions inflict on those around him. That is the dilemma in establishing some rights for smokers and non-smokers. Smoking on public transport was an issue, but I do not intend to go into that area tonight.

I want to raise some areas of concern about smoking and put them on record, and over a period of months I will build up a picture about smoking. The Minister of Health has committed herself to a campaign of informing the community about smoking and its ramifications by early next year. Another part of the article states:

Tobacco companies, using the knowledge that all women wish to be slim and that most have accepted the myth smoking will help, advertise their products in a way which tends to make fact out of fiction. Virginia Slims hint they are the passport to slimness for thinking women slimmer than the fat cigarettes men smoke. Other brands make much of emancipation, showing commercials of rich, successful, beautiful business women portrayed as having made a conscious decision about what to smoke.

The next portion of the article I found interesting. I am not an expert in this, area because I did not start smoking, but the more I read on the topic and the more I investigate it the more interested I become. One brand has a television commercial showing the woman lighting the man's cigarette and deciding what he should smoke. The article continues:

And for all the macho men who smoke *Marlboro* comes the news it was originally sold in the 20s as a red-tipped brand with a strong female image carrying the slogan 'cherry tips to match your ruby lips'. It failed dismally, was withdrawn and then remarketed with a new name and a macho image.

I will refer to that macho image in what I believe was a disgusting advertisement in the newspaper. I would encourage the advertising company to remove it from the advertisement and from the news media. I believe this is part of the problem in our community. It is in this way that attitudes are formulated. It is the attitudes that are formulated in the 12 and 13-year-old children that concern me.

Mr Mathwin: Are you speaking about the surfie image?

Mr RANDALL: No. I do not have anything to complain about in connection with the surfie image, because it is usually a fairly clean image and there are no health hazards involved as a surfie, because of the fresh air.

Mr Blacker: Well washed.

Mr RANDALL: Yes. Let us have a look at the advertisement which has been appearing over the last few days in the press. It is headed '\$25 000 reward for the Marlboro man'. Apparently they have run out of the present Marlboro man; his time or his contract must have ceased, or there may be other reasons. They are looking now for a new Marlboro man. The advertisement goes on to say:

'Come to where the flavour is. You do not have to look like Newman or Bronson, but the Marlboro man should have a strong, distinct individual masculinity—that unique difference that personifies the flavour of Marlboro.'

So here we have a cigarette company pushing a brand which is attempting to promote the cowboy image among young guys in the community. So, if they smoke Marlboro they will fit into that image. This kind of subtle advertising

goes on. Here we are pushing these cigarettes to these guys—

Mr Slater: Coca Cola do the same with their drinks.

Mr RANDALL: I am not worried about Coca Cola tonight: I am worried about smoking. The contest is open to all adult smokers. No age limit is given. However, the advertisement states that employees of Philip Morris and the advertising agency and their families are not eligible to enter. One wonders what will happen if a girl decides she wants to become a Marlboro man and sends in a photograph as required to enter the competition. Will she be ruled out immediately? An interesting case will develop which, obviously, could be taken to the Sex Discrimination Board, and so it goes on.

The advertisement is quite interesting. There would be some ramifications for the Marlboro company in advertising in such a way. I do not want to pursue that point any longer, except to say that I disagree with the way in which companies such as Philip Morris advertise Marlboro cigarettes and create an image. When one considers the image of the Marlboro man, one may conclude that a new Marlboro man may be required because the old Marlboro man, after 20 or 30 years of smoking, is now suffering the results. Perhaps he is in hospital suffering from the lung cancer that health reports indicate smoking brings. Perhaps he is suffering from throat cancer, which medical reports also indicate smoking brings. Perhaps that is why a new Marlboro man must be found because the old Marlboro man, after 20 or 30 years of smoking, has finally had it.

I will not refer further to that area of advertising, but I will spell out now some of the problems associated with cigarette smoking. A study, published in the *New Zealand Journal of Medicine*, volume 302 (page 702), considered mainly a group of office workers chosen from 5 210 adults, who undertook a physical fitness test at the University of California. This very scientific and carefully prepared article shows that non-smokers who lived or worked for more than 20 years among smokers had significantly more lung damage than did other non-smokers. Only smokers who inhaled more than 11 cigarettes a day for 20 years had significantly lower lung function rates than did passive smokers.

As a non-smoker, I am concerned about passive smoking. There are times when one is forced into the environment of cigarette smoke. I believe that the community is beginning to look at life styles and to realise that there are advantages in having a healthy community and body, and in trying to correct some of our problems by preventive health programmes. I refer now to some of these problems.

Smoke from any source consists of minute particles suspended in a mixture of gases that usually include volatile organic substances and water vapour. A single cigarette produces about five million million particles, each measuring about 0.2 μm across. They are droplets of tar, and consist of numerous chemicals; altogether there are about 3 000 different chemicals in cigarette smoke. Some of these chemicals, including nicotine, are present in the unburnt tobacco but most are formed during combustion.

Smoking a cigarette produces two main kinds of smoke; mainstream smoke, which is what the smoker draws into his mouth (and usually on into his lungs), and sidestream smoke, which issues into the atmosphere when the cigarette is held smouldering (or 'idling'), in many cases when a cigarette is left in an ash tray at meal times. From the passive smoker's point of view, it is side-stream smoke rather than exhaled mainstream smoke that is the more important.

First, a cigarette produces about twice as much side-stream smoke as mainstream smoke. (Side-stream smoke may be less conspicuous though, since it is produced over

a far longer period—about 10 minutes per cigarette compared with only 20-30 seconds for mainstream smoke.) Secondly, many of the chemicals in tobacco smoke are present in higher concentrations in sidestream smoke, often considerably so. And, thirdly, sidestream smoke is unfiltered, both by the cigarette filter, and, more importantly, by the smoker himself, whose body retains substantial amounts of the constituents of the smoke that he inhales.

A group called FOREST in America believes that it stands for the freedom organisation for the right to enjoy smoking tobacco. They put the other side of the story and try to play down some of the problems that non-smokers face. They also argue that some of the effects of side-stream smoke are not as important as one makes out. The article continues:

One complicating factor is that low-level exposure to a toxin can sometimes be more toxic than exposure to a higher level of the same toxin—possibly because the higher dose kills target cells instead of setting pernicious metabolic events in train—and it is believed that this might occur with certain of the chemicals in tobacco smoke.

Sidestream smoke inhaled by the non-smoker in low levels may be more dangerous than persons smoking cigarettes in the first place. Some people recognise that they do have a habit of smoking. I do not want to take that habit away from them. They also recognise that they have a responsibility, and quite rightly acknowledge that the non-smoker has a role in the community and has his rights also. The last point in the quotation from *New Scientist* of 2 October 1980 that I wish to record clearly defines cigarette smoke. As I have already indicated, the particles of cigarette smoke are minute. I do not intend to go over what I have just said about the sizes and sorts of gases. However, I would like to refer to some of the carcinogenic substances in tobacco smoke.

Tobacco smoke contains numerous carcinogenic (cancer-producing) substances, including 1 000 or so polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, which are probably the most important. Of these hydrocarbons the most studied, but not necessarily the most important, is benzpyrene; a single cigarette generates about 130 ng and more than 100 ng of this enters the atmosphere directly in side-stream smoke. Pipe tobacco liberates considerably more benzpyrene than the same amount of cigarette tobacco, probably mainly because tobacco burns at lower temperatures in pipes. Although tobacco smoking produces far less benzpyrene than coal fires or the ubiquitous garden bonfire, the difference is that benzpyrene from tobacco smoking is often released into confined spaces. Indeed, non-smokers in a smoky room inhale as much benzpyrene in one hour as they would by smoking four cigarettes, according to the *British Medical Journal*.

For anyone interested in this article and the issue of passive smoking, I strongly recommend that they get the 2 October 1980 issue of the *New Scientist*. This paper clearly outlines the arguments involved. One can research, read and understand the problems that some non-smokers suffer in the community. Tobacco is the major preventable health hazard in the Western world. Tobacco is recognised as a major causative factor for lung cancer, and diseases of the respiratory tract, for example, bronchitis, heart disease, etc. If one wants to go further, one can go to medical journals and get reports from all sorts of doctors who are quite strongly opposed to encouraging this practice of smoking in our community.

One such group, called ACOSH (Australian Council on Smoking and Health (S.A.) Inc.), which meets in South Australia on a monthly basis, is an incorporated body of people who are concerned about the effects of smoking on the community and the way in which it is advertised from

time to time. They no doubt write to members of Parliament to encourage us to participate in their programmes. This group is playing a positive role in our community in encouraging people to look at their habits and educating them in any areas that it can.

Of course, the Government must back up that type of thing in the preventive health role. It has been clearly demonstrated that well devised community awareness programmes combining the use of the media with the use of community events, together with a contribution by professionals in preventive work, can reduce smoking within a community. Examples of this have been seen in Stanford in California; in North Karelia in Finland and, more recently, in Lismore in New South Wales. The Lismore example is interesting, as that is the basis, I believe, on which the South Australian Government will form its campaign in early February next year. Using that basis and what they have learnt from that campaign, I am sure that the South Australian community will get the message about smoking.

A decrease in cigarette consumption saves money for a Government even after revenue from tobacco has been deducted. Obviously, cigarette companies put up a strong argument that the Government should not be interfering in this area because it will lose revenue. Some politicians fear to tread in this area. However, I believe that we need to get over those arguments and remember that a 6 per cent drop in smoking in Australia would save between \$125 000 000 and \$150 000 000 per annum. About \$90 000 000 of that would be lost to excise, leaving a net saving of between \$35 000 000 to \$50 000 000 annually. The cumulative effect of the drop in cigarette smoking, and the advantages to the community in the long term would save Governments money. Preventive health measures help to save Government money, and it is on that basis that I argue.

Any Government in any Western country needs to give the utmost support to such a preventive health measure if it is concerned about the health of individuals. Now is the time to do this, as people are concerned about the health of individuals. That is why the South Australian Health Commission is to be congratulated following the action that it has taken. It has taken action in five ways, and I would like to list them for the House. First, it set up a large-scale survey into the smoking practice of residents of South Australia and their support for Government. Unfortunately, time does not permit me to go into the resultant tables that were gained from that, although I will do so later. I will briefly cover the five points on which the Health Commission should be congratulated, as follows:

(a) In setting up a large-scale survey into the smoking practice of residents of South Australia and their support for Government intervention into tobacco consumption. This survey has been carried out with considerable rigor and produced base-line data on which a campaign can be developed, rather than starting from no reliable evidence.

(b) The Health Promotion Services of the South Australian Health Commission have been reorganised into an effective and cost efficient service to provide the basis for health promotion to be developed in conjunction with very large numbers of expert groups within the State.

(c) The Health Promotion Services has continued to run stop smoking groups with a high success rate and is now developing these in conjunction with local councils.

(d) The Health Promotion Services took the step of placing an advertisement in the *News* to ascertain the number of individuals interested in help in giving up smoking. Within one and a half days 256 people used the phone-in-service. This will be repeated on a larger scale when the public awareness campaign starts early next year.

(e) The Health Promotion Services, in conjunction with other bodies, is currently planning a major programme for intervention into tobacco consumption within the State using media and other methods to decrease tobacco consumption.

That is the campaign to which I referred in the beginning of my speech and in which I am looking forward to participating, if I have the opportunity.

Mr Slater interjecting:

Mr RANDALL: I can participate in a non-smoking campaign in many ways. I can go to my local schools, speak to schoolchildren, and encourage them to look at the evidence before them. Much of this evidence is held at Flinders Medical Centre. I am told that it has human lungs taken from people who were heavy smokers as well as from people who were not heavy smokers. These can be compared. When one sees this, one wonders how people can inflict such disease on their bodies. The challenge is how to break the habit, and it is that habit-breaking issue which the Health Promotion Services want to take up in this State. Over a period of time, I would like to detail to the House some of the issues relating to smoking. Obviously, there is not sufficient time to do that tonight, so I intend to leave my remarks at that and continue my comments later.

Mr WHITTEN (Price): I have listened for the past 21 minutes to the member for Henley Beach, and I wondered whether he would be able to link up his remarks to the Budget. You may recall, Sir, that when we debated the Supply Bill, the member for Henley Beach roundly criticised my remarks on the redevelopment of Port Adelaide, and kept asking, by way of interjection, when I would relate my remarks to the Bill then before us. I have heard 21 minutes of comments on why we should not smoke. I want the honourable member to know that I have smoked for nearly 50 years. Contrary to his prediction that, after 20 or 30 years, my throat would be afflicted by cancer and my lungs would be impregnated with tar, and so on, I am still able to speak, and I am sure he can hear what I am saying.

Members interjecting:

Mr WHITTEN: I thought it possible that he was speaking on the Tobacco Franchise Bill, one of the ways in which the Government could obtain some revenue. That was one of the extra State charges put on before the Budget, in an effort to make the Budget appear better than it is. It is probably one of the most severe Budgets on ordinary people that has been brought down in this State. I refer not only to tobacco smokers, but to others. However, I do compliment the Government on one thing. It has taken a little notice of another addiction that I may have, and has reduced the excise on low-alcohol beer. I think that was a good thing to do, and I am pleased that the Government has done it.

Members interjecting:

Mr WHITTEN: I do not like the stuff once I have drunk beer. At Football Park last Saturday, although previously I could buy beer at \$2.54 a jug, low-alcohol beer was up by 6c a jug last week—so much for reducing the excise on low-alcohol beer.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: Do you drink it by the jug, George?

Mr WHITTEN: Usually, with my friends. I have a few friends who are pleased to have a drink with me.

Mr Slater: But \$2.60 is not bad.

Mr WHITTEN: I am not complaining about the price. Anyone who wants to drink the stuff and poison themselves can pay for it. This Budget is one of the most severe we could possibly have. It provides for a deficit of \$3 000 000, but that is not a true indication of the figures. On the first page of the Financial Statement introduced by the Premier on 15 September, recurrent receipts and payments are shown, with a forecast deficit of \$47 000 000, and capital receipts and payments show a forecast surplus of \$44 000 000. That result of \$44 000 000 is because no money is being spent in the public sector. Schools are being

deprived of the buildings they should have, and many capital works will not be commenced. Last year, work to the value of \$37 000 000 was not commenced, so spending on public works has been reduced by about 70 per cent or 80 per cent in a little over 12 months by this Government. That in itself will cause a great deal more unemployment. Fewer bricklayers will be employed, and less construction work will be done.

There has been a 25 per cent cut-back in school buildings alone. One particular school building about which I am greatly concerned and about which I criticise the Government for its stupidity and foolishness is at Port Adelaide. In October 1980, plans went on display at the Port Adelaide High School and the Port Adelaide Primary School showing what was claimed to be the sort of school that would be built. The claim was that Port Adelaide High School would be consolidated to year 12, and that the Port Adelaide Primary School would close. This was to be the great new school. When those plans went on display parents viewed them and accepted them. They asked me, as member for the district, to do whatever I could to push the project forward. It is nearly 12 months since those plans went on display, but nothing has happened. The Minister of Industrial Affairs, who has responsibility for public works, should get a reference from Cabinet to the Governor so that this programme can be looked at by the Public Works Committee.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Which programme is this?

Mr WHITTEN: The re-establishment of the Port Adelaide High School, for which the Education Department displayed plans 12 months ago. People's hopes were built up that there would be a decent school for their children. I make the excuse for the Government that I know it is short of money, and that \$37 000 000 was not spent last year. However, I criticise and condemn the Government for building up people's hopes when it had no intention of doing anything. It is a disgrace that the Minister should allow that sort of thing to happen.

Also, the Government's action will create further unemployment. The total figure for unemployment in South Australia, that is, persons looking for full-time or part-time work, was 48 700 in August, according to Australian Bureau of Statistics figures. That is a rise of 1 000 since August 1980. Since August 1979 (near enough to the time of the last election campaign), unemployment has risen by 3 400. When the Labor Government left office the unemployment figure was 45 300. South Australia's unemployment rate is 8 per cent, compared to the national average of 5.6 per cent. South Australia has the highest unemployment rate in Australia.

I notice that on page 4 of his statement the Premier said that at the end of June 1981 Australia's unemployment rate had fallen to 5.2 per cent, the lowest since 1976. He used that figure to say that perhaps things will be very much better. I will stop my little expose about unemployment to thank the Minister for handing me a note to say that the Port Adelaide Primary and High Schools will come before the Public Works Standing Committee soon. I am pleased he brought that along, but I will now say something to the Minister that I had not intended to say. An officer of his department last month rang the Principal of the Port Adelaide High School and told her that the hold-up was with the Public Works Committee, that the proposal had gone from Cabinet to that committee in June of this year. As the member for Glenelg well knows, I questioned the Chairman of the Public Works Committee, expressing my disgust that that committee may have been used as a stool pigeon, because we had not received the reference.

I said to the Chairman at that time that I would not raise this matter because I believed I would be putting in

an officer of the Education Department. I am sure that the Minister would not be so low as to give false information in such a way that it would reflect on myself as a member of the Public Works Committee, and also on the Chairman of that committee, who I believe is an honest and sincere person. I say that the Public Works Committee does not work in a Party political way but works in a true and proper manner.

I am very sorry that the Minister should come to me and give me a note that says 'Subject to Public Works Standing Committee.' I think it is disgraceful that he should do such a thing. If he had had his ear to the ground just a little, he would have known (and I feel sure that his own Party members should have told him) that there has been disquiet and that there have been untruths circulated about the matter, which have been detrimental to his department. I am sorry that he has come over here with this note that says 'Subject to Public Works Standing Committee'.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Of course it is.

Mr WHITTEN: Of course it is; I know it is; but do not let the Minister insinuate that the problem is with the Public Works Standing Committee; the problem is with the Minister of Education and the Minister of Industrial Affairs.

Mr Abbott interjecting:

Mr WHITTEN: As the member for Spence says, the Government is passing the buck; it is trying to mislead me, mislead the Parliament and mislead the people, as it has always endeavoured to do. I will not be sidetracked any further. I want to get back to the Budget.

The Hon. H. Allison: We'll take it off the list, George.

Mr WHITTEN: The Minister of Education wishes to bait me by saying, 'We will take it off the list.' Those comments will certainly be in *Hansard*, and I will certainly circulate *Hansard* around Port Adelaide. For the Minister to make that threat is a disgrace.

Let me get back to the question of employment in South Australia. While South Australia's unemployment rose by over 1 000 over the past year, the figure for national jobless fell by 14 100. The result is that the South Australian share of total unemployment has risen from 12.2 per cent in August last year to 12.9 per cent now, yet we have only 9 per cent of the national work force. Those figures give some sort of indication of how the South Australian Government is operating, and what this Budget will do.

The Premier talked about the creation of jobs. Let us have a look at what has happened in relation to the creation of jobs. The latest total South Australian unemployment figure in July 1981 was 558 100. I do not know that I should have used that figure at all because I appear to have written down something wrong there.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: What that proves is that this Government has created jobs since we came into Government; that is the point. The figure that you just quoted is probably the correct figure, and it shows the very point that this Government has been successful in creating 9 000 jobs.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WHITTEN: I thank the Minister of Industrial Affairs for his assistance, but I can assure him that I do not need it. The Premier has been talking about people leaving this State and how there are not as many people leaving now as there used to be in the days of the Labor Government. Let me say that it is my impression that during the years of the Labor Government the people leaving South Australia were the wealthier types who went up to Queensland, in the main, in order to dodge succession duties. The present Government said it would correct that situation, and it deprives itself of \$30 000 000 that it would have received from estates of people that could well afford to pay duties.

But where is the burden falling? It has fallen on the younger people, the people who are left. Those younger people, in the 20 to 30 year age groups, are now the ones leaving South Australia to obtain employment.

Unemployment is higher in South Australia than it is in other States, and young people who are unemployed are out of work so much longer. Jobless South Australians now spend an average of 45.1 weeks unemployed. The average duration of unemployment is now 15 weeks longer than it was in May 1979 when the Australian Labor Party was in office in South Australia. On average, people face more than 10 months of rejection, and depression, and have been forced to live below the poverty line.

At about the time the Premier and Treasurer presented the Budget he emphasised on radio that South Australia was sick. I believe that he is right sometimes, and he was right on that occasion. On 16 September, the day after the Premier and Treasurer delivered his Budget, a South Australian senator moved the following motion in the Senate:

That the Senate—

- (1) concurs with the statement on 8 September 1981 by the Liberal Premier of South Australia that the State under his management is 'sick';
- (2) expresses its concern that this sickness will continue to worsen due to the continuing rise in unemployment figures as shown by the Australian Bureau of Statistics latest publication:
 - (a) The State's percentage of 8 per cent of unemployed being the highest of any State;
 - (b) an increase of 1 200 in August of people seeking full-time employment from 43 000 to 44 200;
- (3) calls on the State Premier to take immediate action to raise the State from its 'sick bed' by calling in a team of specialists under the capable hands of the Leader of the Opposition, Mr John Bannon, to administer urgent remedial treatment.

I think those sentiments were well expressed by Senator McLaren, who is representing South Australia in an endeavour to help and bring to the Senate's attention the plight of our State, which the Premier believes is sick.

Yesterday I visited the Port Adelaide Commonwealth Employment Service to obtain some up-to-date figures of the situation in my electorate. However, an officer there told me that he was very sorry but I could not be given those figures and they have not been able to deliver them for some time. I then asked whether that was because the Commonwealth Government wanted to hide the figures. That good and proper public servant then said that he did not know what the situation was. At one time I was provided with a full set of figures from the Port Adelaide C.E.S. every month, showing the total number of unemployed, the total number of job vacancies, the total number of jobs that were filled every month, and a breakdown of the categories of those trades where people were unemployed.

All I can obtain from the Port Adelaide C.E.S. now are the applications registered since the last return, and there have been a total of 529 new registrations. To me that is another 529 people on the dole queue for the month ended August 1981. There have been 88 placements confirmed since the last return. Therefore, there are 529 more people registered as unemployed in Port Adelaide but we can find jobs for only 88. That is a disgrace. But that is not all. There are many people who will not register for unemployment benefits, and I refer to two-income families where the wife has been put out of work and cannot and does not register for unemployment benefits. On the other hand, perhaps the husband has been put off from work and he cannot register for unemployment benefits because his wife is earning an income of some sort. Therefore, there is a lot of hidden unemployment.

The Budget also refers to the Public Service and on page 7 several paragraphs deal with salary and wage awards. On 25 September, 10 days after the Budget was delivered, the *News* printed an article written by Mike Safe, headed 'PS slams Tonkin's unfair Budget'. The article begins:

South Australia's leading Public Service union today launched an angry attack on the Premier, Mr Tonkin, claiming its members had been unfairly treated in the State Budget.

He went on further to say:

The association is not used to having to deal with such misleading and blatantly false attacks.

I think they are blatantly false attacks, because the Public Service in South Australia is a good Public Service and a loyal Public Service. The public servants do their job to the best of their ability with a reduction in their work force. Their work force and their tasks are overloaded and it is about time that the Government had a look at its guidelines and restrictions on the employment of young people in the Public Service.

Mr Fraser, the General Secretary of the P.S.A., said that the morale of the people in the Public Service was getting very, very low. He said:

The public sector had been particularly hard hit in the State Budget. A further 1 600 public sector jobs had been cut, and along with 800 jobs estimated to be lost in the building industry, this is expected to add 2 500 to the already record unemployment in South Australia.

Here we are with a Premier who says that he is going to get the State going. Another section that has been badly hit is the Education Department. There is wide dissatisfaction amongst teachers, and this Budget certainly provides a lot less in real terms. I have already mentioned that there has been a 25 per cent cut in school buildings and maintenance programmes. If we have a look on page 24 of this Budget (and I am sorry the Minister of Industrial Affairs is missing; he is the Minister responsible for the Public Buildings Department) the Premier made this statement:

The department is taking steps to reduce its work force in line with the reduced work load. While constrained by a non-retrenching policy and a rate of national wastage, the department has reduced its work force in 1980-81 by 613 employees.

He says that emphasis will continue to be placed on reducing further the labour force in 1981-82 by natural attrition, but that it is planned also to increase the volume of work that private contractors do in order to reduce a backlog of urgent maintenance work in country buildings, particularly school buildings. There is the admission by the Premier of this State that the Government has deliberately reduced the work force. It has created a backlog of work in schools and in public buildings and now it intends to pay excessive amounts to private contractors to do the work that the Public Buildings Department should have done over the past 12 months, when the Government deliberately reduced the work force in the P.B.D. by 613.

Perhaps I could speak of what the President of the South Australian Institute of Teachers had to say. He said this the day after the Budget was presented on 16 September 1981, as reported in the *News*. The heading is, 'Budget Cuts Triggers Teachers Strike Threat'. I would hope there is not any strike in the Education Department, because, after all, the ones who are deprived are our own children, but teachers have been a fairly easy going lot. They have accepted their lot. They are in the main dedicated people who wish to do their best for the education of young people in our State. However, they are going to be forced into the position by the Government which has no thought for children, only thought for money, and which, because of its mismanagement, may create industrial unrest in the Education Department.

I say that it may create industrial unrest. I do not know whether this Government is endeavouring to create industrial unrest. I think it did this previously with a couple of Bills it introduced before the Budget. One was the Essential Services Bill and the other the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act Amendment Bill, where I believe it was essentially introduced, or especially introduced, to create

industrial disputation among the unions. Let us consider what Mr Gregory had to say. A report in the *News* of 16 September states:

Teacher strike action 'before this financial year is out' was predicted today by the South Australian Institute of Teachers president, Mr John Gregory.

The State Government, through its Budget, was doing exactly the same things which provoked two strikes earlier this year, Mr Gregory said. . . . Mr Gregory again attacked the Premier for publicly stating teachers appear to be seeking a 20 per cent increase in salary?

It is a furphy invented by the Premier to scapegoat teachers for the cut in education spending, he said.

Here we have two leading figures, one from the P.S.A. and one representing teachers, saying that the Premier is telling untruths. He is deliberately misleading people. In the Budget papers, the Premier stated that the teachers appeared to be seeking a 20 per cent increase in their salaries. The Premier knows very well that the South Australian Institute of Teachers lodged an application with the Teachers Salaries Board in June 1980 for a 12 per cent increase. That is well known to the Premier. Why does he prevaricate and tell lies—I mean, untruths. I withdraw the word 'lies'. I became carried away. Why does he tell untruths that will upset people?

Mr Ashenden: Because Mr Gregory said that they were after a 20 per cent increase.

Mr Whitten: Mr Gregory did not say that. I wish the member for Todd would think a little.

Mr Ashenden: He said that in the press.

Mr Whitten: Mr Gregory did not say that in the press.

Mr Ashenden: He certainly did.

Mr Whitten: I would say also that the member for Todd is prevaricating. He is not telling the truth. I have a clipping of what Mr Gregory said in the press. In the last *Teachers Journal* for September, under the heading 'Salaries and Wages Award' it was stated that teachers are claiming a 12 per cent increase, but, in the words of the Premier, they appear to be seeking 20 per cent. It was stated:

We lodged our work value case for a 12 per cent increase in June 1980. Since then, New South Wales teachers have received a 10 per cent increase; the Minister 11 per cent, Federal MP's 10 per cent. Yet, after a long series of delays, and just as things are starting to move, the South Australian Government has altered the rules in a way that can only mean delay for teacher salary justice.

This is the way in which the Government is operating, and I believe it is a real disgrace. Regarding the school building programme that has been cut back, Mr Gregory stated:

The Government already has a backlog of building works of more than \$1 000 000, yet it slashes its capital works programme by 25 per cent.

I would like to say more in that regard. This Government likes to give the impression that it is the champion of small business, yet by its actions in this Budget it has deliberately endeavoured to further cripple small business.

Mr Ashenden: Rubbish!

Mr Whitten: The member for Todd says 'rubbish'. What has happened in the Budget? Members must realise that South Australia must compete with its nearest neighbour, Victoria. The Government has deliberately put South Australia at a disadvantage.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Further down the drain.

Mr Whitten: Much further down the drain. On an annual pay-roll of \$100 000, which is not a great deal, a small business man will pay \$1 333 in pay-roll tax. No pay-roll tax is paid in Victoria. The Government penalises the small business man who has a small wages bill of \$100 000. For every \$100 000, the Government takes \$1 333 out of him, whereas Victoria does not take a penny. On a pay-roll

of \$150 000, South Australia's pay-roll tax is \$5 500, whereas Victoria's pay-roll tax is only \$2 083. The South Australian excess over Victoria is 164 per cent. On a pay-roll of \$200 000 South Australia's pay-roll tax is \$8 100 whereas Victoria's payroll tax is \$6 250, a South Australian excess over Victoria of 29.8 per cent.

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

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I should like to make a few comments in this debate. I formally support the measure, as that appears to be the appropriate thing to do, rather than create a great stir by opposing it.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Do you support it or not?

Mr BLACKER: I said that I support it.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: But you said it seemed the thing to do, rather than your own belief.

Mr BLACKER: Every member supports the Budget debate as it is. They can come in on—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: You can move for a reduction if you want to.

Mr BLACKER: That is not the appropriate thing to do at this time. One cannot do that unless we pass the second reading. I was concerned when I saw the front page of this evening's *News* to learn that John Fitzgerald collapsed on the tennis court at Portland, Oregon. I rang John's parents a few minutes ago and he is quite all right. He will be coming out of hospital in about an hour and three-quarters time, which is 10 o'clock Oregon time, and will be training again this afternoon. We are reasonably pleased about that. Whether he will be one of the four in the Davis Cup squad—

The SPEAKER: Is it a side line or a base line that is involved here?

Mr BLACKER: I wish to tie up my comments with the sports grants that are provided in the Budget. The last time I spoke on this Bill I referred to a number of young athletes from within my electorate who had excelled, of whom John Fitzgerald was one. The two Lukin boys who have been world ranking weightlifters and Caroline Byles, a champion athlete in the running field, are others, all of whom we are very proud. Another name to be added to that list is young Robert Schulz, to whom I was asked to present a cheque for a grant to assist in his training in interstate activities from the Department of Recreation and Sport. To that end—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: A lady water skiing champion lives in Pasadena.

Mr BLACKER: I am not denying that there are plenty of excellent athletes and sportsmen throughout the State. It is all the better—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: I don't think I had anything to do with it. I suggest it may be the same in your electorate.

Mr BLACKER: It is all the better for the State to be seen to be assisting some of these athletes, even though that assistance is relatively small. A pleasing aspect in my electorate in the past three weeks has been the announcement by the Government that it is prepared to proceed with the upgrading to United States export standards of the Port Lincoln/Samcor Abattoirs. This undertaking requires the support of everyone, including the Government, the primary producers, the producer organisations, the agricultural bureau, and the management and staff of those works. Most members will be aware that the works at Port Lincoln is in excess of 50 years old and, as such, some deep thinking was done regarding whether those works should be scrapped or proceeded with. The Government decided to proceed with it. It is fair to say that the previous Government moved towards those lines of providing quite extensive amenities for the convenience of the staff and obviously for

the general upgrading of the works in all. The announcement that \$75 000 is to be made available immediately so that upgrading can commence, and that a further \$400 000 is to be provided over the next two years, is proof that the Government is prepared to go ahead and make those works viable, if at all possible.

There are other sideline effects of those works which must be taken into consideration, and that is the impact on the work force of Eyre Peninsula—the ability of those works to be able to service the community in times of drought, fire or flood and, generally speaking, to be able to provide services not only of meat killed for local consumption but also for export from that area. The community has responded to that with great pleasure, and commitments have been given by the producers and by producer organisations to endeavour, wherever possible, to undertake the patronage of these works.

Just to say that the works will be patronised is indeed a very difficult thing. It is difficult to qualify how a producer will support it. It is difficult to say to a producer that he shall deliver his stock for processing at the Port Lincoln works when alternative markets are available. It is fair to say that there is a greater tendency for stock from the Kimba and Wudinna areas to be brought to Gepps Cross where there is greater competition not only from local buyers but also from interstate buyers.

In the pig industry, obviously Gepps Cross has been an attraction because four or five Victorian buyers are always competing. Obviously, most of our pig production goes to Victoria. However, that is changing. The introduction of sale by classification is being more and more widely accepted. For certain, there are more pigs going through the Port Lincoln works as a direct result of the sale by classification method of sale. It only stands to reason that, if the pig quality is there and that animal is killed under the right and proper conditions, the market for processed animals should be there as well. Needless to say, freight transport of frozen carcasses to a wider metropolitan market is considerably cheaper than transporting live animals.

That undertaking is one which will be a long-term matter. It will have benefits for the community but, whilst it is relatively easy to say that works will be upgraded as of now, it is even more difficult to keep the licensed standard. That is what is worrying many people, but I feel certain that it will not be for the want of trying. If I can pay tribute to any one individual as a result of this last exercise in getting a commitment from the Government to upgrade the works, that is to the local manager, Mr Peter Hubbard who has responded well to the challenge of maintenance of those works. I could not speak too highly of his efforts in endeavouring to acquire patronage for the works. If there were a few more people like Peter Hubbard, perhaps some of our meatworks may not be in quite the same difficulties as they appear to be in.

I had intended to use the bulk of my Budget speech to speak about the Select Committee into Local Government Boundaries in Port Lincoln. I was very critical of the way that it was handled by the Chairman. I have a file which is about 1½ inches thick on that undertaking. I would like at some future time to raise that matter in the House. I am aware that we are just four days away from the local government elections. I do not think that the time is right for me to raise matters such as that which may be interpreted as opening old wounds or creating an unnecessary stir. I will reserve those comments for a later date.

One of the issues raised in this House recently concerned the future of the CYSS project. It was raised by many members, and there were requests that, if the Federal Government refused to continue the scheme, the State Government should do so. I was an avid supporter of the

scheme, having been on the local committee for three years, and I was closely involved with other members actually on the committee. I cannot speak too highly of the work of the committee, and I wonder why praise for its work was not forthcoming before the recent Federal Budget.

I think perhaps that can be explained because much of the work undertaken by CYSS was at a very base level. The organisers personally contacted many of the unemployed people, endeavouring to instill in them the initiative to try to help themselves. In my opinion, that is where the greatest good of the project was achieved, in getting to young unemployed people in order to encourage them to try to help themselves. If someone did not speak to them and get them involved in community college activities, and get them motivated, they would never, of their own volition, have gone out to seek employment.

To that end, it was a very worthwhile organisation and I am most grateful that the Federal Government has seen fit to further extend the funding of the scheme. I notice that it is not unlimited funding, but it does give time for a reappraisal of the present situation. If a new scheme is to be introduced, at least it could be along similar lines, so that the impact on the community and on those directly involved will not be quite so great.

I was very much concerned by the sittings of the House three or four weeks ago. I wish only to make the comment that I think every member to whom I have spoken has regretted that we embarked on a sitting lasting for all night, all day, and half the next night. The only result was a reducing of the impact or the community awareness of Parliament. If anything degraded the standard of Parliament in the eyes of the public, those excessively long sittings did.

I hope that those who are in a position to determine the sittings of Parliament will take that into consideration before such a marathon venture is undertaken in future. To whomever I spoke, and from whatever their background, it was considered totally ridiculous that members should sit all night and all of the next day in the so-called cause of good government. It backfired in the eyes of the community, and I hope that it will never happen again.

I do not wish to proceed further at this stage. I have a number of issues to raise in the Estimates Committees in relation to local government, further matters on country fire services, and matters on education, but at this stage I support the Bill and look forward to the Estimates Committees.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I thank members for the contributions that they have made to this debate. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HEALTH COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.32 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 30 September at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 29 September 1981

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

SEX EDUCATION

102. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Was the Minister, the Education Department or any individual Government school contacted formally by the member for Brighton during the nine months to 4 August concerning submissions or complaints regarding the conduct of sex education lessons in schools?

2. Did the member for Brighton at any time up to and including 4 August 1981 seek verification from the Minister, the department or schools of allegations he made in his speech of that date concerning the teaching of sex education?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. No.
2. The member for Brighton had discussions with both teachers and parents concerning the issues he raised.

CONCESSIONAL TRAVEL

116. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What are the reciprocal travel arrangements currently in existence for pensioners and unemployed persons between the S.T.A. and other State and Federal Government rail authorities?

2. What representations have been made by the Government to improve concessional and free travel for those persons from such authorities and what response, if any, has been received?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Reciprocal rail travel concessions for pensioners exist between the Federal Government and all State Governments with the exception of Queensland. Reciprocal concessions do not apply to unemployed persons.

2. I have made representations to the Queensland Minister of Transport and have been advised that his Government is not prepared to participate in these arrangements.

STONY POINT

137. **Mr MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment and Planning: Has the Minister or his department (and which) received a copy of the letter dated 30 July 1981 written by Professor R. Radok of the Horace Lamb Institute of Oceanography to the Secretary, Department of Home Affairs and Environment, Canberra, criticising the Santos *Draft EIS—Stony Point* and, if so—

- (a) does the Minister accept the contentions of Professor Radok and, if so, what action, if any, does he propose to take as a result; or
- (b) does the Minister not accept these contentions and, if so, why?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The Department of Environment and Planning received a copy of the submission on the Santos *Draft E.I.S.—Stony Point*, addressed to the Secretary of the Department of Home Affairs and Environment by Professor R. Radok on 10 August 1981.

- (a) As the letter was received as a formal submission to the draft E.I.S., it is appropriate that it be processed along with the other 60 or more pub-

lic submissions following the normal assessment procedures:

- (i) all submissions received by SADEP, D.H.A.E. and the proponent are circulated to the other authorities
 - (ii) the proponent considers the submissions and formally replies to them in the final E.I.S.
 - (iii) the SADEP and D.H.A.E. assess the final E.I.S. and consider the submissions and the proponents replies to them in their assessment
 - (iv) the two departments advise their respective governments of their assessment.
- (b) The Minister will receive comment on the submission by Professor Radok through normal assessment procedures and appropriate action will be taken at that time.

TOURIST PROJECTS

145. **Mr SLATER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism: Has the Government made special arrangements with the State Bank for the availability of loan capital to develop tourist projects and, if so, what arrangements have been made and will the loans be available on special conditions and favourable interest rates?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: In March 1981, the Minister of Tourism announced that the Government had approved the provision of loan capital of up to \$5 000 000 to be provided through the State Bank for the development of tourist projects.

Since that time the Department of Tourism has held discussions with the State Bank on the procedures for administering the Tourism Development Loan Scheme and substantial agreement has been reached. In addition, the Tourism Development Board has been developing proposed guidelines for the scheme which will be forwarded for the Minister's consideration. Discussions are currently being held about terms and conditions of loans.

PERI URBAN STUDY

157. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. When will the PERI Urban Study be released to the general public for inspection and comment?

2. For what reason did the Minister instruct his Director-General to withdraw the report and give instructions that it was not to be released to members of the public following its release to the press in July last?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The report is now available on request.
2. There was no Ministerial direction on this matter. The Director-General of Agriculture withdrew the report from further public release pending consultation between the Department of Environment and Planning and the Department of Agriculture.

DRYLAND FARMING

158. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture: How many copies of the audio visual kit on dryland farming have been distributed or sold since January 1979 and how many were in French and Arabic, respectively?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: Since January 1979, approximately 88 copies of the audio visual kit on dryland farming have been distributed or sold. Of these, 11 were in French and 18 in Arabic.

PORT LINCOLN ABATTOIR

159. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. What is the estimated cost of upgrading the Port Lincoln works of SAMCOR to U.S.D.A. standards?
2. What is the estimated cost of maintaining the works at U.S.D.A. standards?
3. What is the estimated annual increase in revenue if the works are upgraded to U.S.D.A. standards?
4. If upgrading to U.S.D.A. standards is to be undertaken, will funds be provided by SAMCOR or the Treasury and, if neither of these, what will be the source of such funds?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Estimated (at this time) \$200 000.
2. Estimated (at this time) \$100 000 per year for two years.
3. Estimated \$147 000.
4. SAMCOR

AGRICULTURAL COUNCIL

160. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. What was the total cost of the Minister's attendance at the Agricultural Council in Darwin in August last?
2. Who accompanied the Minister?
3. Did the Minister visit any other town en route to Darwin and, if so, for what purpose?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) Air fares—	
Mr and Mrs Chapman (Adelaide/Alice Springs/Darwin/Adelaide)	1 376.40
Press Secretary (Adelaide/Darwin/Adelaide)	624.00
	<hr/> 2 000.40
(b) Accommodation and meals—	
Mr and Mrs Chapman	611.40
Press Secretary	211.00
	<hr/> 822.40
Add air fares	<hr/> 2 000.40
Total costs	<hr/> \$2 822.80

2. See above. Mrs Chapman's visit was in keeping with the Cabinet policy initiated in 1977, and re-affirmed by this Government, that Minister's wives be permitted to accompany their husbands on one interstate conference each year at Government expense.

3. Yes—Alice Springs. This stop-over was in line with the Minister's public announcement of 29 July, which stated *inter alia*, that he 'would spend time before the opening of Agricultural Council assessing the impact of self-government on the Northern Territory's economy'. Current pastoral conditions and other industry developments were also studied en route and in the Darwin area.

KANGAROO ISLAND LAND

161. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. What is the present status of the Kangaroo Island Land Management Study?
2. When will it be released for comment and, if it is not to be released, why not?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The position is substantially the same as that provided in answer to Question on Notice No. 97 on 18 September 1980.

162. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. What is the present status of the report on Kangaroo Island vegetation clearance?
2. Has the report been rewritten and, if so, by whom and what changes have been made?
3. Will the current version of the report be released for public comment and, if not, why not?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The final report from the Department of Agriculture to the Inter-departmental Working Party, which is to report to the Cabinet Sub-Committee consisting of the Ministers of Agriculture, Lands and Environment and Planning, is still in preparation.

2. The final report from the Department of Agriculture will be based on an earlier interim report and incorporate relevant new information. The report preparation is being co-ordinated by the Department of Agriculture representative on the Inter-departmental Working Party. Changes to the interim report will include layout, editorial corrections, improvements in presentation, and inclusion of additional information.

3. This report will be but one of those provided as an input into the Inter-departmental Working Party and, as such, is not intended as a public document. Any later decision to publicly release any or all of the three Departmental working papers will be a matter for Cabinet to consider.

S.T.A. LAND

163. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture: Was the Minister aware on 5 August 1981 that the land made available to the United Market Gardener's Association by the State Transport Authority was zoned residential?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: Yes.

KANGAROO ISLAND ABATTOIR

164. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture: What is the current Government policy towards the establishment of an abattoir on Kangaroo Island?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: If an abattoir were established on Kangaroo Island the Government would consider various industry incentives, require licensing of the premises and Department of Primary Industry inspections in compliance with the South Australian Meat Hygiene Act, consistent with all other abattoirs in the State.

MINISTER'S REPORT

165. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. How many copies of the Minister's report of his last overseas visit have been printed, how many have been distributed, and how much did it cost to be produced?

2. What alterations were demanded by Cabinet before the report could be released, what was the cost of altering it, and what was the cost of subsequent re-printing?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) 200
- (b) 106
- (c) \$387.00

2. None. The Minister considered that some amendments were appropriate, including correction of minor geographic and clerical errors. The cost was approximately \$170.00.

RECEPTIONIST

166. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture: Has a receptionist been permanently appointed to the Loxton office of the Department of Agriculture following the retirement of the previous receptionist and, if not, why not?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The position of receptionist at the Loxton office of the Department of Agriculture has been occupied by the present incumbent for the past 18 years. The position of receptionist at Loxton Research Centre, vacated recently due to transfer, was permanently filled on 14.9.81.

PINUS RADIATA

168. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Forests: What is the programme of *Pinus radiata* planting in South Australia for the next five years, including the respective areas and the number of hectares to be planted?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The reply is as follows:

Region	Hectarage per year, 1982-86
South East	1 250
Central	231
Northern	up to 43
Western	up to 15
Total	1 539

The planned planting programme is the ideal, subject to seasonal factors. In the western region, the ratio of *Pinus radiata* and eucalypts is yet to be determined, but it is expected that hardwoods will form the bulk of the plantings.

JURY SERVICE

169. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Attorney-General:

1. Does the Government intend to increase the current payment made to persons required to attend for jury service and, if so, by how much and, if not, why not?

2. What are the current rates and methods of payment applicable for employers and employees who are required for jury service?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. Jurors fees are currently being reviewed.
2. The current rate of compensation payable to jurors was proclaimed in the *Government Gazette* dated 21 December 1978 at pages 2304-5. Jurors are paid \$20 for each day of attendance with provision for payment of actual monetary loss up to but not exceeding \$50 per day. Jurors

also receive a travelling allowance of 10 cents per kilometre, each way, as proclaimed in the *Government Gazette* dated 7 October 1976 at page 1107. This allowance is calculated on a radius basis within the metropolitan area and on actual distance travelled for country areas. Jurors are paid by cheque, usually fortnightly with provision for more frequent payments if requested by individuals.

MAINTENANCE ORDERS

170. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health representing the Minister of Community Welfare:

1. What is the number of maintenance orders at present payable through the Department of Community Welfare?

2. How many such orders are in arrears, what is the highest amount owing and what is the total amount owing?

3. How many warrants for non-payment were issued in the year 1980-81, how many of these have been served and in how many cases have the arrears of maintenance been paid?

4. How many complaints for non-payment are awaiting hearings?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. There are 6 616 maintenance accounts which are regarded as current.

2. The volume of work involved makes it impossible to provide an answer.

3. Nine warrants of commitment were issued for non-payment of maintenance during 1980-81. Eight warrants have been executed and in each of these cases, the amount of arrears was paid.

4. 187.

ACCIDENTS

173. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. How many accidents and deaths, respectively, involving agriculture machinery or equipment occurred in South Australia during the year 1980-81?

2. What were the major causes of these accidents and deaths and the types of machinery or equipment involved?

3. What safety awareness programmes operate or are to be introduced in an effort to reduce these accidents and deaths and what is the estimated cost of such programmes?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Farm accidents are not reportable to any authority, therefore no statistics are available for 1980-81 in respect to the number of deaths or injuries due to agricultural machinery or equipment. The Coroner's Office has recorded one tractor death and two electrocutions due to irrigation pipes touching overhead wires for the period in question.

2. Again, no accurate statistics are available; however, surveys conducted by the Department of Agriculture indicate that tractors and machinery account for only 4 per cent of all farm injuries, but such accidents are the major cause of accidental farm deaths and serious injuries, such as amputations. An Australian-wide survey suggests that the fatality rate per 10 000 tractors is identical to that for motor vehicles.

3. The South Australian Department of Agriculture commenced a rural safety programme 11 years ago and it is the only one conducted by any Department of Agriculture in Australia. An experienced professional safety practitioner is employed as rural safety advisor and an on-going campaign is conducted by direct contact, publication of literature and the use of all forms of media. The estimated cost

of the programme for the forthcoming year is in the order of \$15 000.

other States prior to the transfer of the non-metropolitan railways. This was not so in the case of rail freight increases in 1980-81.

MAINTENANCE ORDERS

174. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health representing the Minister of Community Welfare:

1. How many court orders were made during 1980-81 in respect of maintenance orders?

2. How many persons have served prison sentences in each of the years 1979-80 and 1980-81 for non-payment of maintenance orders?

3. What are the gross outstanding amounts involved for those years?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The volume of work involved does not permit an accurate answer to be given. An estimated 240 orders were made during 1980-81 in relation to applications to enforce maintenance orders.

2. No persons have served terms of imprisonment in each of the years 1979-80 and 1980-81 for non-payment of maintenance arrears.

3. The total amount received during 1979-80 was \$4 222 442 and during 1980-81 was \$4 578 317. The total amount paid out during the year 1979-80 was \$4 186 656 and during the year 1980-81 was \$4 607 009.

There are many variables involved in relation to the debit balances on maintenance accounts. It is not possible to accurately state the gross outstanding amounts for those years.

POKER MACHINES

178. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Recreation and Sport:

1. Has the Minister received representations from licensed clubs or associations seeking the Government's support for the introduction of poker machines in South Australia?

2. Does the Government still oppose the introduction of such machines and, if so, why and if not, why not?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. No.

2. Yes, in view of the social implications.

PENALTY RATES

180. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: Does the Government intend to move towards abolishing penalty rates in various industries and, if so, why, in what industries and when?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: No.

FREIGHT CHARGES

181. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: On how many occasions during the year 1980-81 did the Minister express opposition to his Federal colleague on the increased Australian freight charges, what were the respective statements of opposition and what were the respective responses?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: None, assuming that the honourable member is referring to Australian National freight charges. Whilst there is provision for the State to object to rate increases, this applies only where South Australia loses any advantage it enjoyed relative to the

PUNWOOD FILE

186. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture: Has the South Australian Police Force provided the Minister of Agriculture with a report on the loss of the Punwood file from the Minister's safe or elsewhere and, if so, what has been the finding and what action will be taken and, if not, when does the Minister expect to receive a report?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: As stated by the Acting Minister of Agriculture in the House on 3 December 1980, the investigation by the police centered on security within the Minister's office. Certain on-the-spot recommendations by the police concerning security procedures were implemented immediately, and on his return from overseas the Minister discussed the matter with the investigating officers, after which further security measures were taken.

RECEPTIONIST

187. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. What was the position in the Grenfell Street office of the Department of Agriculture made available to Mrs V. Auricht, the previous receptionist at the Loxton regional office of the Department of Agriculture?

2. Why was special permission given to fill Mrs Auricht's new position?

3. Is Mrs Auricht's new position a permanent appointment and, if so, what is her classification, qualification and salary?

4. Was the position advertised and, if so, where and how many other applicants were there for the position and, if not, why not?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Mrs B. Auricht has been appointed as clerical officer class 1 in the Accounting Section.

2. The vacancy to which Mrs Auricht transferred was consequential to the secondment of another officer to the Public Service Board.

3. Originally, her transfer was to a temporary position. However, owing to an officer transferring permanently to another department, Mrs Auricht's transfer to Adelaide is now permanent. Her classification is clerical officer class 1 (CO-1) and salary \$12 451 per annum. She possesses a Bachelor of Education Degree.

4. The vacancy was not advertised, as Mrs Auricht had been seeking a transfer to Adelaide following her husband's appointment to a position in Adelaide. This vacancy was the opportunity to grant her request.

PERI URBAN REPORT

188. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. In what manner was the matter of the dispute between the Director-General of Agriculture and the officer involved in the tape-recorded interview concerning the PERI Urban Report resolved?

2. Is the Minister satisfied that information from the Director-General that permission had not been given to release the report was correct and, if not, what action does he intend to take?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The replies are as follows:

1. By discussion and agreement between the officers.
2. The Minister is satisfied with the information provided by the Director-General regarding the premature public release of the report resulting from a misunderstanding between officers.

TREE SEEDLINGS

189. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Forests:

1. What is the Minister's policy on the sale of tree seedlings by the Woods and Forests Department?
2. Does the Minister believe the department should actively compete with private nurserymen and, if not, what restrictions does the Minister intend to apply to the Department to assist private nurserymen?
3. Does the Minister intend to restrain the country tree-selling tours organised by the Woods and Forests Department?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The replies are as follows:

1. To provide trees and shrubs for sale to the public together with technical advice on the establishment of plants, particularly native species.
2. There is inevitably some element of competition. Restraints are applied in respect to the establishment of new outlets and the amount of advertising undertaken.
3. The policy is that tree selling tours are undertaken only upon request by rural organisations and with the approval of the relevant local government body.

AGRICULTURAL CO-OPERATION

190. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. Has the Department of Agriculture had any discussions or negotiations with Yugoslavia, Egypt, Mexico, Portugal or China on the establishment of agricultural projects or other matters of agricultural co-operation and, if so, what discussions have been held with each country?
2. What contracts have been signed, or letters of intent exchanged, with the Government(s) of each country concerned?
3. What is the nature of the proposal in each case?
4. How many officers have visited these countries during the last 12 months, who were they, what was the purpose of their visits and what was the cost?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Discussions have been held with Mexico and China.
2. No contracts have been signed or letters of intent exchanged with these countries.
3. No specific proposals have been made. The central government and one state government in Mexico have expressed general interest in South Australian agricultural technology and livestock. The Chinese government has also expressed a general interest in South Australian agricultural technology.
4. Dr G. Simpson visited Egypt and Dr R. van Velsen visited China. Both visits were to undertake consultancies for the Australian Development Assistance Bureau. No costs were incurred by the South Australian Government.