HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 9 June 1982

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

PETITIONS: CASINO

Petitions signed by 201 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Federal Government to set up a committee to study the social effects of gambling, reject the proposals currently before the House to legalise casino gambling in South Australia, and establish a select committee on casino operations in this State were presented by the Hon. Jennifer Adamson and Mr Lewis.

Petitions received.

PETITION: CHILD-PARENT CENTRES

A petition signed by 57 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide for child-parent centres to remain under the care and control of the Education Department, without funding cut-backs, was presented by the Hon. D. C. Wotton.

Petition received.

PETITION: PIE CART

A petition signed by 5 031 residents of South Australia praying that the House oppose the proposed restricted trading hours of the Adelaide railway station pie cart was presented by Mr Slater.

Petition received.

QUESTION TIME

GRANTS COMMISSION

Mr BANNON: Does the Premier agree that his bargaining position with the Prime Minister on the cuts to South Australia's funding following the Grants Commission report has been seriously undermined, first, by his endorsement of the Federal Government at the 1980 election, and, secondly, by his statements concerning the railways agreement, particularly those made in 1977? South Australia stands to lose $51 000 000 of Federal funds under the recommendations of the Commonwealth Grants Commission. About 100 separate items are contained in that sum of $51 000 000, but in part it does relate to the very good financial deal that the former Government made with the Federal Government over the sale of South Australian railways, a deal which the Fraser Government tried to get out of as soon as it came to power.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader is now commenting.

Mr BANNON: It is a matter of record from the Commonwealth Grants Commission to which I refer, the basis of its recommendation to the Federal Government. It was reported at the time that the Fraser Government had tried to avoid the agreement made under the previous Government and was forced to admit that it was legal and valid. On a number of occasions the Premier has suggested that the opposite is the case. At the time those earlier negotiations with Mr Fraser were going on, his behaviour was described as 'cheering on those who were trying to do South Australia down'. I would like to quote from the Premier, in March 1977, when he told the *Advertiser*, then as Opposition Leader:

> South Australia has got to be prepared to do the right and proper thing, and not seek any dishonest advantage over the rest of Australia.

He added:

> South Australia must be prepared to lose the financial advantage it gained from the transfer of its country rail services.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes, and South Australia will have to be prepared to run that risk, as the Leader has well said, simply because of the absolute and crass stupidity and ineptitude of the former Dunstan Government which entered into this agreement. Let us go back to the beginning of the Leader's question. I do not agree with his propositions. First, yes, certainly, we endorsed the Fraser Government at its last election. Frankly, I believe that the endorsement of the Fraser Government helped considerably in its electoral success. I can only say thank goodness it was a success electorally, because the alternative would have been disastrous for Australia. I do not always see eye to eye with the Fraser Government in its dealings with South Australia. When that happens I make quite clear why I do not agree, and I put up some positive and constructive suggestions. But, if we remember the Whitlam era and what could have become the Hayden era, there was every justification for wholeheartedly supporting the Fraser Government at the last election.

Now, let us turn to the more significant matters that the Leader has raised about the railways agreement. Certainly, I have made statements about the railways agreement, that it was not backed up by any legislation in respect of moneys that would come to South Australia in the tax-sharing arrangements, because it was not—

Mr Bannon: Are you arguing for Fraser?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Leader of the Opposition is quite amazing because he is totally and absolutely—

An honourable member: Inept!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Inept, yes, but he is totally without any real understanding of what the problem is. This is not my assessment I am quoting. It is the Grants Commission's assessment, an independent body presided over by a most eminent judge. Here we have the Grants Commission saying that there is no legislative backing for the gentleman's agreement that was made apparently between Mr Dunstan and Mr Whitlam (there is some contradiction in terms there). There was no contract or agreement ever written. The only record is a letter from Mr Whitlam to Mr Dunstan saying:

> I do not think it is necessary for us to put anything in writing about this deal.

What an incredible situation that is! If I may say so, it is not uncommon in the very many arrangements entered into by the Labor Government in the past. I can remember the contract entered into for the supply of natural gas to Sydney, at a considerable advantage to Sydney and a considerable disadvantage to South Australia, our own State. That is giving us a great deal of trouble in renegotiation, but at least we are on the way. Let us get back to the railways agreement. I would be very happy not to mention it and the most deleterious effect this will have if, in fact, the Federal Government accepts the Grants Commission's recommendations.

I would not have brought it up, but the Grants Commission has brought it up. Having brought up that matter and having threatened in its report last year to remove $91 000 000 from our share of tax reimbursements, I was able, by talking very hard and with the support, I may say, of a one-time colleague of the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Lowe from Tasmania, who was so unceremoniously dumped by the left wing of his Party, to persuade the Grants Commission to

look at the whole problem again. Once again, the commission has looked at the matter with specific reference to the railways agreement, and once again it has found that there is no legislative or legal backing which it can consider and which will enable it to take into account the actual railways transfer agreement in deciding how much money our State will get.

Because of the re-examination undertaken by the Grants Commission, the $91 000 000 has now been reduced to $51 000 000. I suppose that, in a way, one could say that that was a win for South Australia, but I am not content or happy with that. A $51 000 000 loss would be quite disastrous to this State, spread across all aspects of the Budget, as it would have to be. I do not intend to let that go and, indeed, tomorrow I will travel to Sydney to have urgent talks with the Prime Minister on the matter. I will put forward not only the trends that were established and examined by the Grants Commission but also the hospitals cost-sharing agreement and the railways agreement, because I believe that the Commonwealth should rethink that matter.

More particularly, I believe that the smaller and developing States deserve additional funds in contrast with the larger State Governments of New South Wales and Victoria in particular, which are desperately trying to take as much money as they can to rescue their disastrous Budget situation and which are governed by colleagues of the Leader. Those States are creating a blow-out in their Budgets of astronomical proportions, even in the short time in which Labor has been in office in Victoria.

Mr Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I invite the Leader to have a look at some of the promises made and already broken by Mr Cain, in Victoria. Those States are trying to take away money from the developing States, which need it far more than do the bigger States. That will be the last and the major factor that I will put to the Prime Minister. It is absolutely essential that the smaller States, and in particular States such as South Australia, which are doing everything they can to help themselves (and doing it very responsibly), receive all of the help and additional assistance that they can. I believe that South Australia has a good case, which I will put as strongly as I possibly can when I see the Prime Minister tomorrow. I will put our case even more strongly with my other Liberal colleagues when we go to the Premiers' Conference.

STATE ELECTION

Mr MATHWIN: Is the Deputy Premier in a position to say whether there will be a State election on 17 July or 31 July, as rumoured today by the Leader of the Opposition? The Deputy Premier will be aware of the many and varied attempts by the Leader of the Opposition to forecast the date of the next State election, either by sticking a pin into a piece of paper or by gazing into a crystal ball. His latest rumour comes just prior to the A.L.P. State Conference this weekend, and forecasts that the election will be on 17 July or 31 July.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: My preference would be 17 July, because that happens to be my birthday, and we are quite confident that, when the Government does decide to go to the people, members opposite will be bitterly disappointed with the result. The Leader of the Opposition does indeed have a credibility problem. He has a real credibility problem.

Mr Trainer: You haven't any credibility to have a problem with.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The honourable member at the back has his problems, too, and one of his problems is his Leader. The fact is that we have had this series of scurrilous allegations in relation to Federal Hotels offering bribes. We brought before this House yesterday a statutory declaration in effect giving the complete lie to those allegations, so the Leader of the Opposition has changed his ground—he has a real credibility problem. It is only a month ago that I remember his proclaiming to the world, 'Well fellas, we can relax now, one thing is for sure, we will not have an election this year or before the end of the year.' That was on the occasion of what they saw as the success of their brilliant strategy in Mitcham. The Leader proclaimed to the world at large, 'We won't be having an election in the near future.' I do not know whether or not he was disappointed with the success of his strategy in Mitcham. However, within a month he says, 'We will go to the polls on 17 July or 21 July.' It is easy to understand why the Leader of the Opposition has to thrash around in this fashion. Indeed, a very large credibility gap is appearing in the Leader's remarks. We know that the Labor Party has a conference this weekend; we know that he would be trying to unite the troops behind him. The Premier mentioned the unceremonious dumping of former Premier Lowe with notice: he got the letter one morning, and by the afternoon he was out of a job. This ploy of the Leader of the Opposition to pull his troops together for the weekend corroboree is because of the impending election.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The fact is that if he can frighten his troops into thinking that there is an election next month they will not unceremoniously dump him a la Lowe. The other interesting event (and I am glad the member for Elizabeth has now appeared in the Chamber) within the Labor Party and elsewhere concerns the emergence of the strength of people like the member for Elizabeth. It has been confidently predicted that the member for Elizabeth will be one of the official South Australian Labor representatives on the Federal Executive.

An honourable member: But he can't make the front bench.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: He cannot make the front bench because he has an appreciation of the Leader that was previously described as having the strength of orange flower water. The fact is that the emergence of the member for Elizabeth must be a source of considerable perturbation and worry to the Leader of the Opposition. All in all, the best way by which the Leader can dampen down these events that are occurring imminently within the Labor Party is to take a chance on his credibility gap and plump for an early election—25 December is on a Saturday; maybe he will predict that date next.

WET LAND AREAS

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: In an attempt to raise the tone of this Chamber, I direct my question to the Minister of Environment and Planning, known as *Pongo Australis* to his friends. Has the Minister recently, or at any time, discussed with members of the Field and Game Association, or with any other bodies associated with the Conservation Council, or with relevant landowners, the Commonwealth Government, or other State Ministers (for example, in Hobart last week), the desirability of re-establishing wet land areas in the South-East and Upper South-East of this State?

The so-called desiccation of the South-East has, of course, been viewed with some alarm by people for a considerable time, and it has been in part linked to the South-Eastern drainage scheme. It is suggested that there has been a deterioration of aquifers. Of course, that is subject to seasonal conditions, and there has obviously been quite a considerable

reduction in the amount of surface water, which has affected the amount of game and other native species in the area. The suggestion put forward in some quarters is that there should be some damming or at least some impeding of the waters that are channelled to the coast, through the South-East drains, in order to re-establish some of these wet land areas for both game and for conservation purposes, which, in turn, would have the effect of having some recharge of the aquifers.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The honourable member has asked about seven questions, if I counted them correctly, in the one question that he was supposed to put to me at this time. In answer to the first question, I have had discussions with at least one group, as suggested by the member, in the past few weeks. In fact, last week at the meeting of the Australian Environment Council in Hobart that was one of the matters that was discussed. Indeed, it was only one of a large number. Following that meeting, I had discussions with some of the Ministers representing other States on that same question. Victoria, as the honourable member may be aware, is concerned with the same problem, particularly in the areas adjacent to the south-eastern section of this State.

The honourable member would be aware that my colleague, the Minister for Water Resources, and I have some time ago announced the establishment of the Wet Lands Committee. He would also be aware that much work is being carried out in the South-East of the State relating to the matters that he has brought to the notice of the House. He would realise that there are problems in the South-East in regard to the damming of water and limestone, particularly in the areas of limestone. I suggest that the reports that I have received back from my colleague in regard to the work being carried out by that committee indicates that it is an area that it is looking at very closely.

An honourable member: They've been looking at it for nearly two years.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: As my colleague says, this matter has been looked at over a long period of time. It is certainly one about which the Minister of Water Resources has been concerned. I look forward to some of the recommendations that will come out of the work that that committee is now doing. I know that the Field and Game Association quite naturally is concerned about the reduced amount of game that is now available for hunting in the South-East. They have made representations to me on that matter ever since the Liberal Government has been in office. I know that they were making the same representations to the previous Government. I believe that that is one of the reasons why the Wet Lands Committee was established in the first place. So, with the member for Baudin, we will be awaiting the recommendations in the report that will be brought down by the Wet Lands Committee relating particularly to the situations raised by the member in regard to the South-East.

ROAD TRAUMA COMMITTEE

Mr BECKER: Has the Minister of Transport received a copy of the report published by the Road Trauma Committee of the Royal Australasian College of Surgeons and, if so, what action does he and his fellow colleagues and other State Governments propose to take? All members would have received today a document called 'Road Trauma. I refer to 'The National Epidemic', published by the Royal Australasian College of Surgeons, the foreword of which states:

> A devastating disease is sweeping through 'the lucky country'. It is killing more than 3 000 men, women and children every year and seriously injuring at least 10 times as many more. It is called the 'road toll'.

The report contains valuable statistical information covering the past decade. Statistics contained in the report show that the number of road deaths in all States and Territories in 1975 was the highest, at 3 694, for the 11 years shown. In 1974, South Australia had its highest road toll for the decade, 382 people having been killed in that year. The report contains a series of horrendous illustrations of crashed motor vehicles and motor cycles. The report states at page 15 that 644 pedestrians were killed, 67.4 per cent of whom were males and 32.6 per cent females, a ratio of approximately two males to one female.

It further states on the same page that of the 390 motor cycle riders and 52 pillion passengers killed in 1980 the ratio of male to female riders was 32 to one. The age group 17 to 20 years recorded the highest number of drivers killed and injured, 207 males and 35 female drivers killed, and 128 male passengers and 62 female passengers having been killed. In that same age group 165 motor cyclists were killed. The report shows that in the five to 16 age group 41 pedal cyclists were killed. The report continues, under the heading 'Head Injuries':

> One in 11 of all injured road crash victims sustain intracranial or brain injury. In fact, 70 per cent of all road deaths are caused by injury to the brain and nervous system.

The report shows that the average number of days spent in hospital per injured person is 13.4. The Minister would be aware that my colleagues and I are involved in many voluntary health and welfare agencies. We see the end result of these road traumas and we endeavour to assist with rehabilitation, which is time-consuming and expensive.

The report contains 12 recommendations designed for us and other Parliaments in Australia. It recommends that the legal blood alcohol level be reduced to .05 grams per 100 millilitres of blood; that all cyclists wear protective head gear; that all motor cyclists undergo a period of approved off-road training prior to the granting of an initial riding licence; that there be a uniform road code; that there be a full autopsy examination on all road crash casualties; the teaching of basic life support techniques; and uniform minimum penalties.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I have seen a copy of that report. I understand that all members have received a copy of this excellent report in the mail today, and I commend it to them. Often, with reports of this nature, the statistical information is hidden in the text, but in this report it is set out with much clarity. Indeed, I believe that the whole report is set out in that manner, and I commend it to all members of the general public. I have also just received the 'Report on Adelaide Road Accidents No. 6', which I have not the time to read and which comes from the excellent Road Accident Research Unit at the University of Adelaide. I also commend that report to honourable members, because the Adelaide University Road Accident Research Unit is something of which we South Australians can be very proud. The unit is headed by Dr Jack McLean. It is nationally recognised, and the unit is doing extremely good work for the Commonwealth Government, as well as being supported by the State Government.

Returning to the report on road trauma that the honourable member mentioned, we are extremely fortunate in this State that we have a South Australian Chairman of the Road Trauma Committee, Mr Donald Beard, who is also a member of the national committee and Chairman of our Road Safety Council. If he has not already done so (and I am fairly sure that he has), I will ensure that he has the report circulated to the Road Safety Council for its recommendations. I hope to join the Road Safety Council for a full meeting in the

next few weeks, and I hope that this will be one of the items for discussion.

Mr Keneally: It will be a farewell meeting.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I hope the member for Stuart realises that this is an important subject and that road trauma and the road toll in Australia is probably the greatest problem that faces Governments throughout the Commonwealth, because the cost in human misery and suffering is enormous.

I thank the member for Hanson for bringing these recommendations to the attention of the House. One of the recommendations was that random breathing testing should be instituted nationally on a Federal basis, and it is extremely interesting to see that that recommendation is supported by the House of Representatives Select Committee on Road Safety and indeed by the Federal shadow Minister for Transport (Mr Morris). I believe it will not be long before random breath testing is carried out in all States of Australia. In reference to the recommendation that the prescribed limit of alcohol in the blood should be reduced to .05 per cent, the State Government has consistently taken the stand that this should be a matter of review by the Parliamentary select committee that will review the implementation of random breath testing.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mr HEMMINGS: Will the Minister of Health say whether there is any substance in the rumour that the name of the Modbury Hospital will be changed and, if so, what is the proposed new name and what cost will be involved in such a change?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Napier is invited to approach the Chair before the question is put in a presentable form to the House.

NUCLEAR-FREE ZONE

Mr GLAZBROOK: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy say what effect there would be if South Australia were declared a nuclear-free zone? This week the Victorian Premier (Mr Cain) announced that his Government would introduce legislation to declare Victoria a nuclear-free zone. Mr Cain also foreshadowed similar moves in other parts of Australia. In the *News* yesterday under an article on page 2 headed 'Worth a look—Bannon', Mr Bannon is quoted as saying that it was an idea worthy of examination. Following that story I have been asked by concerned residents to question the effect that such a move would have on South Australia and its future.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: This is a question which must be exercising the minds of the Leader and his colleagues. The declaration of South Australia as a nuclear-free State would have a disastrous effect: we would not have needed to go through any exercise of bringing the Roxby Downs indenture Bill before the House and the Labor Party would not have had to go through the trauma of inventing a series of amendments, as it has done, which would put a torpedo through that Bill with a semblance of seeking to keep the project going. Obviously what, is happening in Victoria is that the accounts are now coming in and the pay-off to the socialist left is starting to be made. Serious problems would arise in Victoria, or indeed in any State in Australia, if it was stupid enough to follow the lead of Premier Cain. I think the Prime Minister has highlighted some of those problems in relation to our treaty contracts with our allies in the Western world, and I also think of the effects on the non-proliferation treaty. No-one in the Labor Party has yet suggested that we should not be signatories to the non-proliferation treaty in relation to nuclear matters. One of the clauses of that treaty obliges the signatories to be suppliers of nuclear materials. That is part of the treaty, and no-one is suggesting at any level within the A.L.P. that we should not be signatories to that.

So, it runs completely counter to the obligations which a nation accepts when it becomes a signatory to the non-proliferation treaty. Obviously, Mr Cain has a bit of homework to do there, as well as looking at the obligations to our partners in relation to defence. Of course, he has also got a problem with his Federal Leader, Mr Hayden, who said this morning in the *Australian* (and this problem would equally apply to the Labor Party in South Australia):

> If a nuclear warship wished to enter Victorian ports and the Defence Department allowed it permission to do so, the Victorian Premier would be bound to comply.

Mr Cain has that problem, and it would also be a problem for proponents of a nuclear-free State in South Australia. This further opens up the credibility gap which, as I have mentioned, is widening daily for the Opposition Leader, because his response to the report in the *News* yesterday made interesting reading, if the report is accurate (and that is often a defence of members opposite—they are wrongly quoted). It has not been denied, but they have had trouble lately denying things, as we have noticed. He said:

> It is unlikely that it—

referring to a nuclear-free zone—

> will come up in the Victorian form here, but it is an idea worthy of examination.

Let me remind the Leader and members of the House who perhaps have better memories than he has (I am sure the member for Elizabeth vividly recalls this, because knowing his views I am sure he would go along wholeheartedly with Mr Cain)—

The Hon. J. D. Wright interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: No, we are dealing in facts. Let me remind the Leader of what occurred at the June 1981 State Conference of the A.L.P. (and we have the repeat exercise next weekend), when the following motion was passed:

> That this convention calls for the declaration of South Australia as a nuclear-free zone and requests the S.A. A.L.P. to examine the implications and report back to the next convention on the feasibility of such a declaration, and that the water catchment area of the Adelaide Hills be declared a nuclear-free zone as a first step.

So, there we are—'this convention calls for the declaration of South Australia as a nuclear-free zone'. That resolution is perfectly clear, yet yesterday when approached by a reporter from the *News* the Leader says, 'Yes, that's an interesting idea. Maybe we ought to look at it. Of course, it couldn't really apply in the Victorian sense.' What balderdash! Where is the credibility of the man in relation to that sort of comment to a reporter from the *News*? Of course, there is always the possibility that the *News* misreported.

Mr Bannon: I wasn't misreported.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: So now we come to the question of whether or not he will admit to the credibility gap.

Mr Bannon: I said I wasn't misreported; I didn't say what I was reported as saying.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Well, the credibility gap is there for all to see. It is also interesting to note that one of the Leader's staff, who seeks media prominence from time to time (Mr Mike Rann), and who bursts forth over the air waves with surprising frequency for one working for a member of Parliament, nonetheless becomes spokesman from time to time for the A.L.P. When I suggest that the Leader wants to keep his head down, up pops Mr Rann's

head. Anyway, Mr Rann is also a writer of some note and has recently written a publication, which I understand the A.L.P. has been assiduously distributing, called *Uranium: Play it Safe.* Mr Rann describes himself as an adviser to the Leader of the Opposition. In that booklet, Mr Rann has quite a lot to say about this concept of nuclear-free zones, nuclear-free areas and nuclear-free States, as such. He states, in part:

Concerned citizens should also press their local councillors to attempt to have their local area declared a nuclear-free zone . . . Following the declaration of a nuclear-free zone there are a number of things a council can do to publicise their position. Signs can be erected at municipal boundaries stating, 'This is a nuclear-free zone,' and stickers can be affixed to council vehicles. Coburg council in Victoria has done this. Their stickers say, 'Coburg. This is a nuclear-free zone.'

Let the A.L.P. policy decision of last year be confirmed this year in 1982. It will have made a farce of all the money that the Labor Party spent when in Government on encouraging uranium exploration. There would be no more uranium exploration in South Australia. The A.L.P. really encouraged the joint venturers to get going and spend their money, and the Party was quite proud of that. It set up the Uranium Enrichment Advisory Committee in 1973, and they went overseas to investigate the nuclear options. We would be able to save all that expense in future and members opposite would not have to go to all that trouble to construct amendments to shoot down the Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Bill. Think of the money they would have saved if they had followed Victoria's example! It would certainly simplify life and help the Leader with his credibility gap.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mr HEMMINGS: Again, I direct a question to the Minister of Health, and I hope that she—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will ask his question.

Mr HEMMINGS: Yes, Sir. Is there any substance in the public claim that the Modbury Hospital is about to undergo a change of name and, if so, what is the proposed new name, and what cost would be involved in such a change?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I recall reading (but I cannot recall whether it was late last year or earlier this year) that the board of the hospital had considered the possibility of a change of name and sought the opinion of staff of the hospital and the local community as to the likely acceptance of such a proposal. I understand that the staff and other interested bodies were warmly supportive of the hospital's continuing under its present name.

Decisions of this kind are matters for the hospital board, and I confess that I have had no formal communication with the hospital on this matter, nor would I expect to have in such early stages. I cannot say what the change of name might be, but as far as I am aware there is no firm proposition to change the name at present. If there were, it would be a matter for the board of the hospital to decide, and any change would have to be incorporated in the constitution, which would then have to be approved by the South Australian Health Commission.

T.A.A. STAFF

Mr SLATER: Will the Minister of Transport provide further information on or justify his answer yesterday to my Question on Notice that there will be no redundancies of T.A.A. staff in Adelaide when the finance department of T.A.A. is located in Melbourne. I understand that staff members of T.A.A. are quite upset at the Minister's answer. A meeting of T.A.A. finance staff held in Adelaide on 11 May was addressed by Mr N. E. Gerahty, Personnel Services Manager of T.A.A., and Mr R. Winders, Deputy Finance Manager, both of whom are located in Melbourne. During the meeting, Mr Gerahty said:

And finally, and painfully obviously, there will be a number of people declared redundant.

How can the Minister's answer to my question be justified?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I remind the member for Gilles that, although I have quite a number of portfolios, T.A.A. is not amongst them.

Mr Slater: You're supposed to be answering my question.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The honourable member will get an answer if he will be quiet. Of course, if there were redundancies, that would be a matter of great concern. I made inquiries of T.A.A., that is the answer I received, and that is the answer that I provided to the member for Gilles. If the honourable member thinks there is anything wrong with that answer, then I suggest that he give me as much detail as he can and I will then take it up again with T.A.A.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Why doesn't the honourable member take it up with T.A.A.?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: In answer to the Minister of Health, I am always pleased to try to help members opposite.

RESCUE SERVICES

Mr SCHMIDT: What action does the Chief Secretary intend taking to rationalise and co-ordinate rescue services provided by the Metropolitan Fire Service and Police Department in relation to vehicular accidents? Last Friday there was a rather serious accident on Ocean Boulevard and it was found afterwards that the victims of the accident were not rescued from their vehicle until some one hour after the accident had occurred. On 5AD yesterday morning an interviewer, speaking to a Mr Doyle, who I think is the Secretary of the Firefighters Union, suggested that there may be some jealousy between the two departments concerning who should service such accidents and provide this necessary service. Mr Doyle went on to say that he did not think that there was any rivalry between the two services, but rather that perhaps the solution to the situation lay with the Government and that something should be done in that area. The pertinent point he raised was that the firefighting service at O'Halloran Hill was only some two or three kilometres away from this accident scene and that that service could have very readily arrived at the site far sooner than did the Police Rescue Service on that occasion, hence he raised the matter of what the rationalisation of such services should be between the two departments.

The Hon. J. W. OLSEN: I have had discussions with the Deputy Commissioner of Police and the Deputy Chief Fire Officer asking them to look at the rationalisation of services, taking into account equipment that is available in the various parts of Adelaide, its call-out time to the various parts of the metropolitan area, together with staffing requirements of the Metropolitan Fire Service. I have asked that they report back to me as to the mechanism that ought to be employed to co-ordinate emergency services in this State to ensure maximum support for the travelling public. I emphasise that point: the Government's main concern must be the preservation of human life and the reduction of the associated risks. I will not be party to petty jealousies that might have developed between two services; I am not interested in empire building by one section over another. It is the public interest that must be to the fore in this matter and I have therefore directed that both services in fact lay all the cards on the table and provide information as to what equipment is available, where it is located in the

metropolitan area, and how best the service can be rationalised for the travelling public.

We must keep in mind that the Government is subject to manning restrictions and rigidity in relation to the Metropolitan Fire Service, but of course, as a professional service, it has a particular function, that is, fire protection, and we must ensure that adequate staff is available to respond to a call at any time. There cannot be a situation whereby perhaps the Metropolitan Fire Service responds to an accident call but is then not available to undertake its primary task, that is, to respond to a fire call. In conclusion, I point out that I am aware of the difficulty that exists and that we intend to rationalise the problem and have discussions with the interested parties, the two emergency services, to ensure that rationalisation is undertaken.

GOVERNMENT HOSPITAL CHARGES

Mr MAX BROWN: Will the Minister of Health carefully examine the current practice of Government hospitals charging parents of new-born babies full hospital fees for the baby when the new-born infant is in need of specialist attention, with a view to discontinuing the practice, especially up to the end of the tenth day normal birth confinement of the mother? I inform the Minister that I have had two recent cases where new-born babies have needed specialist care. The first case was where a mother was hospitalised for six days in the Whyalla Hospital, her daily charges being $85 per day. The baby developed eye trouble and required the attention of a specialist who diagnosed conjunctivitis and required drops being administered a few times a day. The baby immediately became a patient and was charged $85 per day for three days in its own right.

The second case was where a baby was being examined by the mother's general practitioner. During the examination the general practitioner thought the fontanel was soft and asked a specialist walking past to examine the baby. This was done, the examination taking but a few minutes, the verdict being that the baby was all right, but the extra charge was placed on the mother's account. It would seem to me that the normal confinement period charges of the mother should suffice until a 10-day period expires. Any extra charge must be a drain on parents' normal hospital health coverage.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Certainly, I will examine the practice of charging, but I think that even the limited explanation that the honourable member has given will indicate that the cost of medical treatment to a baby in the first 10 days of life can be very high indeed and, obviously, if that treatment is provided to the baby the cost must be covered one way or another, particularly if the parents are insured. The second example concerning a specialist just happening by and making a quick examination is perhaps the area that needs looking at. As the honourable member would be well aware, the intensive neo-natal services that can be provided to some babies in the first few days of life cost literally tens of thousands of dollars. It certainly is not realistic to suggest that fees should not be charged. However, I will investigate the instances that were raised and provide the honourable member with the report as to the policy regarding charges for new-born babies who require specialist medical treatment.

ROAD TRAUMA COMMITTEE

Mr BLACKER: I desire to ask a question of the Minister for Transport, supplementary to that asked by the member for Hanson. In his reply to the member for Hanson, the Minister made reference to what the Government was doing in relation to the suggestion of lowering the blood alcohol level from .08 to .05. My interest is in the last two recommendations of the National Road Trauma Committee, where references were made to the teaching of basic life support. The recommendation states:

> That the teaching of basic life support techniques be made available to all sections of the community and that an approved certificate be a requirement for the granting of a driving licence.

The last recommendation refers to the 'Uniform Minimum Penalties', and states:

> That uniform minimum penalties for convicted road users be introduced so as to ensure that lesser penalties than those prescribed will not be imposed, thus ensuring that the Courts do not detract from the effectiveness of legislation designed to protect all road users.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: As I told the member for Hanson, I will be referring the document to the Road Safety Council for its advice. It is against the policy of this Party to impose minimum penalties. However, it is well recognised that the Road Traffic Act provides for minimum penalties. Once again, we have to balance that question against the saving of lives on the road. Of course, in such a situation there is really no decision to be made. However, uniform minimum penalties would be an item for the Australian Transport Advisory Committee (ATAC), and it will be interesting to see whether this report is a subject for discussion at the next Transport Advisory Council meeting. I cannot help the honourable member further on that point.

On the question of a compulsory first aid certificate, which is a shorter way of putting it, once again we are faced with a decision as to whether such a requirement would save lives compared to the gross amount of regulation that would be required and the cost of implementing such a proposal.

Once again, a balance has to be struck. I have already referred that matter to the Road Safety Council, because I have had a deal of correspondence about it from various organisations in the community. It is certainly worthy of consideration, but it is the belief of my officers that it would be extremely difficult to administer and to bring into practice. That does not mean that it is not a worthy subject for discussion and investigation.

MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS

Mr ABBOTT: Is the Minister of Health aware of the financial discrimination that has been imposed upon motorists 70 years of age and over as a result of the recent amendments to the Road Traffic Act compelling these people to have an annual medical and optical test before consideration will be given to a renewal of their driving licence? Doctors recommend annual medical examinations for a wide spectrum of the community and the costs of these examinations are eligible for refund from the registered medical health funds.

However, the medical health insurance organisations have ruled that the medical and optical examinations for a drivers licence are classified as medical scanning and do not qualify for refunds. Hence people over 70 years of age are being financially discriminated against by being forced to pay licence fee plus medical expenses. The Minister would be aware of the licence fee concession for eligible pensioners. However, the classification and ruling of the medical health organisations is seen as a further penalty upon elderly people, especially those who just fail to qualify for the pensioner health benefit card and the whole range of fringe benefits. Does the Minister intend rectifying that anomaly?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I am pleased to advise the honourable member that I have already taken action to

try to rectify the situation he describes. I have written to the Minister for Health, Mr Jim Carlton, pointing out the anomaly that exists and stressing to him that the State Government regards these compulsory tests not as scanning but as a preventive health measure which is taken in the interests of total community health and safety and which, therefore, should be considered in the light of eligibility for free checks. I have not yet received a reply from Mr Carlton, but I have put the point as forcefully as I can that I believe the Commonwealth Government should take action to ensure that these tests can be taken without cost to the person undergoing them.

ELECTRICAL WEED CONTROL

Mr LEWIS: Is the Minister of Agriculture aware of the articles which appeared in the *National Farmer* on Thursday 8 April, at page 24, under the title 'Weeds in for a nasty shock', and in the *Sugarbeet Grower* of March 1981, at page 18, under the heading 'Electrical energy proves effective in weed control', which describe a new system of weed control without risk to the user/operator of poisoning, without risk to the consumer (whether grazing animals or people), and without toxic residue risk of chemicals in the environment? If he is aware of them, will he undertake to investigate the possibility of doing some pilot trials in conjunction with farmers and growers who could benefit from the use of this new method of weed control? Does he know of any details and claims about costs, and how the machine works?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I am aware of the Lightning weed killer unit which has been produced in the United States, and I am also aware of the article to which the honourable member has referred. I understand that the machine costs about $A15 000 and, therefore, we are not able to buy one for trial under local conditions. However, I do recognise the merits reported to be associated with this new unit which have been briefly cited by the honourable member. It would appear from the articles promoting this unit that it has a lot going for it. Indeed, it seems that it is not only effective in its objective to control noxious and undesirable weeds in a whole range of crops but also, as pointed out, it minimises the impact on the community as well as on the operator.

I will inquire from my colleagues in the other States whether they have any information on tests that have been carried out under local conditions in Australia because, as implied in the question, it appears to be a favourable breakthrough for the rural industry and, indeed, for the horticultural industry. In that context, I appreciate the honourable member's raising the matter in this place.

ALLIED ENGINEERING PLANT

Mr HAMILTON: Will the Minister of Environment and Planning now give a clear undertaking that he will honour his promise given to a group of residents from the Albert Park district on 27 May that he would place a submission before Cabinet regarding the problem of noise, dust and pollution control at the Allied Engineering plant at Royal Park? At that meeting, the Minister gave a clear and categorical assurance, as I and my constituents recall, to place a submission before Cabinet on Monday last. On asking the Minister yesterday what was the outcome of that submission, the Minister said that he did not have time because he was interstate and had overlooked it. After receiving that information from the Minister, I rang my constituents who are most incensed at the Minister's attitude and his breach of the undertaking that he has given to them. I seek from the Minister an assurance that the matter will now be placed before Cabinet on Monday next.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I cannot give that assurance. I would have thought that the honourable member would realise that next Monday is a public holiday. However, I can give an assurance that the matter raised will be taken before Cabinet, as I indicated to his constituents when they visited me some time ago.

CAWTHORNE DISCUSSION PAPER

Mr RANDALL: Is the Minister of Industrial Affairs aware that many interested parties are having difficulty in gaining access to copies of the Cawthorne discussion paper? I seek leave quickly to explain the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Henley Beach does not have to be quick unless he wants to be.

Mr RANDALL: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I live and learn a lesson each day in this House. Recently, on the Minister's behalf, I attended a seminar organised by the workers education group to discuss unionism and the Liberal Party's policies. While I was at that seminar, it was pointed out to me that many members of the union movement were interested in what we as a Government were doing, but that they have difficulty gaining access to the Cawthorne discussion paper; they requested that I should ask the Minister to correct the situation. I therefore contacted the Minister's office about the matter. The other point that needs to be made is that at that seminar I was told that the Minister is always saying that he wants to be communicated with, and that he wants to hear the unions' points of view. They therefore ask that the Minister give them the opportunity of having easy access to the Cawthorne discussion paper so that they might put forward their point of view.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I am delighted to see that so many people realise that I am all heart. The honourable member wrote to me about this matter, which I have had investigated. I have also received a number of requests from other outside parties for the Cawthorne Report. We did print many copies of the report initially, but unfortunately, because of public demand, we have now run out of copies. It has now been decided to reprint a further 150 copies of the report, which will be made available shortly.

Mr Becker: How much will they cost?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: We will charge $10 a copy for the report, because we have found that many libraries want a copy of the report for reference purposes. I think that that is appropriate now that we have distributed the paper widely and requests are being made for future copies of the book for reference purposes. So, further copies will be available shortly from the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment at a cost of $10.

One college of further education has, I understand, specifically requested 15 copies. I am fascinated to see that this investigation, which was started by the Government, into the whole area of industrial relations and the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act should be taken up as a permanent textbook for South Australia. I think it is a reflection on the way in which the Government has carried out the inquiry and certainly on Frank Cawthorne and the manner in which he has written the report, the broad range of subjects that he has raised and aired, and the manner in which he has done it. I can assure the honourable member that the request that was put to him while representing me at that one-day seminar will certainly be met.

CHILDREN'S PROTECTION AND YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It contains sundry amendments that have arisen largely as a result of the Children's Court Advisory Committee's continuing role as monitor of the administration and operation of the Act. The import and effect of each amendment will be explained in the detailed explanation of the clauses of the Bill.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 defines 'alternative offence'. This new definition is required in relation to a later clause in the Bill that makes clear that an adult court dealing with a young offender has jurisdiction to hear not only the offence for which the child was committed for trial but also any other offence that is an alternative to that firstmentioned offence. For an offence to be an alternative offence, it must arise out of the same facts as the first offence, and must bear a lesser penalty.

Clause 3 excludes parking offences from the provisions of the Act that require certain offences to go through the screening panel process. Such offences, like other traffic offences, will therefore be dealt with by the Children's Court as a matter of course, and will not be able to be dealt with by a children's aid panel. Alternative offences within the meaning of the new definition must be excluded from this process, as they are dealt with directly by the court of trial.

Clause 4 formalises an existing practice whereby screening panels recommend that a child not be dealt with at all for an offence, and recommend instead that he be given a police warning. Clause 5 effects an amendment consequential upon clause 4.

Clause 6 effects a consequential amendment and also makes absolutely clear that the screening process in no way derogates from the discretion of the police not to proceed against a child, even where a screening panel has decided whether the child should go to court or be dealt with by a children's aid panel. Clause 7 enables a child who has been remanded in custody for trial in a remote country area to be detained in a police prison, a police station or lock-up during the course of his trial. In some country areas there is no other place in which a person may be safely held, although normally a child is not to be held in a place where adult offenders may be detained.

Clause 8 inserts a new section providing that, where a child is detained in a police prison, police station, watch-house or lock-up pursuant to section 42 or 44, he must be kept apart, as far as reasonably practicable, from adult persons detained in the same premises. Clause 9 amends the section dealing with applications by the Attorney-General for a child to be tried in an adult court because of the seriousness of the offence, or because the child has repeatedly offended. The amendment makes clear the copies of prosecution witnesses' statements are only to be made available to the child and his guardian for the purposes of the proceedings on the application if the court so directs. Clause 10 is a consequential amendment.

Clause 11 states that an adult court, in dealing with a child, has full power to try him, upon information, for the offence for which he was committed for trial, or for any alternative offence to that offence. The adult court is empowered to deal with the child for any offence of which he is found guilty by that court, for example, for the offence of manslaughter where he was indicted for murder (an information is not required in such a case). Clause 12 restates the sentencing powers of an adult court in dealing with a child for homicide (other than murder), or pursuant to an application by the Attorney-General. If the court finds the child guilty of an alternative offence to the offence for which he was committed for trial, the court is only empowered to deal with him as a child, and not as an adult.

Clause 13 enables a senior member of the Police Force to lay complaints for breaches of bonds, instead of the Commissioner of Police. An evidentiary provision is inserted to facilitate proof in relation to the laying of complaints for breaches of bonds. A court, in dealing with a breach of bond, is given the same wider powers as courts now have under the Offenders Probation Act. Where a child is subject to a suspended sentence of detention, the court may refrain from revoking the suspension if it is satisfied that the breach was trivial, and may, if it thinks fit, extend the bond for a further period of not more than one year. Where the court does revoke the suspension, it may reduce the term of the sentence of detention.

Clause 14 provides that the Training Centre Review Board, in authorising unsupervised leave for a child who is serving a sentence of detention, may impose conditions that are to be observed by the child during that leave. Clause 15 requires a court that has sentenced a child to a fine, or ordered him to pay any other sum of money, to give the child a written statement of the time and place at which he must pay the fine or other sum.

Mr ABBOTT secured the adjournment of the debate.

CLASSIFICATION OF PUBLICATIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Following the success of the Government at the last election, a general expectation was raised to the effect that the availablility of pornography would be somewhat more restricted. To a certain extent since then standards have been tightened but the general provisions of the Classification of Publications Act have remained the same. The Government has received representations from various bodies suggesting amendments to the Act, and there have also been ongoing negotiations with censorship authorities in the other States and Canberra regarding the possibility of standardising procedures and decisions in relation to the censorship and classification of publications. Whilst maintaining the structure of the Act, this Bill is designed to tighten the method of sale of classified publictions and to increase penalties under the Act.

During most of 1981, South Australia pressed for an Australian conference of censorship Ministers. This meeting was sought to discuss proposals put forward at an officer level resulting in recommendations being made for consideration of Ministers. As a result of this State's pressure, a conference was finally held in Sydney on 16 October 1981. At that meeting, it was agreed that the recommendations should proceed to a draft Bill and, when the South Australian Act is amended in accordance with this Bill, the amended Act will be a model for consideration by other Governments in Australia.

At the present time, the South Australian Classification of Publications Board has a range of five restrictions that it may impose upon publications that it classifies as restricted publications. These restrictions may be imposed in any combination, but chiefly they are imposed in combinations of:

(A) Not to be sold to minors; *or*

(A) Not to be sold to minors and (B) Not to be displayed in public areas; *or*

(A) Not to be sold to minors;

(B) Not to be displayed publicly;

(C) Not to be sold except to adults making a direct request;

(D) To be delivered only to the purchaser who requests the publication whilst he is at the place at which the publication is for sale and takes delivery at that place.

In practice, those classified (A) only—not to be sold to a minor—are sold in transparent plastic bags which may be put out on shelves to which minors have access along with other members of the public. They are sold in delicatessens, newsagents and many other places. Those which are restricted not only in relation to sale to minors but also from public display are sold either in opaque bags in these locations plus restricted publications areas (nowadays confined to sex shops rather than book shops as well) or, alternatively, they are kept under the counter and are wrapped before delivery to the cusomer. Those classified (A), (B), (C), and (D), as mentioned earlier, are sold chiefly in sex shops, although it is not illegal for them to be sold from under the counter elsewhere.

The new Act, when amended by this Bill, will provide for two categories of restricted publication in addition to the unrestricted classification and the proviso to refuse to classify books at all, thus rendering any vendor liable to prosecution under the Police Offences Act. This reduction from five restrictions in various combinations to two categories—(category 1 and category 2) is essential if an Australian standardisation is to take place. The Commonwealth has long used a system with only two classes of restriction.

The proposed category 1 classification will be allocated to those publications that are commonly classified (A) (not available to minors) although, of course, the actual decisions will still be made by the Classification of Publications Board. Magazines in this class will be sold in sealed packages. Material in category 2, which will contain the remainder of the publications thought suitable by the board for sale, will not be permitted to be sold or displayed anywhere except in restricted publications areas. Nowadays, such areas are confined to sex shops, but there is provision in the regulations for such areas to be established in premises selling books.

I have outlined the most obvious changes proposed. There are other provisions which will become apparent on reading the explanations for each clause. There is a provision for the board to have due regard to the views of the Minister. That is not to say that the board must do as the Minister wishes. There is already provision in section 12 (3) for the board to have due regard to decisions made by other authorities of the Commonwealth and the States relevant to the performance of its functions, and to have due regard to the nature of the publication and all other relevant factors. Nevertheless, the amendment goes some way towards meeting the view that the Minister should have responsibility for the board decisions.

There is a wider provision for the board to refuse to classify publications. The Bill provides that restricted publications, and any sealed package in which they are contained, must be marked in the prescribed manner with the appropriate symbol and warning. This is proposed in the expectation that at least some of the restricted publications will continue to bear the warning on the cover after they have been removed from the package. It will be of assistance to subsequent reader and to secondhand book sellers who, of course, have to observe the Act, in any case. There is an important provision that retailers may have the option of refusing to carry publications, not only those which have been refused classification (at present provided in the regulations) but also publications that have been classed as restricted.

It is quite common for proprietors of delicatessens to say that they would rather not carry certain material, but that they are bound by their contract with the wholesaler or distributor to carry a complete range of the products availalbe. Some retailers place such material out of sight to avoid selling it, but this is a stratagem which places them in some jeopardy for breach of contract. The Bill authorises retailers to refuse to receive, exhibit or sell such publications without penalty under a contract. Penalties throughout the Act are increased, and these variations take into account changes in money values since the Act was first passed. There is also a wider provision for regulations which may be required, chiefly because of the need in a model Bill to cover situations that apply only in some other States. However, it should be said that it is not proposed at this stage to make regulations in South Australia prescribing the form of applications for classification and the registration of restricted publications areas. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure. Clause 3 amends section 4 of the principal Act, the interpretation section. The clause inserts definitions of 'category 1 restricted publications' and 'category 2 restricted publications'. Under amendments proposed by clause 6, a restricted publication will automatically attract one of two sets of conditions according to whether it is classified as a category 1 or category 2 restricted publication. Clause 3 also inserts a definition of 'restricted publications area', being any premises or part of any premises established, constructed and managed in accordance with the regulations.

Clause 4 amends section 12 of the principal Act which sets out the criteria to be applied by the board in determining the classification to be assigned to a publication. The clause provides that the board is to have regard to the views of the Minister, in addition to the matters to which it is presently to have regard, in determining the classification of a publication.

Clause 5 amends section 13 of the principal Act which provides that the board is to classify a publication that is offensive according to the terms of the section as a restricted classification publication. Subclause *(a)* widens the category dealing with drugs to include drug misues as well as drug addiction. Subclause *(b)* provides for the two categories of restricted publication. Subclause *(c)* replaces subsection (3) of section 13 of the principal Act. Paragraph *(a)* of the new subsection preserves the effect of the existing subsection (3) and paragraph *(b)* gives the board the right to refuse classification where the publication is particularly offensive.

Clause 6 replaces section 14 of the principal Act. The new section imposes conditions on restricted publications instead of merely providing the board with a discretion to impose conditions as the present section does. The conditions are to be those applying to category 1 restricted publications or category 2 restricted publications. A category 1 restricted publication is to be subject to two conditions, one being that the publication is not to be sold, delivered or displayed to a minor (except by the minor's parent or guardian or with his authority) and the other requiring the publication to be contained in a sealed package if it is displayed in a place to which the public has access other than a restricted publications area.

A category 2 restricted publication is to be subject to five conditions. These are to be, first, a condition that the publication is not to be sold, delivered or displayed to a minor (except by the minor's parent or guardian or with his authority); secondly, a condition that the publication is not to be

sold by retail or displayed or delivered for or on sale by retail except in a restricted publications area; thirdly, a condition that the publication is not to be delivered to a person who has not made a direct request for it; fourthly, a condition that the publication shall not be delivered to a person unless wrapped in opaque material; and, fifthly, a condition that the publication shall not be advertised except in a restricted publications area or by way of printed or written material delivered to a person at the written request of the person.

Clause 7 by subclause *(a)* replaces subsection (1) of section 15 of the principal Act. Under the new subsection the board no longer has power to vary conditions attached to a publication, as these will now be fixed under section 14. Subclause *(b)* makes a consequential amendment to section 15 (2) for the same reason. Clause 8 makes consequential amendments to section 17 of the principal Act.

Clause 9 amends section 18 of the principal Act. Subclauses *(a)*, *(b)* and *(e)* increase penalties provided by section 18. New subsection (3) replaces existing subsection (3). Under new subsection (3) the information to be marked on restricted publications is to be prescribed by regulation. Existing subsection (4) is struck out by the clause as the requirement for the wrapping of restricted publications is now to be dealt with by the conditions that apply as a result of classification. The clause also makes a drafting amendment to subsection (5) designed to make clear that the restricted classification referred to in the subsection is classification as a restricted publication under the principal Act and not a restricted classification under the Film Classification Act. New subsection (6) is an evidentiary provision.

Clause 10 inserts a new section 19a, which provides that a party to a contract for the sale, delivery, exhibition or display of, or any other dealing with, a publication may refuse to proceed with the contract if the board refrains from assigning a classification to the publication or classifies it as a restricted publication.

Clause 11 makes amendments to section 20 that are of a consequential nature. The clause also inserts a new subsection (3) designed to reverse the effect of the Supreme Court decision of *Dunsmore v Tiley* 18 SASR 259. The clause provides that the protection afforded by subsections (1) and (2) from liability for offences relating to obscenity or indecency does not remove the obligation to comply with the provisions of the Film Classification Act. That is, the clause is designed to make it clear that where a film has been classified under the principal Act as a restricted publication, but is not classified under the Film Classification Act, it will be an offence under section 4 of the Film Classification Act to exhibit the film in a theatre and an offence against proposed new section 9a of that Act to make the film available for viewing in the circumstances prescribed by that provision.

Clause 12 amends section 22 of the principal Act which provides for the making of regulations. The clause provides for the fixing of a fee for applications for the classification of publications. The clause provides for the making of regulations regulating the establishment, construction and management of restricted publications areas, including the prevention of access by minors, and for the registration of such areas. The clause also authorises an increase in penalties for offences against the regulations from the present maximum of $200 to a new maximum of $1 000.

Mr ABBOTT secured the adjournment of the debate:

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 1 June. Page 4191.)

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): The Opposition supports this measure and, although two of my colleagues will speak in this debate, I intend to confine my remarks to three aspects. First, it is interesting when one reads the second reading explanation to note the time that has been taken to reach this point. It illustrates the difficulties that are inherent in trying to achieve legislation that is common to all of the States in this Federal situation. The history of the matter makes interesting reading. The National Association of Australian State Road Authorities undertook a study to determine the most appropriate mass and dimension limits for commercial motor vehicles. This would apply possibly nationally or to particular regions of Australia.

We are not told when that study was initiated, but we are told that a report was brought down in November 1975. That report was referred to ATAC, after consideration by the ATAC Advisory Committee on Vehicle Performance and, after consultation with industry, draft regulations incorporating the recommendations were adopted by ATAC in February 1977. Those regulations, in turn, were referred to a State committee that was established to consider commercial vehicle limits in South Australia. The committee has recommended the adoption of draft regulations, with a few minor variations to suit South Australian conditions, and we are now, in the year of grace 1982, legislating to provide a framework for the bringing down of those regulations.

I congratulate the Minister for the speed with which he has been able to adjust himself to the changes of plan. The Government told me at lunch-time today what would happen, and I believe that the Minister was told five minutes ago. The Minister should not draw the conclusion that I am criticising him in any way for the delay, because he has been in on the fag end of this matter. I make the point that we are dealing with something that appears to have been initiated well before 1975. That illustrates the delays and frustrations inherent in trying to achieve a common approach to legislation when dealing with six or more Governments (as the Northern Territory is now involved).

That seems a pity, because either these regulations are important not only to the safety of the people in the industry but also to that of everyone who uses these roads, or they are not. If they are not important, we should not take up the time of this place to debate them: if they are important, it is extraordinary, and in some ways quite unacceptable, that the matter should have taken so long to reach this stage, remembering further that this is not the conclusion. We will set up the legislative framework, and regulations will be brought down. It may well be that the Minister has the regulations ready so that, within a day or so of the Act being proclaimed, they will hit the *Government Gazette*, and the system will be off and operating. I sincerely hope that that is the case, and I imagine that that will occur.

As far as I can see, no blame resides with anyone who is taking part in this debate or with any member of this Parliament, but one wonders why it is not possible to achieve a more streamlined means of introducing such measures. I hope that I am not transgressing and that my following comment will be taken merely as some sort of illustration: I am personally involved at present in a similar matter. I am trying to persuade our Attorney-General and his colleagues in other States to bring down legislation relating to the transfer of prisoners from one prison to another. That is proving to be a very long and involved process. I do not want to go into the details, because I would then be transgressing. However, I raised this matter at the request of one of my constituents whose son is in gaol in New South Wales. It is obvious that it will be a long time before the Governments involved, and possibly the Commonwealth (because sometimes Commonwealth prisoners are involved), will be

in a position to achieve legislation to enable these transfers or exchanges to occur.

Something like that appears to have occurred in this case, and that is a pity. I believe that we must all undertake the responsibility, especially those who are, have been, or in the future might be in a position to negotiate with Ministers in other States or with the Commonwealth, to do all we possibly can to reduce the delays that are inherent in these matters. That is the first point.

Secondly, I would express the opinion that this scheme of legislation and regulations will somehow be able to overcome the continuing problem that seems to exist in the motor vehicle industry in respect of breaches of the law and the problems faced by people whether in Government or in the industry. I doubt very much whether there is one person in this Chamber, except possibly the member for Mitcham (because she is so new to this Chamber—but perhaps even she should be included), who has not been approached at some stage by at least one constituent saying, 'Will you please take up with the Minister of Transport the problem I face in regard to fines incurred as a result of breaching axle bearing regulations or overloading the truck?'

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: It certainly happened to the honourable member's predecessor.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I am sure it did, because that honourable member was here for a long time. I have been in this place for only 12 years, and I have had many such approaches. On one occasion I remember taking a constituent to Mr Geoff Virgo's home one evening to discuss a problem with him. The Minister knows that I have written several letters to him in relation to these matters. Problems seem to be endemic to the industry. I do not want to point the finger and I know that, as long as there are regulations, people will try to beat the system. One wonders why the incidence of that sort of thing is so high in this industry.

I recall on one occasion a gentleman coming to see me not in relation to a breach of regulations but because he had been sold a truck that was a dud. He was having all sorts of problems, and I attempted to negotiate with the vendor of the vehicle. During the course of our conversation, and because it was a matter of some public comment at the time, I said, 'I won't dob you in or anything like that, but what hours do you drive this truck?' He replied, 'I travel from Adelaide to Brisbane. On the return trip, I usually carry sugar, which is not the sort of thing that goes off quickly. So I can have a couple of stops on the way. From Adelaide to Brisbane, I carry durables or something like that, so I drive non-stop.' I am afraid that I no longer have that gentleman as a constituent.

I do not know whether his death on a Victorian country road was on the way to Brisbane or on the way back from Brisbane. I felt extremely upset about the whole thing, and I have attempted to assist his widow from time to time with problems that have arisen as a result of the untimely death of her husband. It is quite possible that that man went to sleep at the wheel because he had driven for so long without a rest. Of course, he was technically in breach of certain regulations. These problems exist in the industry, and it is important that people who are involved in an administrative sense do what they can to assist. It is also important that we as legislators do what we can do to assist, while at the same time making perfectly clear that, where there are regulations, they must be obeyed.

The only specific point to which I refer and which will be taken up further by my colleagues who will speak in this debate is in relation to the tolerance factor that is to be written into the legislation in regard to primary producers. I understand that, for 3½ years after the bringing down of the regulations, primary producers will have a 20 per cent tolerance factor for the gross vehicle mass limits.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Not on actual limits.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: No, on the gross vehicle mass limits. I thought that I quoted the text of the Bill correctly, and I am glad to have the Minister's assurance that that is the case. For an additional 6½ years, there will be a 10 per cent tolerance factor. At the end of 10 years, these people will be on an all-square footing with everyone else in the community. I do not criticise that, but, for one thing, in the Minister's second reading explanation we have not been given any real justification why that should happen, so I invite the Minister, either when he responds to this debate or at the appropriate time in Committee, to bring forward some justification why that tolerance will be or is being offered. The Opposition will address that matter on its merits. However, that matter aside, we support the Bill.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I wish to refer briefly to the load limit changes of regulations and their effect. Sometimes I believe that we may be unfair to one group or that we legislate to cover one group and not another.

It is true that many heavy vehicles are involved in the committing of offences against the laws that this Parliament has made. Sometimes they are quite deliberate offences, because the rates paid by the major national transport companies which have the contracts for the haulage of a lot of goods in this country are so low that they force the private operators of vehicles, very often with massive hire-purchase agreements, into a position of having to carry loads greater than those allowed by law, or they are forced to go right up to the limit in the hope of making their operation pay. Usually, the prime mover is owned or is being paid for by the operator and the pantechnicon, freezer unit or trailer unit is owned by the major haulage company.

There is no doubt in my mind that the companies screw the operators down to a very low price in many cases, to a point that they have some difficulty in surviving economically. I do not say that that is the case with all companies; some of them give their operators a reasonable figure. That is the first point that I wanted to make, and it is one reason why the operators run right up to the limit of the law with weights and also driving hours, because the quicker they can get to a point the more likelihood there is of unloading in time to get a return load.

Also, sometimes the principal contractor guarantees to a person or company taking a contract that the goods will be delivered by a certain time, and this occurs particularly with perishable goods or goods that are required by clients at a certain time for re-delivery or distribution in capital cities. In such cases it becomes imperative that an operator travelling between, say, Adelaide and Melbourne reaches his destination sufficiently early to unload and enable an early distribution of the goods so that they are available in the city of delivery during the same day. Further, an operator might be striving to arrive and unload as early as possible so that he can get another load and return, even if in doing so he uses up the proper rest periods. That is also a part of the problem.

Sometimes the law is unfair with regard to this aspect. If a person loads, say, soil at night and cannot unload it until the next moring and an inch or more rain falls overnight, the difference in the weight of the load is considerable by the next morning. If such a person happened to be stopped by a patrol in those circumstances he could be liable to a considerable penalty. In addition, viability of an operation could be affected if the haulage distance of the load is short.

Another problem concerns the collection of material from a pit where there is no weighbridge and where one tries to estimate the weight by cubic metres. Cubic metre weight varies with different materials; soil nearer the surface has a

different weight from that of soil taken from some depth and it also varies due to the consistency of the soil and its silicon content as opposed to finer clay content or dampness. The ability to estimate the weight accurately enough is very difficult. The argument, of course, would be 'Why don't they load it to a less extent to guarantee that the load is not over the limit, so that they are not penalised if they happen to be pulled up before they can get to a weighbridge or before they are checked?

Of course in many parts of the State they are not checked, as there are no weighbridges between the pick-up point and delivery point, and a check can be made only if a driver goes off his route. By doing this not only does the operator increase costs but if he passes them on they affect the rest of the economy. In that area also the law becomes very difficult to abide by. Unfortunately, the penalties are heavy enough if one is caught a couple of times to put one out of business. One might argue that, even with Government contracts, the amount that the Highways Department or local government pays in cartage rates per kilometre tonne is so low that one has to take the load up to the point of virtually breaking the law to have a chance of surviving with a viable proposition. So, on the one hand, we have Parliament making the laws, and the Government has a controlling interest or a control through numbers (I am talking not about the present Government but about Governments, *per se*, over the years), it's departments keeping the price down to such a low level for the cartage contractor that they virtually force him to break the law if he is to survive as a viable operator. That is unfair but it is what happens.

Of course, some of these people who cart sheep for long distances argue that if there is heavy rain for the whole journey the weight of the load will increase considerably. Also, I draw another comparison: last weekend I was talking to a young man who had ridden a motor cycle direct from Brisbane to Adelaide. If such a person conforms to the law as far as speed is concerned, his or her travelling time is not that much less than that of a haulage contractor nowadays with their high-powered vehicles; haulage contractors can now pull heavy loads through the Hills because of the massive power of their vehicles, and can do so at quite a high speed, keeping very close to the speed limits. If both the haulage contractor and the motor cyclist conform to the law, the time period of delivery or travel from, say, Brisbane to Adelaide is little different—it might be two or three hours, but the man or woman on the motor bike could be just as tired, just as vulnerable to an accident or just as liable to force someone else to take an action to avoid one as would be the truck operator.

Some would argue that, if a truck hits a vehicle or runs into a house, that would do more damage or cause more deaths than would occur in an accident involving a motor cycle. That is true, but also there are people who drive motor cars long distances, city to city, and drive continuously without changing drivers. They are just as dangerous on the roads as are truck drivers. It has been proven that a truck's braking power is better than that of the average sedan, whether a truck is empty or fully laden. Members of Parliament might recall the tests that were taken in a northern section of the city which involved testing the braking power of trucks or semi-trailers laden or unladen. It was found that the ability of a truck to pull up was greater than that of the average family sedan. So, people driving motor vehicles at high speeds can just as easily involve other motorists, including semi-trailer operators, in accidents, yet we do nothing with the law in that area.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: I know which vehicle I would rather be in in the case of a collision.

Mr EVANS: That is true on the plains, but in the hills I would not like to be in either of them. With all the tonnage behind, the braking power is gone. I think the honourable member would realise that the end result would be catastrophic. It could be a service bus that is hit by a driver travelling such distances. The law applies to the drivers of service buses as well. So, I just wish to make the point that we never attempt to cover that area because we are interfering with the private motorist and we do not really think he counts.

In the case of driving long distances, allowing time for rest, and so on, one of the main problems involves drivers who are prepared to take 'yippee beans', if I can use that term. They are the danger people, because they are drugging themselves; eventually, it catches up with them and they are in real trouble. That area is hard to discipline and hard to control; in fact, it is virtually impossible. It is an act of irresponsibility, but we as a Parliament can only talk about it; there is little we can do about it. Those who take dope, hoping to keep themselves awake for long distance driving, are breaking the law but the drugs also are affecting their judgment.

As I have said many times, our buses in this State are overweight. The axle limits fully are far beyond what is allowed private truck operators. The argument is that we cannot make the buses any lighter, because we want them to last and carry as many passengers as possible. We lose millions of dollars a year through our State Transport Authority because of the high cost of purchase, operation, and so on. So, we do not mind if the taxpayer pays to subsidise the buses, even though they are overweight and would break the law if they were run by private operators.

For many years they have been over the width by about 6 inches. Now they can go to 8 ft 2½ inches, and they are only 3½ inches over width. If a private operator buys one it must be cut down the middle, and 3 inches must be cut off; it has to come off the middle, and not the edges, although I do not know why.

It is strange that we do this and then say, 'Why do we have weight limits?' We have weight limits because we have not built our roads to a satisfactory standard to carry heavier weights. We make sure that the S.T.A. buses travel mainly on roads built to a standard that will stand their weight. I can give examples of little old roads in the hills that are macadamised and have a bit of black over the top of them. S.T.A. buses go along those routes, and I do not want to see them move, because people need the service. If a truck driver was following them he would be booked and the bus driver, or the S.T.A., would not.

The vehicles that we are using to cart goods are in many cases the same sort of power units as S.T.A. buses, produced in the Continent where the load limit over the axle is much higher than in this country. So, the vehicle is produced to carry heavier weights over the axle on roads that are satisfactory. Our problem is that we have not got our roads up to a satisfactory level. We have departments and other operators trying to screw our owner operators down to an unsatisfactory economic level, to a point where they break the law.

It comes back to that point, Sir: if we make laws to control one area we have to take an interest in putting some form of fixed price as a minimum amount paid to an operator for a tonne-kilometre cartage rate. That is something that most Governments, regardless of political philosophy, do not like to tackle, because it is hard to police. Once a restriction is imposed in one area it is necessary to some degree to consider the other area. We do not often get an opportunity to talk about this subject, although I have been concerned about it for some time. I support what the Minister is doing. It is an improvement and in the rural sector I

believe it is fair that the opportunity be given to change. People there do not buy a vehicle as a contractor does, using it for several years, running up a great number of miles, and disposing of it. Those vehicles can last 20 years or more because of the distances they travel. They are used only in season, carting short distances, and the capital cost cannot be written off quickly enough; in fact, it is not economic for the whole State, let alone the industry, to write them off too quickly when they have travelled such short distances. There should be a lenient period to make effective use of the capital invested in those areas for the total economy of the State when we have to compete with other States and other parts of the world.

I support what the Minister is doing, but I wish to have on record the reasons why the industry has suffered. I know, because I was on the fringe of it during the early part of my life and suffered by it when I had to drive distances in such vehicles.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): As indicated by the member for Baudin, the Opposition will not oppose the Bill. However, before I get to that, let me say that the member for Florey, who was to have taken charge of this Bill, is in hospital. I know that all members on both sides of the House would wish him well. We hope to see him back on deck very shortly.

Turning now to the Bill, it has been pointed out that the recommendations of ATAC which are contained in the Ministers second reading explanation and on which I will not elaborate, indicate the reasons for the measure. The member for Fisher has explained some of the problems in relation to axle loadings. As a South-East lad myself, I had contact with a great many of those—

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: The Tantanoola tiger.

Mr HAMILTON: No, that is more like my colleague the member for Hartley who comes from that area; I come from a bigger area, from Mount Gambier, an area I know well. The Minister would recognise the problems in the South-East with the various types of industry. Many years ago I came across the question of the log contractors, who carted their logs from the various mills and the areas in which the logs were felled. I recall many contractors and subcontractors expressing their hostility at being fined for being overloaded. They may have loaded 20 or 30 logs onto their trucks, some of them being dry, but others being green timber. To their dismay they were over loaded and incurred very heavy penalties. The other question was—

Mr Slater: They must have kept a log book.

Mr HAMILTON: Right. The other question concerns the large freight forwarders in this country. I believe there are pressures on some of the contractors who cart from the railheads to the various localities, various business houses, the big containers transported from one capital city to another. I know from my experience in the railway industry that on many occasions we found that these containers were overloaded on the rail. The freight forwarder estimated the tonnage contained within the containers, but when we weighed them we found that in many instances they were overweight.

Of course, when the containers are unloaded at the railhead the subcontractors are quick off the mark in coupling up their prime movers, and away they go. The member for Fisher explained some of the problems that subcontractors are confronted with. If they are not quick off the mark the contractor is down on them like the proverbial ton of bricks.

The other matter the member for Fisher touched on (and he obviously has some experience in and knowledge of the transport industry) was the pressures brought to bear on some truck drivers to drive for long hours. As a youth in Mount Gambier I can recall many of my friends being killed on the Mount Gambier to Melbourne and the Adelaide to Sydney and return runs because of the pressures brought to bear by some of the contractors for them to get back, or because of the amount of money they were paid for each run, so that the more runs they did per week or fortnight the more money they brought home in their pay packet. As the member for Baudin pointed out, many truck drivers lost their lives because of that situation.

I turn now to clause 8 of the Bill which inserts new sections 146 to 150, upon which, no doubt, the member for Price will elaborate later. This involves the question of a prime mover being owned by a subcontractor and the trailer by a company or companies involved with the various commodities transported. The incompatibility of some of these trailers with the prime mover is another matter that the Minister might care to elaborate on. What controls will be, or have been, introduced to ensure that these trailers not only are compatible with the turntable but also with the air brake equipment and the side lighting on the trailers themselves? I feel sure that the member for Price will elaborate on this point at length because of a situation that arose in his electorate.

The member for Fisher touched on the subject of rural producers. I recall reading an article which appeared in the Farmers and Stockowners journal of January this year. I take particular notice of what is said in these articles, because the question of transport and the way it affects the man on the land is of prime importance to members on both sides of the Parliament. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1) (1982)

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to apply, out of Consolidated Account, the sum of $290 000 000 for the Public Service of the State for the financial year ending 30 June 1983. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill provides for the appropriation of $290 000 000 to enable the Public Service of the State to be carried on during the early part of next financial year. In the absence of special arrangements in the form of the Supply Acts, there would be no Parliamentary authority for appropriations required between the commencement of the new financial year and the date on which assent is given to the main Appropriation Bill. It is customary for the Government to present two Supply Bills each year, the first covering estimated expenditure during July and August and the second covering the remainder of the period prior to the Appropriation Bill becoming law.

Members will notice that this Bill provides for an amount greater than the $260 000 000 provided by the first Supply Act last year. The increase of $30 00 000 is needed to provide for the higher levels of costs faced by the Government. I believe this Bill should suffice until the latter part of August when it will be necessary to introduce a second Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 provides for the issue and application of up to $290 000 000. Clause 4 imposes limitations on the issue and application of this amount. Clauses 5 and 6 provide the normal borrowing powers for the capital works programme and for temporary purposes, if required.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1) (1982)

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act for the further appropriation of moneys from Consolidated Account for the financial year ending 30 June 1982, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

In doing so, I propose to make a few brief comments about the State's general financial position before explaining the items in the Supplementary Estimates. I will give a detailed account of the financial operations for 1981-82 when I introduce the 1982-83 Budget to the House later this year. In presenting the Budget to the House last September, I said that the Government planned for a small deficit of $3 000 000 on the operations of the Consolidated Account for 1981-82. I pointed out to members that this would increase the accumulated deficit of $6 600 000 recorded as at 30 June 1981, to $9 600 000 at 30 June 1982.

With three weeks of the financial year still to go, there remain some uncertainties which make it difficult to predict with confidence the final Budget outcome for 1981-82. For instance, the Commonwealth Government has yet to give the States final advice of the stocks it will allocate to finance their borrowings under the Australian Loan Council programme, and the interest payable thereon. However, present indications are that, without any special new provisions, a surplus of more than $10 000 000 could be achieved on the operations of the Consolidated Account for 1981-82.

The major contributing factor in this anticipated surplus on Consolidated Account is an improved position on the capital account. Departmental recoveries and repayments are now likely to exceed budget by about $10 000 000, largely as a result of greater than expected receipts from land sales and the early repayment of advances under the Loans to Producers Act by two South Australian co-operatives following their corporate restructuring. For several reasons, including a steady reduction in the labour force, competitive tendering for many contracts and work not proceeding as quickly as originally anticipated, it now seems likely that an underspending of some $10 000 000 may emerge on payments. Before I detail the proposed appropriations contained in this Bill, it is fitting that I pay a tribute to the South Australian Public Service for the way in which it has worked towards this anticipated Budget result.

This financial year has been another one where finances have had to be controlled tightly. Stringency has been the byword of 1981-82. I appreciate the co-operation of departmental heads in facing considerable challenges of the past two years. The two main challenges have been:

1. The need to reduce manpower numbers within the public sector. This objective was endorsed by mandate from the 1979 election, and was given even greater urgency by continuing shortfall in Federal-State tax sharing. The objective is being achieved without retrenchment and the credit must go to Public Service managers—not only heads of departments, but also middle management.

2. The need to introduce p.p.b. and adopt a cost-benefit approach. 'It is easy to manage by expansion; it is a great challenge to manage by contraction.' Taxpayers have benefited by savings from these initiatives and I recognise the enormous effort the Public Service has put in to implement this programme. Programmed performance budgeting is now regarded by its members as an essential management tool.

Because of this effort by South Australia's public sector managers, our anticipated 1981-82 Budget result compares favourably with the situation in other States, in that we have done better than was expected on Consolidated Account. The States of Queensland and Western Australia, assisted by their royalty income, may well end up with near-balanced Budgets.

It looks as though New South Wales will end the financial year with a deficit on recurrent account of at least $100 000 000 more than expected and Victoria at least $70 000 000 more than expected on recurrent account—despite both of these States imposing and now apparently maintaining a 1 per cent increase in their pay-roll tax for pay-rolls over $1 000 000 per annum. Likewise, Tasmania is looking towards a larger than expected deficit on recurrent account this year of over $30 000 000. Therefore, our result can bring some satisifaction both to the Government and to members of the South Australian Public Service. It is appropriate to place on record, too, the Government's great appreciation of the fine work by the Under Treasurer and his officers and the Chairman of the Public Service Board and the officers of his department.

As to the expected surplus of about $10 000 000 on the 1981-82 operations of the Consolidated Account, the Government proposes to apply it towards meeting inescapable capital repayments for Monarto and commitments for Riverland Fruit Products Co-operative Ltd (receivers and managers appointed). Members will recall that my Government brought out the Commonwealth Government's interest in Monarto ($15 100 000, including capitalised interest) for $5 100 000 in 1980. Land sales are expected to realise over $5 000 000 in 1981-82. We have used part of the proceeds of those sales to recover State loan funds advanced to the project ($2 500 000) and now propose to redeem part of the semi-government borrowings which presently stand at $7 700 000. We propose to set aside up to $3 000 000 in 1981-82 towards the redemption of those borrowings as they fall due. Proceeds from the sale of remaining land at Monarto will be applied, first towards redeeming debt and only when all debt has been discharged will the excess be used in the Budget.

Regarding Riverland, all members are aware of the difficult circumstances which surround the canned deciduous fruit industry in Australia and the Riverland cannery at Berri in particular. Considerable financial assistance has been provided to the cannery over recent years, and now the sharp downturn in market demand for canned deciduous fruit has created even greater problems for the cannery. The cannery is incurring large losses, due in part to its highly geared capital structure. The Government has left no stone unturned in attempting to find a practical solution to the problem which the this Government inherited, being acutely aware that there is a limit to which taxpayers' money can be used in these circumstances.

The Government now has a number of commitments to meet with respect to the operation of the cannery, which has been continued in the public interest, and in the hope that some solution can be found. These are:

1. Payment of $2 100 000 (with interest) is now due to the State Bank of South Australia as part of an agreement to reduce its financial involvement in the cannery which has placed some strain on the bank's liquidity position.
2. A liability for $3 900 000, being an advance (by way of a State Bank commercial bill line) to the co-operative by Riverland Fruit Products Investments Ltd—a company wholly owned by the former South Australian Development Corporation, whose administrative functions were absorbed by the Department of Trade and Industry.
3. Receivership losses which are guaranteed by the Government are expected to amount to some $7 500 000 at 30 June 1982.

The present intention is to allocate as much as practicable this financial year to make payment to the State Bank,

redeem the commercial bills and meet part of the receivership losses.

The extent to which that allocation can be met under Special Act authority is not clear at the moment and accordingly some special provision is being sought also under the line Minister of Industrial Affairs—Miscellaneous. The Industries Assistance Commission is undertaking an inquiry into the industry on an Australia-wide basis. It recently issued an interim report with a final report expected before the end of 1982.

Finally, the Government is seeking appropriation for one other purpose which will have no effect on the outcome of the Consolidated Account. In November last, after considerable negotiation, we reached an agreement with the Commonwealth Government with respect to the South Australian Land Commission (now the South Australian Urban Land Trust). In brief, the Commonwealth Government agreed that:

For a payment of $36 000 000, it would relinquish in full its interest in the commission ($89 000 000, including capitalised interest, at 30 June 1981). It would accept three instalments: $25 000 000 in 1981-82 and $5 500 000 in each of the two succeeding financial years.

The Supplementary Estimates seek the necessary appropriation to make the first payment of $25 000 000. It will be offset by the payment of a corresponding amount into the Consolidated Account by the South Australian Urban Land Trust before 30 June 1982. As a result of all these proposed transfers to meet previously incurred commitments, the Consolidated Account is expected to show an approximate balance in 1981-82 and thus the accumulated deficit of $6 600 000, recorded at 30 June 1981, will remain virtually unchanged as at 30 June 1982.

Appropriation

Turning now to the question of Appropriation, members will be aware that, early in each financial year, Parliament grants the Government of the day Appropriation by means of the Principal Appropriation Act supported by the Estimates of Payments. If these allocations prove insufficient, there are four other sources of authority which provide for supplementary expenditure, namely, a special section of the same Appropriation Act, the Governor's Appropration Fund, a transfer of Appropriation from another purpose, and a further Appropriation Bill supported by Supplementary Estimates.

Appropriation Act—Special Section 7 (1) and (2)

The main Appropriation Act contains a provision which gives additional authority to meet increased costs resulting from wage awards. This special authority is being called upon this year to cover most of the cost of a number of salary and wage determinations, with a small amount being met from within the original appropriations. However, it is available to cover only these increases in salary and wage rates which are formally handed down by a recognised wage-fixing authority and which are payable in the current financial year.

The main Appropriation Act also contains a provision which gives additional authority to meet increased electricity charges for pumping water. Tariffs have increased at a rate greater than that provided for in the Budget and there will be a call on this Special Appropriation.

Governor's Appropriation Fund

Another source of appropriation authority is the Governor's Appropriation Fund which, in terms of the Public Finance Act, may be used to cover additional expenditure. The operation of this fund was explained fully to members when I introduced the Bill to amend the Public Finance Act in December 1980. The appropriation available in the Governor's Appropriation Fund is being used this year to cover nearly all individual excesses above allocations.

Transfer of Appropriation

The Public Finance Act provides for adjustments to the amount of moneys appropriated from Consolidated Account so that excess money for one purpose may be transferred to another purpose where there is a deficiency. No such transfers are proposed this year.

Supplementary Estimates

Where payments additional to the Budget Estimates cannot be met from the special section of the Appropriation Act or covered by savings in other areas, and where excesses are too large to be met from the Governor's Appropriation Fund, Supplementary Estimates must be presented. They may also be used as a means of informing Parliament of particularly significant Budget developments even though extra appropriation authority is not technically required. The details of the Supplementary Estimates are as follows:

Treasurer—Miscellaneous

As I mentioned a moment ago, the Government has negotiated a settlement with the Commonwealth Government with respect to its interest in the former South Australian Land Commission. Appropriation is sought now to enable the first instalment of $25 000 000 to be paid.

Minister of Industrial Affairs, Miscellaneous

The appropriation of $7 500 000 now sought is in accordance with my explanation about Riverland Fruit Products Co-operative Limited.

Minister of Health, Miscellaneous

The revenues of health units from patients' fees are now likely to be much less than originally planned. New fee arrangements came into operation on 1 September 1981, and all States are in difficulty because their actual revenues are running well below the estimates determined by the Commonwealth after consultation with the States. Also, health units have been unable to reduce the cost of medical and pathology services to the extent anticipated. As a result of these factors, it is likely that an additional $9 000 000 of State funds will be required by the Health Commission in 1981-82.

Minister of Lands, Miscellaneous

The appropriation of $3 000 000 now sought is in accordance with my explanation with respect to the repayment of semi-government borrowings for Monarto.

I lay on the table the Supplementary Estimates of Expenditure, 1981-82, and move:

That the paper be printed.

Ordered to be printed.

Mr BANNON secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1) (1982)

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 4461.)

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I intend to be very brief when speaking to this Supply Bill. A number of my colleagues will contribute on matters related to it. I simply want to direct attention to the Bill itself and indicate the Opposition's support for it. It is proper and usual custom

for the Government to secure Supply at the end of one financial year to carry it through the period July and August of the next ensuing financial year. As is pointed out, a second Supply Bill is introduced in the latter part of August to cover that period between the introduction of the Budget and its being passed in about November.

In his second reading speech, the Premier and Treasurer drew attention to the fact that the Bill provides $30 000 000 more than was provided in the first Supply Act last year. That is an increase of 11.5 per cent, which would seem to equate fairly accurately with the expected level of inflation and cost increases that may occur, taken over the equivalent period last year. It is interesting to look at that figure. We have had some horror talk at various times by the Premier about costs to Government, particularly wage costs. There has been quite a bit of grandstanding and, indeed, stick waving on occasions over wage claims and their possible effect.

It is interesting that in the current Budget an increase of about 14 per cent was predicted. Apparently, 11.5 per cent suffices for the inflation factor in this Supply Bill. So, a lot of those predictions of shock and horror will prove either illusory in the Government's view or some further emergency provision will have to be made. Which of those statements is true is yet to be discovered, although I think the basis of that 11.5 per cent should be explained by the Premier in any reply that he gives.

My second point is that last year the increase between the two Supply Bills was $40 000 000, or about 18 per cent. In his explanation of that the Premier mentioned, as he does on this occasion, that the increase was needed to provide for the higher levels of costs faced by the Government. Incidentally, now that the Premier is back in his seat, I refer to the basis of the 11.5 per cent increase provided this year as opposed to last year. I realise that this is to cover inflation and higher costs, but if the Premier could in his reply elaborate on what areas and inflation predictions the Government is using as the basis for it, that would be useful.

Last year the provision was for an 18 per cent increase over the previous year. Although one of the reasons given was the higher level of costs, the Premier also mentioned a factor for consolidation of the two accounts. That factor presumably has been worked through on this occasion and does not require separate reference. It may account for the reduction in the amount both in actual money terms and in percentage increases. But, that is another thing that the Premier may be able to cover in his explanation. With those few remarks, I indicate the Opposition's support for the carriage of this Supply Bill.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): I support the Bill. It gives me an opportunity to raise certain matters which, for the most part, come within the province of the Minister of Environment and Planning. The Bill appropriates certain revenue for this State and, of course, the Minister's department will no doubt be involved in the expenditure of at least some of that. Therefore, I take the opportunity to comment on certain aspects of the ongoing work of the department which, for the most part, as in all Government departments, comes to the surface or is made manifest by way of expenditure of certain funds.

First, the House will be aware that only earlier this afternoon I asked a question of the Minister in relation to wet lands creation in the South-East of the State. I do not think it can be denied that there has been a desiccation of the South-East. Certainly, it is true that there has been a general reduction of surface water in the South-East as a result of the digging of channels associated with the South-Eastern Drainage Scheme. I am not quarrelling with the general concept of that. It would not have been possible to bring the South-East into any sort of productive capacity without considerable draining of the low lands in that area. What people are saying, on the other hand, is that the matter has gone too far.

I believe that I detected, when I asked a question of the Minister, some sort of whispered advice to him from his colleague, the Minister of Education, who of course is the member for Mount Gambier, in relation to my contention that there had been some deterioration in the aquifers in the area. I do not know whether the Minister has information that is not available to me. As I said at the time, these matters are subject to the vagaries of the climate. But, of course, the Minister would be well aware that there is no longer a body of water at Mount Gambier called the Leg of Mutton Lake.

The Hon. H. Allison: It hasn't been there since 1954.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Precisely. But it was once.

The Hon. H. Allison: The aquifer level has fallen about 16 ft in the last 25 years.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Is it not the point that I am trying to make?

The Hon. H. Allison: But you drained it.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: In part, that is true. Is the Minister trying to suggest that the South-Eastern Drainage Scheme does not pre-date the Labor Government? I refer him to that report that the then Premier, the Hon. Des Corcoran, released at the very first country Cabinet meeting.

The Hon. H. Allison: I was one of those who initiated an inquiry in 1964.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: In that case, the Minister should be well aware of the contents of the report, the antiquity of the scheme and just how old some of the drains are. He should also realise that this process has been going on for a very long time. It is not only true that the Leg of Mutton Lake has dried up: it is also true that one of the two Valley Lakes has almost gone. That must surely be a response to the general drying up of the upper aquifers. As I understand, there are two basic levels. The Blue Lake carries the discharge from a lower aquifer which enters the ground somewhere around Mount Burr or to the north of Mount Burr.

The Hon. H. Allison: Kingston.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Possibly as far north as that. Because it is a lower aquifer, it is less susceptible to what is happening on the surface. That is why there has been little appreciable difference in the level of the Blue Lake. Because of the draining of the surface, there has been a drastic reduction in the amount of water in the upper aquifer, and the manifestation of that is seen in what has happened to the Valley Lakes and the Leg of Mutton lake. If there is some sophistication there that I am missing, I will be glad if the Minister corrects me, but I do not think there is.

I have read the report to which I referred, and it rather took my fancy. It was pointed out that, in the last century, because of the enormous amount of water, people would take bets as to whether or not it was possible to travel by canoe from Dismal Swamp to the Murray mouth without requiring any portage at any stage of the journey. I am not aware that anyone tried to do that, but the fact that people were prepared to speculate on that possibility illustrates how much surface water was around the place.

The removal of that surface water, while obviously having a considerable effect on the productive capacity of the South-East, has had two deleterious effects, one on the amount of available underground water, and the other on the amount of wet lands that are available for either conservation purposes (which, of course, is my main concern) or for gaming purposes. The latter is of a lesser concern for me, as I can

never understand why anyone would want to take a gun and shoot anything.

Mr Lewis: Or me.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The member for Mallee would have very good reason for agreeing with me—unless we are dealing with pests that are difficult to eradicate in any other way! In fact, it is true that people who are involved in the hunting of game have been prepared from time to time to give support to conservation matters, and it is good to have their support in the thrust to set up wet lands. My colleague in another place, Dr Cornwall, was written to recently, probably in the mistaken impression that he was still Minister or perhaps that he was a Minister in the Liberal Government. The writer of the letter appears to have been aware that there had been a change of Government. Nonetheless, he also seems to be addressing my colleague as the Minister.

This gentleman from Keith wrote to my colleague regarding section 85 in the hundred of Laffer. I will neither quote directly from the letter nor give the gentleman's name, but I will use what is said here as the basis of my remarks in the next minute or so. This gentleman points out that, about two years ago, Dr Cornwall's department (and he may well be talking about the Department of Environment and Planning prior to the change of Government) endeavoured to secure his block of land to retain beautiful wet lands swamps.

The gentleman was approached through the department to place some of the land under a heritage agreement. Apparently, the department asked for about 400 to 500 acres. The gentleman agreed to that proposition, provided that he could get some assistance in obtaining a loan from the Rural Assistance Branch (I am not sure whether he meant the bank or some aspect of the Department of Agriculture) to buy the property opposite that which he already owned.

The point is that that land is all low country. Last year, in the very wet season, it was seven-eights flooded and, if that gentleman were to enter into a heritage agreement, he would be left with no land with any productive capacity at all. His proposition was to the effect that, if he could buy the higher land opposite his property, he would be only too happy to enter into a heritage agreement in relation to the land, but he required assistance by way of a loan. The Government was not prepared to give that assistance.

That gentleman went on to say that, so far as he was concerned, the freckled duck, the wild geese and other native bird life could 'all go to hell because now we will clear the lot'. The following indicates why he believes Dr Cornwall is still the Minister. He went on to say:

> We tried to help you in your cause and retain these valuable areas . . .

The gentleman, who is interested in entering into an arrangement with the Government in relation to a heritage area in this very important matter of wet lands protection, has been rebuffed. My colleague has written to the Minister of Environment and Planning in relation to this matter, and I take the opportunity to raise the issue in the hope that the Minister can do something. It would be good to have this area so dedicated.

The Hon. H. Allison: It would be nice to know whether he has the genius to tell us how to retain water at the surface on a limestone plateau, which is the largest in the world. If he solves that problem, he solves it all.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I am not sure what impact that matter has on the issue to which I refer. This man has a swamp, and he is only too happy for the Government to take it over. However, he would like a little bit of assistance to obtain some productive land so that he can still make a quid, and he has been rebuffed in this matter. It may well be that the Department of Environment and Planning may consider it unusual for this to take place. The department is not in the business of negotiating with banks or the Department of Agriculture in relation to some sort of assistance for a rural producer. Let us show a little bit of flexibility.

I can now see what the Minister was getting at in his interjection. My point is that it is not necessary that the water be retained at the surface. I am more interested in the recharge of the underground aquifers than in the retention of the surface water.

The Hon. H. Allison: To do that, one would have to stop the growing of pine trees, irrigation and the entry of people: just close down the South-East.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I am sure that it is not necessary to close down the South-East. We are talking about certain selected areas which can be chosen and which can be subject to this sort of treatment. The point is that there was a time when a good deal of the South-East was under wet lands. Nature had created that situation, but we have dispensed with it. It is not impossible to reactivate it. A good deal of the water would obviously be lost to the underground aquifers because there is a calcareous soil and limestone underneath. So what? It is all part of trying to get water back into the aquifer.

Perhaps the Minister may eventually see the return of the Leg of Mutton Lake. Who knows? In any event, I have taken too much time on this matter. I hope that the Government is looking at it very seriously (as the Minister says it is) and that the Minister is doing more than simply talking to his colleagues in other States. I hope that he is talking directly to landowners in the area with a view to getting something done. If honourable members opposite would like to talk to their colleague, the member for Victoria, they would find that he has expressed a good deal of interest in this matter in the area and has supported it.

I refer now to a matter that concerns not the Minister of Environment and Planning but the Minister of Lands. I have received a letter from Dr Twidale of the Department of Geography at the Adelaide University. I do not have the time to quote the letter in full, but I will quote the core of it. Writing to me as shadow Minister of Lands, the title of the letter being 'Charges for use of air photographs,' Dr Twidale states:

> 1. Up to about 10 months ago it was possible to borrow air photographs from the Lands Department on signature and for reasonable periods without charge. This facility was greatly appreciated (though I venture to suggest that as with so many things we did not fully appreciate our good fortune until the situation changed) and made possible a great deal of research both for staff and students at the university. Many projects that were undertaken depended on our ability to examine air photographs at reasonable leisure and in the university, with other information and maps available. Now a charge of $1.50 per photo per week has been imposed. The alternative, which is a necessity if extended field work is contemplated, is to purchase the photographs at roughly twice the loan price.
>
> 2. Last year I approached the Minister explaining how disastrous is the new arrangement, and in particular how it would inhibit and curtail research in the State. I pointed out that it would particularly affect postgraduate students. I pointed out that we have already paid for photos through taxes. I pointed out that the immediate 'user pays' principle is not applied everywhere (for example, in the public library system; in the matter of use of Government cars for Ministers and the upper echelons of the Public Service) but to no avail. He remains adamant.
>
> 3. After attempting to use the new system in connection with my field work, and attempting to organise field work for some of my students, I am confirmed in the view that the costs involved are horrific and will seriously curtail genuine research. Moreover, the system is wasteful: many air photographs will be used once and then stored; yet they are required that once, perhaps only to provide negative evidence.

The letter goes on to ask whether I can do something about it. This seems to be to be an example of a very niggardly attitude on behalf of this government. The effect of the charge will not substantially lift the revenue; it will not

mean the difference between the Treasury being in surplus or deficit at the end of the financial year. However, the charge does create problems for students and, having been a student in my time, I know just how pushed one is for cash for all sorts of reasons, let alone because one has to meet these sorts of imposts. Let us remember that the photographs might be needed for some period of time, so we are talking about more than simply $1.50, because it is $1.50 per photo per week.

I take this opportunity, the first I have really had, to raise the matter with the Minister of Lands. I hope that he would take notice of what Dr Twidale, a person of very high repute in our academic community has said, and also what I am saying and that he will reverse this decision to impose this charge on our young geography students, some of whom, no doubt, aspire to work in the Department of Lands, the Department of Environment and Planning, the Department of Agriculture, or somewhere like that once they have graduated, when, it is hoped, the Government will see the benefits of the experience and study that they are getting right now. In a small way, the removal of the charge is some sort of investment in our future.

It is necessary that I return to the matter of scrub clearance to which I have referred from time to time in debates like this. I refer in particular to the matter of the land at Ridgeway Hill, or Newland Head, a matter that I have raised in this place on three or four occasions. First, the matter is extremely clouded, although I think I must concede that I have generally lost the battle; that the Minister is adamant. There has been some discussion from time to time that the Goverment is negotiating, or has already negotiated, some sort of arrangement with the particular landowner involved. That has not been subject to any clarification from the Government and, in any event, whenever I have raised the matter in the House the Minister has made clear that the Government is not prepared in any way to purchase any of the land in question.

There are two disturbing facts involving this matter which it is necessary that I place before the House. These are matters that I do not think I have really raised to any great extent previously. The first, of course, refers to the fact that this land was recommended for listing as a national heritage item. The matter was referred to Canberra, and then the landowner exercised his rights under the legislation to appeal. While the appeal was pending, he proceeded to clear the land. Again, I point out that it is not clear to me whether in fact the clearing has proceeded to the ultimate, whether there is nothing left or whether there is something that can be preserved.

Mr Lewis: Where is that again?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: At Newland Head or Ridgeway Hill, to the eastern end of Waitpinga Beach, or, if one likes, to the west of Victor Harbor, on the south coast on Fleurieu Peninsula. I telephoned someone in Canberra in relation to this matter to obtain what I could of the Heritage Commission's attitude to the whole matter. I made no bones about who I was or why I was ringing. Having been given this information I said, 'Well, isn't that some sort of defect in the system that you are operating?' Why cannot everyone whose property is wholly or in part subject to listing work this dodge, that is, simply put in an appeal and, while the appeal is pending, clear the land, and then there is no point in any sort of listing taking place? The gentleman said, 'Well, I have to agree with you; it is true that this is a deficiency in the system.' It is in fact so much a deficiency as to make the whole system somewhat of a farce. It means that the system works where people of goodwill are invovled. The second point is perhaps more serious. I do not want to be particulary critical of the landowner involved because he offered the land to the Government as a conservation park and—

Mr Lewis: You can't buy everything.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: —the Government turned it down. Of course, the Government cannot buy everything, but it should have the capacity to buy something, and this brings me to my second major point in relation to this matter. The position in which the Minister of Environment and Planning finds himself is that he has no discretionary power at all concerning the purchase of mallee scrub or any other sort of open space. During the Budget Estimates Committees last year, I raised the matter with the Minister. I said, 'Have you got an acquisition programme?', because it was obvious that there was no money available, and he said, 'No, we have no acquisition programme at all. We may be in a position to buy one or two parcels of land [and I must be careful about my language here because it is nearly 12 months ago] to round off some of the irregularly shaped boundaries of the existing conservation parks and reserves, but we are not in a position to go elsewehere and to initiate new parks and reserves.'

At this stage no-one is talking about an ambitious programme of acquisition. After all, much was achieved by the previous Government in this respect, but I believe that the present Minister has been dealt with very harshly, or else he did not have the capacity during the budget discussions to be able to win a battle that he should have won, namely, to get a contingency fund so that when matters like this arise he has a bit of cash in his hip pocket that he can put where it needs to put. Of course, even in that situation there would perhaps be circumstances under which land should have been retained as a heritage item, a conservation reserve or whatever, is lost.

The present position in which the Minister finds himself is that he cannot win any round, because he has not got any gloves with which to fight. So although we are talking about finance for the department, I strongly urge that course of action on the Treasurer, who is with us right now, that is, that his Minister of Environment and Planning should be supported to the extent that he has some capacity to have funds available when significant purchases must be made for open-space area items, particularly where they are to do with our scrublands.

I do not intend to take the matter any further: there are other sensitive areas about which this Government has yet to make decisions. I do not want to raise them, because I believe that, as nothing has happened, the Minister must be winning those battles; such areas have been retained in their natural condition, and I would not want to do anything to remind certain people on the Government benches that that issue is still around the place, because it seems that since everything has gone quiet perhaps the battle has been won. I think that the member for Mallee knows to which significant area of scherophyll forest in this State I am referring. Rather in the time left to me, I will return to the metropolitan area and raise a matter about which the Treasurer may have some knowledge, because it is not all that far distant from his local electorate.

I refer, of course, to the Government's plans (as yet not clearly defined) for flood mitigation in the eastern suburbs, in particular, to the tributory streams of the Torrens River—First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, etc., Creeks—streams which may eventually revert to their original names, which are to be found on that map by Col. William Light (which is often reproduced in historical brochures about South Australia) and which names are rather more euphonious than the pure numbers to which they have been allotted in recent years by the more prosaic modern generation.

Mr Lewis: Harry Medlin mightn't like that; he likes them all numbered.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I am quite happy to take that up with Dr Medlin; I know Dr Medlin extremely well—he is related to my wife. The problem is in relation to Fourth Creek. I think the Premier should know that there are those people who are particularly concerned about the possibility that flood mitigation could mean the construction of a flood mitigation dam in the Morialta conservation reserve. They may be wrong in this respect; I hope they are wrong. I hope that the Minister or perhaps the Treasurer, when he replies to the second reading debate, may be in a position to set their fears at rest.

I have before me correspondence and other documentary material which has been made available to me through Rosalie McDonald, the Labor Party candidate for the seat of Coles. Her informants are people who live in the area and who are particularly concerned that a flood mitigation dam in the Morialta conservation reserve or, indeed, in the headwaters of the Fourth Creek above the reserve could have a drastic environmental effect on that reserve itself. It seems to me that there must be other ways in which this matter can be approached. It is lamentable that we have to approach the matter at all. It is lamentable that planners in bygone years did not make provision to ensure that people simply did not build on the flood plains of these creeks. But there it is; it has happened. People in good faith have been allowed to build in these areas and so, obviously, they have to receive protection.

Mr Lewis: We wouldn't build in the western suburbs at all, if that were the case, or in the—

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: As a matter of fact we did not. That is why we have an airport so close to Adelaide. It is a pure fluke that as recently as immediately after the war there was a large parcel of land available so close to town for an airport, because up until that time the Keswick and the Brownhill Creeks debouched on to that land, and nobody was interested in building on it. It was not until the break-out creek of those two streams was built, which takes the water through the Sturt Creek into the Patawalonga, that it was dry enough for an airport, let alone for the construction of houses. I do not think I misunderstand that particular matter. I am also not trying to suggest that every water course within the metropolitan area should have been retained in its natural state. There is little doubt that that would certainly have drastically curtailed the capacity of Adelaide to develop the way it has. There has to be some sort of balance in these things.

It seems to me that the eastern suburbs could have been far more attractive than they are now if substantially the flood plains of those streams could have been retained in their original form, but that is history. I believe that alternatives have been made available to this Government which would prevent the flood mitigation proposal for Morialta that these people fear. One of the problems is that when you leave it to the engineers they over-kill. Here is a little history lesson for the member for Hanson. I have no doubt he will agree with me on this matter, because in part the vandalism occurred under the Labor Government. I refer to the Sturt Creek and flood mitigation in the south-western suburbs. The engineers said that either two things had to happen; either the creek had to be straightened and concrete lined, or else you had to build a flood mitigating dam on the headwaters. What did they do? They built both. What an extraordinary example of over-kill. It means that, as some sort of remnant of our natural environment, the Sturt Creek is history, yet the dam would have done all that was needed. The dam was built in an area that does not have the environmental sensitivity that the Morialta conservation park has. In conclusion, I hope we may be able to get from the Treasurer and his Ministers some sort of assurance on that and the other matters I have raised before this debate concludes.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): In supporting this Bill, I wish to raise matters that pertain particularly to my own electorate. Members will know that, on a number of occasions since I was elected to the seat in 1979, I have been keen to bring to this House's attention those serious problems that face an electorate such as mine—an outer-urban electorate, fast growing, very often with services lagging behind the population growth. I have on other occasions raised the problems of housing in all its forms, the problems of transport by car, including the ramifications of hefty petrol price increases, the lack of community facilities, and the like.

This afternoon I wish to raise the matter of public transport. Since the last election I have raised public transport questions related to my electorate on a number of occasions by asking numerous questions in this House, by participating in public meetings in my own electorate, and by arranging deputations to the Minister for clarification of issues. Today I want to summarise some of the broad public transport problems that face my area. It is true that parts of the electorate of Salisbury have a good public transport service. Salisbury Central and certain parts of the west ward can be considered as having a very good public transport service most hours of the day or night, but the majority of the electorate is not in quite such a fortunate situation. Much of the electorate is the recipient of what can only be classed as a poor public transport service.

By that I mean much of the Salisbury west and north areas and, indeed, a significant portion of the residential area—not the rural areas in my electorate—which has no public transport services at all. I refer particularly to the Paralowie areas and the western parts of the Salisbury West area of my electorate. In pushing these matters both in this place and in the local community, I have not been seeking preferential treatment for my electors over and above that which pertains to metropolitan residents in other parts of Adelaide. I am merely seeking equal entitlement. I am merely seeking that my electors receive as adequate a public transport service as is available to others in the metropolitan area. In some regards I do not believe that is presently the case.

The no-service areas cover Paralowie, Salisbury Downs, Parafield Gardens and the western portions thereof. There is no public transport service at all in those parts, and constant efforts over a number of years to have a public transport service in those parts have not met with notable success. My predecessor had lobbied the then Minister of Transport on a number of occasions about this matter; in fact, in 1979 he finally achieved an undertaking from the Hon. G. T. Virgo that while they would not install services in that year they did undertake to review the situation in 1980.

That raised the hope that something might be done in that year. In fact, that was not what happened. A review might have taken place in 1980 (about that I am not too certain), but certainly 1980 has long gone and the buses have not long gone in that area. Their absence is still notable. Now I am advised, as recently as yesterday, that there is no early possibility of that area receiving transport services by the State Transport Authority. That is not to say that there are not plans for future services, and I acknowledge that there are plans. However, those plans are, for a start, contingent upon there being roads upon which to run. The route I have seen suggested runs presently over the salvation jane, the soursobs and ditches of some of the back paddocks between the residential subdivision areas. This relies, apparently, upon the provision of funds (and I

accept the funding problem and will make further comment about that at a later time).

It is not just that this area has no public transport and it is not just that there are other areas of Adelaide that likewise might be in the same situation. The point I have been trying to put to those in authority on this matter is that this part of my electorate is lacking in so many services and facilities. These areas do not have decent community facilities. They do not have decent health facilities in many circumstances, and they do not have many of the sort of things that other residential parts of Adelaide have come to accept as their entitlement. To get to the nearest possibilities in these regards, community facilities, health facilities, schools, and the like, they have to use private transport because they do not have public transport to get there.

In a Question on Notice I asked of the Minister I referred to the findings of a Health Commission study in 1980 that looked at the transport problems faced in various parts of Adelaide in getting to health facilities. The report was prepared in 1980, but I understand was based on data collected in 1976, so I acknowledge that there is some inaccuracy in the figures I am about to quote. However, the picture is still representative. The study measured the time taken to travel from the centroid of various local government areas to various health facilities in the metropolitan area. The Salisbury centroid of the Salisbury local government area, which covers more than my electorate, shows that that area lags way behind almost every other part of the metropolitan area.

Mr Lewis: Is that the population or the geographical centroid?

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: The population centroid. For example, the travel times from the Salisbury centroid to other public facilities, such the Royal Adelaide and Modbury hospitals, were not significantly less than those from way down in the southern part of the city. To travel to Modbury Hospital from the Salisbury centroid was something like five minutes shorter than to travel there from the Noarlunga centroid.

The whole situation was summed up by the most dramatic example, which was travel times to the Hillcrest Hospital. The travel time from the Salisbury centroid to the Hillcrest Hospital was 255 minutes. I point out that the travel time takes into account expected walking distance from home to the nearest stop, expected change-over times between modes of transport or routes of transport that have to be travelled, and is based on some averaging of those figures. Therefore, it could be expected in some situations the time could be significantly less than the 255 minutes, but in others it might have been greater. The next longest travel time from a metropolitan centroid to the Hillcrest Hospital—

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: I will read your comments.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: I appreciate the Minister's indication that he will read my comments on these matters. The next longest travel from a metropolitan centroid to the Hillcrest Hospital was from the Noarlunga centroid and was only 120 minutes, so for a metropolitan centroid much further away geographically the time was less than half the travel time from the Salisbury centroid. That is the most dramatic example of what I am saying, but it reflects the kind of thing that happens in relation to all public health facilities and their relation to travel times from the Salisbury electorate.

One can relate many examples of the difficulties people face in this area. A deputation I took to the Minister of Transport yesterday from the Northern Areas Transport Action Group had one mother who related the extreme difficulties she faces every day of the week as she visits a child who is in hospital suffering from spina bifida. She mentioned that it is costing her close to $40 a week to make those visits. She has another young child and, if she were to walk to the nearest public transport bus stop, it would be well in excess of half an hour just to get to that point. Then she would have to travel the bus system, the rail system, and another bus system to visit her child in hospital. Considering the lengthy time that takes out of her day, she is forced to take taxis to the nearest bus stop, hence the high cost I mentioned. I also recall in the hot summer weather a constituent coming to my office, having walked all the way from the Paralowie area, a distance of some three or four miles, because there was no adequate public transport for much of the route and none whatsoever for the balance of it. She had had to walk because she wanted to talk to me about a problem that needed my investigative documents, so we could not discuss the matter on the phone. It took a considerable amount of energy for her to do that.

It has been suggested that there is not the population in that part of the district to justify passenger routes at the moment. I repeat the example that I brought to the attention of this House in 1980, when I returned from my overseas self-paid study tour. Information I obtained from the Department of Transport in the Netherlands was that their philosophy with regard to provision of public transport to new areas was that they would put on a public transport route a minimal service to a new area if it could guarantee six passengers a day, a very small figure. When I discussed the matter with them and said that that obviously could not pay and might overstretch resources they said, 'Yes, but do not forget one thing; by going in at the start of a residential subdivision we get all the residents who come thereafter to that area used to the fact that public transport is available and they will be inclined to use it.'

They find that, ultimately, utilisation rates by local residents are much higher than in other examples where public transport has come long after the residential subdivision has started. In other words, it has come long after people have had to get used to using their cars or have purchased a second car to get around in. That is an interesting concept, and while I am not suggesting a cut-off figure of six passengers a day would be capable of being contained by our State Transport Authority, I repeat my story of this concept to the House in the hope that at least that concept can be considered and be remembered with future residential subdivisions in the metropolitan area.

There are some possibilities that have been suggested and I wish to repeat them to the House. I have already raised this matter in correspondence with the Minister, but I think that they are worthy of more consideration than they have achieved today. One of my constitutents put to me the proposition that the Virginia bus service that links up with the Salisbury railway station should be diverted down White's Road and Kings Road and linked up with the Parafield railway station. The outcome of that would be minimal extra bus travel time for the Virginia passengers but the provision of a twice daily service to residents of Paralowie and the western parts of the west ward. This would not be an excellent service but would be significantly better than what they have at present. There is certainly changeover space available at the Parafield railway station and there would be no real inconvenience to Virginia passengers but a distinct advantage which would raise the patronage of that service.

I know that officers of the Minister's office and the State Transport Authority are suggesting that a community bus service should be run in the Salisbury area. I have no objection to the running of community buses: I think they are an excellent idea, and there are many good examples of them in Adelaide. However, I am not seeking preferential treatment for my electorate: I am seeking treatment as good

as other parts of the metropolitan area receive. Therefore, if we are to entertain a community bus as solving all our transport problems in that area, might I suggest that it would not be unreasonable for the State Transport Authority to bear part of the cost of running that bus. Local government has already indicated that it cannot on its own maintain a community bus system sufficient to meet the needs to which I am referring.

Another possibility that I believe should be considered more seriously than it has been to date is the use of mini-buses. I have raised this matter in my own district and with officers of the Minister's department. The point has been made to me in rebuttal that labour costs are 70 per cent of the costs of running a bus, and I accept that, and it costs as much in labour to run a mini-bus as it costs to run a big bus, which I also accept but I want to look beyond what just appears in the annual accounts of the STA and look at the interest payments being made on the capital assets of the STA. Buses do not grow on trees: they are being paid for out of loan money, and interest is being paid on that loan money every year.

Big buses cost much more than mini-buses, and I have done some rough calculations but I have not yet had them refuted by officers of the STA who have heard me quote these figures, so I repeat them. A large bus running 30 trips a day for 250 days a year and paying 10 per cent interest on its capital cost needs 3⅓ passengers per trip of that bus. Therefore, before even the driver is paid, and before fuel and tyres are paid for, 3⅓ passengers must be there just to pay for the interest. There is an area on which we can make some savings. According to my calculations regarding a mini-bus, it would need only .8 of a passenger with an ordinary 40 cent ticket per run to pay the interest on that type of vehicle, and that is a saving on interest alone of $7 500 a year. That is a significant sum.

The next point of rebuttal I received to the use of mini-buses was that a big bus is still needed during peak hours. I am not suggesting that we convert the fleet of the STA to mini-buses and that little Toyota mini-buses be used on every route around Adelaide. I am saying, however, that a large number of routes and potential routes in this city could be better served by the use of mini-buses. I know from my own experience of a bus service in my part of the electorate (the 411 service) is that it never carries more than 24 passengers a run. Even at peak times it never carries more than 24, and the spread from the minimum to maximum number is within a reasonably tight range. That service could easily be run by a mini-bus service and thus save $7 500 a year.

These are some possibilities which I think ought to get much more consideration by the Minister and the STA. I have tried to be conscious of the cost constraints that are placed on the STA and on any Government of the day in the provision of a transport service, and in so doing I have tried to suggest alternatives that can get the maximum service for the minimum cost. Members will know, as a result of my Questions on Notice to the Minister, that in trying to bring about night services for those portions of my district not yet served (a significant part of my district is not yet served) I have suggested some alternatives that I believe would not incur much extra expenditure.

I have suggested that the 501 route which presently does not have a night service at night-time be supplemented by a run-on of route No. 6 from Gepps Cross to the Salisbury Town Centre, that run-on only to take place at night-time and at weekends while the 501 route does not have a night service. The Minister's response to that request has been, 'No, but in 1983 we may have some chance of a night service for the 501.' I give notice to the Minister now that I will be keeping on the pressure for a much earlier night or weekend service for the 501 route.

The other suggestion I have been making which I think is worthy of greater merit is a more flexible approach to night and weekend services, and that is that we try to run the services when the patronage may be there. I agree that we can forget about Monday to Wednesday nights, but on Thursday night there is surburban late-night shopping; on Friday night there is city late-night shopping; on Saturday afternoon there are sporting functions; and on Saturday night there are functions to which people go to enjoy themselves, and with random breath testing many of these people would appreciate the opportunity to make use of a night bus service.

In one of my questions I suggested that that take place on the 411B route for a trial period. I suggested that a service be run during those limited periods to pick up shoppers on Thursday night at 9 o'clock, to pick up shoppers from the train service on Friday night at about 9.30, to have a sports connection service on Saturday afternoon, and to have a clubs connection service on Saturday night. I have suggested that there should not be a commitment to keep it going if it patently did not provide sufficient operating returns. I suggested a six-month trial period, but at this stage the Minister has not seen fit to agree to that suggestion. I hope that he will reconsider his attitude on that matter.

I have been highlighting some of the proposals and suggestions that either I or others have made, but what we really need is a full-scale review of the public transport needs and options open for outer-urban areas, and in particular I am raising the matter on behalf of my electorate. Indeed, at a recent public meeting the following motion was passed:

> That the State Transport Authority undertake a complete survey into transport needs and options of the Salisbury North and Salisbury West areas as a matter of urgency.

It was pointed out to the meeting by officers of the STA that indeed they do do surveys: officers go on buses and survey passengers about where they would like the bus to run. There is a reasonable likelihood that, if passengers are on the bus already, it provides them with a reasonable service. Surely the people we need to interview are those not on the buses. The people at that public meeting said that their idea of a survey was a random sample household survey around the area to find out what the people think would be a reasonable service; why they do not use the service that is available; whether they would use a service if it were available; and what sort of traffic generators are important to them (whether they want to go to the schools, hospitals or shops, etc.).

We could then have a proper transport plan prepared for the area that would provide routes that meet the needs of the people. It is important to consider the provision of routes to meet the needs of people. The 400 and 401 services in the area seem to be quite bereft of traffic generators on the routes through which they pass (by that I mean places that would be liable to generate patronage). A major community facility in the Salisbury North area, the Salisbury North Community Centre, which has a lot of use by many people, is not on a public transport route; it cannot be reached by bus. Surely that is a major oversight. Surely patronage must be increased if the route were modified to take such a place into account. Likewise, services to schools vary quite markedly.

A suggestion was made by the Elizabeth council in January this year that a proposal to erect a Salisbury bus-rail interchange should be scrapped and replaced by a proposal to have a bus-rail interchange at the Elizabeth Town Centre.

I immediately responded to that proposal as, in my opinion, having rocks in its head. I sought a deputation with

the Minister of Transport and made my point of view quite clear, as I want to do in this House. Salisbury is the logical railway station at which to have a major bus-rail interchange. That is not to argue that there should not be some bus-rail connecting facilities at the Elizabeth railway station. Of course, there should. Services already use that station, but Salisbury is the logical main point, for any number of reasons.

First, it connects more readily with out-of-town services. You will realise, Sir, that it is at Salisbury that the standard gauge line, coming through, diverts and leaves the metropolitan residential area. It is through there that services to Perth and Alice Springs finally will pass, not through the Elizabeth Town Centre. Secondly, it is a logical point to arrange for inter-district metropolitan transport. Salisbury connects with services in the north to Elizabeth, south to Adelaide, in the east to Tea Tree Gully and in the west to Port Adelaide. It is a much more logical central point for such inter-district changeovers than is the Elizabeth railway station. Already, large numbers of bus services somehow connect with the Salisbury railway station, and any proposal to shift the interchange to Elizabeth must mean rerouting of a large number of those bus services. Many more bus services connect with Salisbury than connect with Elizabeth.

But, the other point that is well worth remembering is that the population potential growth in the northern suburbs is much greater in the next 20 years in the Salisbury area than it will be in the Elizabeth area, and points north. Salisbury West and Salisbury North areas have substantial parts still awaiting fill-in development. Population projections indicate that the population of the city of Salisbury, presently some 85 000 to 90 000 people, will be well in excess of 100 000 by the end of the century. Projections for population growth are not as great for points north of Salisbury; they are, indeed, quite significantly less. Surely, therefore, if the bus interchange is to provide a real service it should be where the people are likely to be.

So, I really hope that any suggestion to consider shifting that bus interchange will not be entertained at all. Some people raised the point that by having it at Elizabeth one would focus on the Myer retail development that is to take place there. But, the real point about public transport is people. I hope that the focus on any bus interchange will be people and not shops. We are trying to get people where they want to go, which is not only to shops, but also to their places of work, to their health facilities, community facilities and visiting other people. In that context, again, I pose that. Even though the Salisbury commercial centre is not as big as the Elizabeth commercial centre, it is the more logical place to have a bus-rail interchange.

In the few moments I have left to me I want to raise another matter of importance in the local area. We have had devastating frosts, in the agricultural sense, over recent days. We saw the other night television coverage of the effect that that has had on market garden produce in the Virginia area. May I make a plea before the House. It was not localised to Virginia. Similar effects occurred on market garden produce within the Salisbury electorate, at Waterloo Corner, Salisbury North and St Kilda. All those areas have had significant damage to their crops.

Market gardeners, as I remind the House, have not had an easy time of it over the years. Shortly after the last State election (and I am not suggesting it was because of the last State election) they suffered devastating hail. The economic impact of that was very severe indeed. I know, because I had very close contact with the growers in my electorate at that time, going around and seeing just how great the impact was and doing what I could to help them through those problems. Many of them have not even started to recover from that damage. They have also had problems caused by the marketing situation that I have related to this House on many occasions. My consistent efforts to have a growers market established in the northern suburbs have been to try to offer some form of economic help to market gardeners to try and alleviate the severe economic problems which they are now suffering. Now they have yet another problem from which they are suffering, namely, the frost damage. I hope that the Minister of Agriculture sees his way clear to make a Ministerial statement to this House on exactly what the Government is considering doing about that damage. Is any financial compensation being considered, or is any special reconsideration being given to loans to growers in 1979 to replace the glass in their glasshouses?

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

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell): In the time that I have available in this debate I wish first to canvass a matter of some importance in relation to my electorate and that of the adjoining electorate of my colleague, the member for Ascot Park, in relation to highways proposals which will affect South Road's future, and indirectly to the matter of the so-called north-south freeway. Recently, the Minister of Transport made a public announcement, with a great deal of fanfare, about what he described as the reassessments (I suppose that would be the correct word) that have been carried out by his department and the present Government in relation to the future of the north-south corridor. Towards the end of those remarks, the Minister, somewhat smugly I thought, suggested that what had been a problem, in his words, for the people who lived in that vicinity of any proposed alignment of a corridor had been resolved by his announcement that day.

I want to disillusion the Minister, because the announcement actually made was that where perhaps a four-lane each-way corridor had been considered the proposals contained in his announcement suggested that possibly a two-lane each-way corridor was being considered. My colleague, the member for Peake, has pointed out that he has an interest in the area too. But, I was dealing more with that area of South Road that lies between Cross Road and Flinders University. My colleague, the member for Ascot Park, has, as part of his electorate, the western side between Daws Road and Cross Road. I have the eastern side, that very fine electorate of Mitchell.

Of course, over a number of years there has been a great deal of discussion and various proposals in relation to the future of South Road. It is probably not untoward of me at this time to point out that South Road carries the greatest volume of traffic per hour of any undivided road in the State. That point has often been overlooked by members. We all go for a run down Anzac Highway or Port Road. We assume that, because those roads are divided, they are not too bad. On South Road, particularly in the area of which I speak, there is no physical barrier to motorists at all, only a line marked, with two lanes either side, yet it carries the greatest volume of traffic per hour, in terms of vehicles, in the whole of this State. This problem is not caused by the present Government. I do not suggest that. It has existed for some time. Proposals to handle this need to be carefully thought out and researched. It is for that reason that I bring to the attention of the House the fact that the announcement by the Minister recently did not contain some of those necessary ingredients.

All that was really stated was the verbiage which caused further concern to those residents along that lateral route who live in the vicinity of South Road, mostly to the west, and whose land is actually on the alignment of any proposed further north-south corridor. I made approaches to the Minister's office and, on behalf of, for example, St Bernadette's

Parish, which is located in St Marys, on the eastern side of South Road, I asked whether there was a proposal as part of the interim measures announced by the Minister (the announcement to which I referred earlier) in regard to the widening of South Road south of Daws road. I must be fair to the Minister and say that, in a reasonable time, back came an answer, which was of great interest, certainly to the people whose business premises or other properties are on the alignment of South Road in that vicinity.

The Minister's letter stated quite clearly (and I thought it was a pity that we do not receive more information of that nature from Ministers when we approach them) that the Highways Department had no proposal to widen South Road south of Daws Road. Stop—end of story. That is a clear statement of intent, and I was able to pass on to St Bernadette's Parish and any other person who was concerned about the operation of a business or who lived in a house on the alignment the fact that, clearly, there is no immediate need for concern.

I wish that the story was the same in relation to the section of South Road between Daws Road and Cross Road. For five weeks I have been endeavouring to obtain information from the Minister's office about what is proposed in that section of South road, but I have been told that the information is being collated and will be made available to me, as a member for an area that is vitally affected by the proposals. That information will be given to me when it is got together (I think they were the correct words).

That is the point I wish to make. There was an announcement about the north-south corridor and the future of South Road, but when I asked for information on which one would assume an announcement would be made, I found that the information is not in a condition to be made readily available. I trust that the Minister and his officers, on hearing of the way in which I have brought this matter to the attention of the House, will be able to get weaving (in simple terms) and make available that information, because clearly business people are concerned about whether or not they will lose land from the front of their property if it is directly on South Road. Some residential properties on South Road in the district of Mitchell have a frontage on the South Road alignment. There are not many, but there are some, and, even if only one individual was living in a house or if one person had a business in that situation, he would be entitled to all the information that is available so that he could look to his future. I will say no more about that matter, except that I believe that the Minister will accept the fact that I have chosen this occasion to bring to his attention this very important matter that relates to my district.

The Premier, in his second reading explanation of the financial matter before us, presented various details relating to the current financial status of the State. On page 8, there is a specific reference to the South Australian Land Commission, as it was called in the time of the previous Government, now called the South Australian Urban Land Trust.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: That is the wrong Bill. Your are referring to the Appropriation Bill.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I understand that this is the Premier's second reading explanation in relation to the State's financial position.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: That document refers to appropriation. We are debating the Supply Bill.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: That is no problem. I can still deal with the situation.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: I just wanted to get it right!

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I appreciate the Premier's pointing out that fact. I intended to make only a passing reference to that matter, and I will have an opportunity to do so when we consider the Bill to which the Premier has referred. I also intend to refer to the fact that the operations of the Department of Mines and Energy come under any Supply Bill that comes before the House. In a matter that was before the House recently, I referred to the fact that the Department of Mines and Energy has demonstrated, from information that I obtained while a member of a select committee, that it does not have any group, section or officer charged with the responsibility to look at markets for the materials with which, one would assume, a mines department is concerned—that is, metals. No market research is being carried out in that department in relation to the future of metals, whether copper, gold, uranium, and so on.

On an earlier occasion I stated that I found this extremely strange, particularly because the Department of Mines and Energy is often called upon, through its officers, to provide advice and assistance (and quite correctly so) for people who may be engaged in exploration or other activities with a view to proceeding to a production phase in a mining operation in South Australia. In relation to the major project possibility for South Australia which has received a very great deal of attention in recent times, including the setting up of a select committee, I could not understand why no work is done in that area. The answer I was given by a senior officer in the department was that insufficient staff was available for that purpose, and that it was not clear whether that should be a duty or a responsibility of the department. The point I put is that it is quite clear that that area should be a responsibility and a duty of the department.

To take that point a little further, I believe that members will be surprised, as I was, to learn that, when approaches were made by the select committee on which I served to the Federal Bureau of Mineral Resources for advice in this area in respect to possible markets for copper, uranium, gold, silver, and so on, apart from the statistics that were available, no other form of market advice was available. Therefore, it would seem that, in an area where very large sums of money are spent and invested, and where there is capital spending, and so on, the whole of the damn country is operating almost on guess work and people's views rather than any co-ordinated or concerted effort to provide skilled analyses of markets, which has a vital bearing on whether projects should proceed.

It was in that state of mind that I endeavoured to undertake research into uranium and its future in the world market. I was assisted by the Parliamentary Library, and we were able to ascertain that Nuexco, the main office of which is located in California and which has branches in every country of the world where uranium is mined or sold, was an international brokerage firm of such a size that it is able to claim in its brochure that it is the world's principal uranium brokerage marketing firm.

From the information I have obtained from them it would seem to me that we ought to have someone in the Department of Mines and Energy looking at the markets, because of the kind of prognosis which is coming from a firm of the stature of that to which I have referred. This information was compiled at a later date than that which has already been presented to the House, and that is why I believe it is of sufficient importance to take up the time of the House in presenting it today. The brochure to which I refer is dated 22 March 1982. It is entitled *The Uranium Market; whither goest the yellowcake road.* This paper was presented on the date I have mentioned in New York City at the Atomic Industrial Forum Fuel Meeting by Geo White, Junior, Senior Vice-President of Nuexco. With regard to the future of uranium, Mr White said:

> At the risk of stating the obvious, it must be observed that the long-term health and development of uranium business depend

on the long-term health and development of nuclear power as a source of electric generation.

He went on to say this:

We talked about uranium demand generated by enrichment contracts, by conversion contracts and by fabrication contracts.

I think he means 'fabrication' in the sense that perhaps we do not normally use in this House when we sometimes imply that a member is not using the facts in as correct a manner as is possible. He went on to say:

More generally, we focussed on a high uranium demand associated with a thriving nuclear industry. We believe our own optimistic forecasts because we wanted them to be true. We ignored the reality; utilities were getting into financial trouble; load growth levelled out; reserve margins increased;

He further stated:

We ignored all this because, as the true believers in nuclear power, we just knew that nuclear was the only way that made sense.

In the paper he asked the question: 'So, where are we now?' He then further stated:

We have a world-wide uranium industry that expanded vigorously to meet a market characterised by a continuing erosion of future demand.

He does not refer to demand but to 'future demand'. With regard to the over-supply situation he stated:

As a natural consequence of this over-supply situation, inventories will continue to grow on a world-wide basis. Slide number 2 [he was presenting slides with the paper] compares production, consumption and inventory.

He further states (and figures are given which are important):

Total inventories will rise from more than 400 000 000 pounds uranium oxide in 1982 to more than 630 000 000 pounds of uranium oxide by 1990. These figures exclude the material owned by the U.S. military body (which holds defence stocks) and other national, non-utility stockpiles.

In that paper Mr White presented a table which is headed 'Free world (that is, outside the so-called Communist bloc countries) uranium supply/demand balance'. A series of tables for yearly production and consumption appear. Other columns showing net inventory increase, and so on, are given but I will not take up the time of the House to deal with those. I simply point out that in 1982 production is stated by Nuexco as being 106 300 000 pounds of uranium oxide, and consumption given as 56 500 000 pounds.

To save time I will skip a year and refer to the figures given for 1984: production is given as 106 000 000 pounds and consumption is estimated at 81 100 000 pounds. Because members might be beginning to think, 'Well, all right, those two figures are gradually getting closer together, things are going to improve', I point out that if one refers to the figures given for 1987, three years further on, it can be seen that production is estimated at 108 900 000 pounds and consumption is estimated at 92 900 000 pounds. Taking a further three-year step to 1990, production is estimated as being 115 300 000 pounds and consumption as being 96 400 000 pounds. What is the importance and what is the signficance of that? The fact is that the figures refer to a time projected several years ahead from a time when we already have colossal inventories in the free world, anyway. In no year between 1982 and 1990 will demand exceed production. It will always be behind production, so the net effect is that there will be an increase in inventory. People could say, 'So what, who cares if we dig up ours and sell it, that is not our problem.' However, what is being overlooked is the fact that pressure from over-inventory and over-production in relation to demand must cause a further lowering of prices.

If one refers to an even later Nuexco publication, dated May 1982, at page 27 we see current prices from the world international markets. On that page figures for the current month (that is, May) are given, which indicates how hot off the press the figures are. It can be seen that the exchange value price for uranium per pound in U.S. dollars was $20.75 per pound, even lower than spot prices that have been spoken of recently. In Australian dollars today, although I have not done the total cross-reference research, I think it would be safe to say that that amount would be of the order of $19.80. So, the price is below $A20 for a pound. If one refers to the price given for the previous month one finds that it had fallen from $US22.50 to $US20.75, and it can be further seen that 12 months prior to that it was $US25 for the same quantity, that is, a pound of uranium oxide.

Some people would say, 'Well, the exchange value is not a figure you can look at and the spot price is not a figure you can look at because they are isolated and single instances.' Let us look at the transaction value, which is the price actually attained in sales of both a small and large nature and includes prices that are able to be ascertained, because not all contract prices are made available for the sale of quantities of uranium over a period. However, exactly the same trend is discernible: 12 months ago the price was $US25.70 a pound; the month prior to May it was $US23.40, and for the month of May it was down to $US22.60. Why is it that Nuexco is cataloguing and showing these trends in market prices?

Mr Lynn Arnold: The Deputy Premier is most cynical about that; he believes that Nuexco has an axe to grind.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Yes, I find it very difficult to understand why the Deputy Premier would come to that conclusion. Why would a brokerage firm have an axe to grind in this area? In this case it is a brokerage firm involved in the sales to and from producers, utilities, buyers, and so on. Whatever happens, they would be operating, as we would all understand, on a margin basis, just as do stockbrokers, and so on. In fact, there would be an incentive from Nuexco to want the price to be higher, because presumably on a percentage basis its fees would be larger. But no, it is pointing out the true state of the market. We are not talking about some fly-by-night operation; these are people who have been in the field since 1968, a company which has main offices in California and branches in every country in the world involved with uranium, including Australia, where it has an office in Sydney.

So, they are somebody to whom we can listen. They certainly have no axe to grind in respect of Roxby Downs or any other Australian uranium project. That is the reason why I chose to use the kind of information that they have available. What are they saying? They are saying that, as far as they can foresee (they do not claim to be totally omniscient and to be able to say what is going to happen decades ahead), based on the price trends that they are able to demonstrate, there is unlikely to be any improvement in the uranium markets before 1990, and almost certainly before the middle of the 1990s. That information is there; they are not my words. I have more of the Nuexco articles, but I do not want to take any more time at the House. They are available and will be in the library when I have finished with them. Other members can read them and draw their own conclusions.

Earlier, when I spoke on this matter, I made no attempt, as I think the Deputy Premier claims, to be selective or to do spot quoting. I pointed out that there is an argument that, because the costs of production in the United States are already increasing and the price is down, there will be a tendency to push some people out of the market. Therefore, there is a possibility for Australian producers to get into the act. However, we are not talking about next year or the year after. That is the point that must be grasped by those who have taken the trouble to listen to me. We are talking about a long time ahead, assuming that the present demand for nuclear-generated electricity continues at its present very slow growth rate. It was less than one per cent last year and

is postulated again for the current year at the same rates. There will possibly be a slow increase in demand.

For the benefit of the honourable members on the Government back benches who think 'Ah, here is a point that I can seize on,' it does not take into account what is happening in the technology of nuclear fuel use. Nuexco is in that business too; it is a brokerage firm of the stature that I have pointed out, and it makes sure that it is really up with it and knows what is going on.

There already has been, after a two-year concerted programme which commenced in the U.S., a 25 per cent improvement in the use rate of a given quantity of uranium in a reactor, in terms of the energy that can be gained from the same amount in a reactor. At the same time, there is less demand in the terms of the amount of energy that can be generated with respect to the amount of fuel that must be purchased.

I find that an achievement for the industry of which it can be proud. It is making better use of the fuel source that it is using. What is more, the prognosis is for further improvement within the next five years. Let people who would be prepared to accept what the Deputy Premier tried to say recently in this House, namely, that Nuexco did not know what it was talking about. It was stated that, when I was speaking, I had used selective quoting, and so on. Let them have a look at the information that I have now put before them, because the whole impetus and thrust of what I am trying to put before the House is information.

I do not know everything about this matter; I do not claim to know that. However, I do claim to have made a concerted effort to try to find out what information is available and what is likely to be the trend in this area. I think that is probably somewhat more frank and straightforward than what the Deputy Premier has been in his attitude in dealing with this similar matter before the House. On the information that I have given today, I think members would agree that it is at least fair to say that, if there is a future for the sale of uranium mines in Australia, or anywhere else in the world, in terms of the price that can be obtained for that commodity, there is not likely to be any rapid increase for a considerable period or time or probably (I do not think anyone can be sure or say any more than I am attempting to say now) in the middle 1990s.

Mr ABBOTT (Spence): This Bill provides for the approval of $290 000 000 to enable the Public Service of the State to be carried on during the early part of the next financial year. In supporting the Bill, I want to make some comments about the difficulty being faced by the youth in our community in the transition from childhood to adult life.

The gathering economic recession over the past seven years or so and the current state of our economy has added a new dimension to the pressures on young people and to the problems of the transition period to adult life. On top of all the social and emotional problems of becoming a self-supporting and responsible adult, young people today also have to deal with the chronic unemployment of, perhaps, themselves, their friends and, in many cases, their parents. The traumas and difficulties of youth no longer have at the end of them the prospect of a reasonably secure adulthood. For an increasing number of young people, the time between school and adult life is no longer one of occasional unemployment associated with picking and choosing work while a career is determined. Instead, it is often a period of almost permanent inability to find a job, and hence a place in our very work-oriented society.

In my view, any discussion of the future of the youth of South Australia must begin with the present record unemployment levels. This is at the core of the problems facing young people, and it flows on to stand as the cause of many of the problems between youth and the rest of the community. I believe that there is very strong evidence that many of our current problems of teenage crime, alcoholism, drug taking and homelessness originate in the despondency, boredom and financial hardship of unemployment.

Young people are hit two ways by unemployment. First, they are directly affected if they cannot find work. Secondly, they suffer if their parents are out of work and, of course, some of them are unlucky enough to cop it from both sides. Even in good economic times the unemployment rate among young people will tend to be higher than it is for adults.

Since 1975, when the Australian economy began to move into the current recession, unemployment has increased dramatically. All sections of the labour force have been affected, but youth unemployment has increased more rapidly than any other group and has stayed at much higher levels. For example, the latest unemployment figures from the Australian Bureau of Statistics (for March 1982) show South Australia with an unemployment rate for adult persons looking for full-time work at 6.1 per cent, compared to a rate of 19.9 per cent for persons 15 to 19 years of age.

In recent months South Australia has experienced unemployment levels not seen since the Depression of the 1930s. In February this year, the Australian Bureau of Statistics recorded that 50 800 South Australians were looking for work, which was the highest figure recorded since the Australian Bureau of Statistics unemployment series began. Unemployment of these dimensions cannot fail to increase the number of families with teenage children who suddenly find that the family bread winner is on the dole. It cannot fail but to increase the pressure on the young job seeker.

The extra pressure on a young person which arises when family support is removed or reduced as a result of unemployment raises the general question of the family's role and the effect of changes to the structure of those families. In the past, what would have been regarded as a normal period of transition to adult life had, at its centre, the family, which provided not only physical accommodation but also financial and emotional support. This structure of support is increasingly less solid.

First, the family itself is changing, and we must accept that the traditional idea of living through to adulthood with two parents is not everyone's experience. It is difficult to get precise information on how the family structure is changing in Australia. However, to give members an indication, in 1975 the Australian Bureau of Statistics conducted a survey, which estimated that there were 166 000 one-parent families, which represented aproximately 9 per cent of the total number of families in Australia. Early last month we received the first results of the 1981 census. They show that there are 1 400 000 persons who are either separated, divorced or widowed. Although obviously not all of them have children, they nevertheless represent 10 per cent of our total population.

Secondly, the ability of any family unit, regardless of structure or size, to provide support is being eroded by the present economic malaise. Unemployment, of course, brings a rather dramatic change to household finances. However, spiralling interest rates and continuing inflation have had an almost equal effect as they impinge on many more people. These two factors, unemployment and family breakdown, are clearly linked to one of the most urgent problems facing young people, namely, the need for housing. The Government is simply not doing enough to try to overcome the problem, so it needs to be convinced of the seriousness of that problem. However, as far as its causes are concerned, the evidence from successive studies is quite compelling. For example, the working party on youth housing set up by the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment reported in July 1980 that the major causes of housing problems were family problems or breakdown, unemploy-

ment and financial difficulties. The three overlap, of course, but either in isolation, or together, they are clearly the most significant. The working party's report also referred to an earlier study carried out in 1979 by the Victorian Consultative Committee on Social Development, which concluded:

> There is no doubt that if there was one thread to be traced through all of the reasons for homelessness among youth it would be unemployment.

In December last year a report by Shelter claimed that 9 000 young people were facing a housing crisis in Adelaide, that there had been a 50 per cent increase in the use of temporary shelters and that the average age of youths using those shelters had fallen dramatically.

Only a month or so ago, the Chairman of the National Youth Advisory Group was reported in the press as claiming that many youths spend their nights in derelict buildings, old car bodies, or under bridges. He went on to say:

> The root cause is unemployment, which, combined with domestic problems, often forces youths to run away from home.

He also suggested that the desperation of being both homeless and unemployed led directly to crime and associated problems such as drug taking. It is certainly a fact that, as unemployment rises, so too does the crime rate. This was specifically referred to by the South Australian Commissioner of Police in his annual report for 1979-80. A report issued late last year by the Attorney-General's Department dealing with homicides and serious assault concluded as follows:

> There seems little doubt that steps taken to reduce unemployment and to improve the level of well-being of the most disadvantaged members of the South Australian public could contribute to a reduction in violence.

A significant minority of young people is facing considerble difficulties at the moment and a very uncertain life in the future. Also, the generations coming up are not going to have it any easier, and the number of young people who are presently facing these problems is, unfortunately, increasing.

Members may well ask what can be done. I realise there is no easy or one-off solution. I stress this, because all too often one finds suggestions being put forward that simply enforcing more discipline or adopting a more practical curriculum in schools will solve everything. It does not take much to see the error of that sort of approach. For example, the idea of more discipline, either in schools or from parents, is put forward. For a start, many of the people about whom I am talking have left school. It is no good wanting a more disciplined family upbringing if one of the central causes of the problem is the breakdown of traditional family structure. And, of course, no amount of discipline will create jobs.

Similarly, with education, it is true that technological change has overtaken many of our ideas of what a young person needs to be taught. In particular, many of the training programmes that currently exist for the young unemployed are either teaching skills which are becoming irrelevant or which are already over supplied. Although that needs to be changed, it still cannot alter the fact that, for every job vancancy in South Australia, as recorded by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, there are currently 22 persons unemployed. In short, there is nothing to be gained by blaming the victims,and there is nothing to be gained by the tactics of isolation and control.

What is happening is that the traditional process of integration of young people into adult life and the rest of the community is simply breaking down. Our aim must be to restore it and not to separate our young people as a problem group to be controlled. The Government should see its primary aim as being to reduce unemployment and restore economic development. I recognise that this is essentially a national problem and that the degree of influence that a State Government has on the econon. is marginal. However, the State Government should use what resources it has to create jobs and to start tackling unemployment. With the aim of integrating youth in mind, the Government should also offer help to those groups and organisations that are working to provide community-based support to young people in a much stronger way than is presently the case.

Governments must recognise that the period between childhood and adult life is a crucial one. If we do not want our future citizens to have experienced a distorted and distressed transition into the community, Governments cannot simply just step aside. Understandably, many young people feel cheated and resentful. We can ignore that—after all, the young eventually grow up—but in the meantime we might have our own Brixton. As a community, we must develop an environment conducive to the integration of young people into society. We must accept that traditional structures such as the family are not working in all cases, and we must try to give support that takes their place. We must not condemn the young to the status of a problem to be controlled, or blame them, because they are victims of problems that they had little part in creating.

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

The SPEAKER: Last evening during debate on the Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Bill, the member for Elizabeth sought leave of the House to incorporate statistical material in *Hansard*. When asked by the Deputy Speaker for an assurance that the material was purely statistical, he gave an affirmative answer. I have now been acquainted with the material and have to inform the House that it is not statistical. The material is about 25 *Hansard* pages in length, relating to the nuclear industry, is descriptive rather than statistical, and contains opinion and conjecture. I point out that the rest of the member's 30-minute speech covers about three pages of *Hansard*. I have instructed the Leader of *Hansard* that the material is not to be included in *Hansard*, and also instructed him that, when there is any doubt as to the statistical nature of material sought to be incorporated, he is to refer it to me for an opinion.

Of further concern to me is the length of the material sought to be included. Such material ordinarily should only supplement the speech of the member in a way that saves the member and the House time and allows the member to develop his arguments without having to read a long list of statistics. I believe that an approximate length is about a page, and have further instructed the Leader of *Hansard* that where the material is of greater length he is required to refer it to me for decision.

I view the action in seeking to incorporate this particular material as a flagrant breach of the accepted practice, which I cannot condone. I would hope that it does not become necessary to require material to be incorporated as statistical to be presented to the Chair before leave is granted. However, if the measures that I have outlined do not ensure that such a breach does not occur again, it will become neccessary to follow that course of action. Members should be responsible for their own discipline.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Are you, Sir, making a ruling to that effect?

The SPEAKER: I made a ruling to that effect.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I move:

That the Speaker's ruling be disagreed to.

The SPEAKER: Bring it up in writing.

Mr McRAE: I ask for clarification of one matter. As I understand the situation, disagreement has been moved in relation to a ruling that you, Sir, have given. No-one on this side of the House, apart from the member for Elizabeth, has had an opportunity to peruse the material on which your ruling is based. In those circumstances, I see—

The SPEAKER: Order! The only manner in which the member for Playford may continue to what amounts to debate the issue is for the member for Elizabeth to withdraw his motion that the Chair has asked to be delivered in writing. Otherwise, it becomes necessary for the motion that is now in possession of the House, other than on points of order, to be concluded. With all due respect to the member for Playford, he is not raising a point of order, but is seeking clarification. He will be appreciative, as I am and as a number of other members are, that the Standing Orders appear to be deficient in relation to provision for the clarification of issues that are not points of order.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The matter that has now arisen has occurred suddenly. You, yourself, Sir, have pointed out that the Standing Orders do not appear flexible enough to cover every situation. I think that that is really what you are saying. It seems to me in the present circumstances (I listened to your ruling—I believe that that is what the House was given—with some interest, and I have no quarrel with that ruling in your position) that—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitchell is in precisely the same position now as was the member for Playford. He is now seeking to debate the issue by way of questioning procedure. I regret that there is no provision. I have asked the member for Elizabeth to bring up in writing his disagreement with the ruling of the Chair. I am quite sure that every member will then have the opportunity, either during that debate or subsequent debate, to raise the points that are now being sought by way of clarification.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I believe that I must pursue this point. Only last evening, Sir, you pointed out in this House that, when a point of order was raised, you did not normally cut off members in the middle of a sentence. At the time you cut me off then, I was trying to illustrate to you—

The SPEAKER: Order! I want the position to be completely clarified right at this point. The Chair always has the opportunity to interrupt a member who is on his feet. The Chair normally would not interfere with a member who is seeking to raise a point of order, but if the Chair is of the opinion that the contribution by a member does not constitute a point of order the Chair has a perfect right to interrupt the honourable member, indicating the ruling that it is not a point of order. It may well be that the honourable member has redress in some other way. I make the point again that the honourable member's contribution at this juncture is not a point of order. I cannot hear him further, unless there is a legitimate point of order.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I will endeavour to make a legitimate point of order. The point of order that I wish to raise is that in the ruling which you have given and which has led to the scene we are now in (I hope I can get that far) the words 'a flagrant breach' were used. My point of order (and I think it is fair in the circumstances; you, Sir, can rule otherwise. That is your prerogative) relates to whether there is a precedent for the use of the words 'a flagrant breach' in relation to this matter for the incorporation of statistical matter in this House. That is the point of order.

The SPEAKER: I will accept that as a point of order, because it is one that can be demonstrated readily, taking into account a situation that arose with the member for Peake, who sought leave to have statistical material incorporated. On subsequent checking it was found that the material was both statistical and editorial, if I can use that term. The member for Peake was advised of the situation and the record corrected. The amount of material that the member for Peake sought to have included might have extended the material in the *Hansard* by half a page of *Hansard* print. I used the term 'flagrant', because at this moment I am not positive that the contribution that the member for Elizabeth sought to have incorporated last evening would conclude at 25 pages of *Hansard*. The information I have received is that it may be 25 to 30 pages of *Hansard*. I used 'flagrant' in view of the fact that it is the grossest breach of this privilege that has ever come to my notice in this House.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Mr Speaker, may I move that the debate on this matter be adjourned until 10 p.m.?

Mr McRAE: I second the motion.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no motion in the possession of the House at this moment. I have invited the honourable member for Elizabeth to deliver it. I will then ask whether it is seconded and the motion that the honourable member has sought to draw to my attention could be entertained at that moment.

Mr McRAE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: Let him get on with it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Playford.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: You are just holding it up.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr McRAE: I am looking at Standing Order 178. It refers to the adjournment of the debate. I think, in the ordinary context of the English language, a debate commences when one person disagrees with a remark made by another. You, Sir, made an observation, and indeed, a ruling. That then precipitated a series of discussions between yourself and the honourable member for Mitchell. With great respect, I suggest that a debate has commenced and I—

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot uphold the point of order that the honourable member is making, or accept it as a legitimate point of order. If the honourable member reads Standing Order 178 in its entirety, he will see that it does not have the meaning that he is seeking to put before this House at the moment. I was addressed on a point of order by the honourable member for Mitchell. I accepted as a point of order and answered in the fact that I could not countenance a motion of the nature that was being put to me, because at this moment, whilst I have had a motion foreshadowed to me, it was in the procedural process of being delivered to me and, upon its being delivered, I would then ask whether it was seconded. I could then accept the procedural motion that was suggested. Whether the House accepted that course of action would be a matter for the decision of the House. There are several positions that I think should be made clear to the House. The honourable member for Elizabeth has now delivered to me the following motion, which I accept:

> I move disagreement with the Speaker's ruling on the grounds that it is not in conformity with Standing Order 138.

Standing Order 138 states:

> Where a member, in speaking to a question, refers to a statistical or factual table relevant to the question, such table may, at the request of the member and by leave of the House, be inserted in the official report of the Parliamentary debates without being read.

Is the motion seconded? Before giving way to any member, I would make the point that the motion currently before the Chair may be debated by two people, one for and one against. The honourable member for Elizabeth, having been the person who delivered the motion to the Chair, will be given the first call and then a member who is deemed to be against the motion will be seen by the Chair. The honourable member for Elizabeth.

Mr Becker: Who seconded it?

Mr McRAE: I second it, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! Would the honourable member for Playford please resume his seat. Does the honourable

member for Elizabeth desire to speak to the motion that he has delivered to the Chair?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Yes, I will in due course, but I rise to take a point of order before taking the call. The point of order is that I understand that the member for Mitchell or the member for Playford seeks to take a point of order and you have refused to recognise that member. I believe it is quite proper that they should be recognised on a point of order, because a motion of that type takes precedence over other business.

The SPEAKER: Order! I accept the contention in the point of order raised by the honourable member for Elizabeth that a member may not be denied the opportunity to stand to take a point of order. Neither the honourable member for Mitchell nor the honourable member for Playford has been denied the right to take a point of order, but it is essential for the Chair to conform to the Standing Orders, which recognise the delivery of a motion before the Chair. The motion having been delivered, the Chair will then call the honourable member who was responsible for that motion. Having been called, if another member then seeks to rise to take a point of order, the member who has been called to speak to the motion will be sat down and that member will be heard on the point of order, but we are not progressing very far unless we consistently refer to the provisons in Standing Orders. I call the honourable member for Elizabeth. I see the honourable member for Mitchell.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: He wasn't on his feet.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Who is running this show? What do you want me to do? Stand up all the time?

Mr Becker: Hurry up and get on with it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitchell may take a point of order.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I will endeavour to take a point of order. My point of order is that, clearly, the House cannot be deaf to the situation that has arisen. I have clearly indicated, despite the fact that we were in the throes of a procedural matter, that I wish to speak—

The SPEAKER: What is the honourable member's point of order?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: My point of order is that I have a procedural motion to put to this House, which is that the motion before the House be adjourned. The motion is in the hands of the Speaker and has been read to the House, and I seek clarification on that point.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not accept the point of order. I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that the honourable member for Elizabeth has been called to speak to his motion. Whilst the member is in possession of the call for debate of any kind, no other member except a Minister may seek to have him sat down for the movement of a further motion. A procedural motion may be taken at the end of the honourable member's contribution and before another member is seen.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: We can spend profitless time on points of order but there has to be common sense in this matter and the common sense is that the member who has moved the motion has deferred so that precedence ought to be given to the member now on his feet and speaking to the House and to you, Sir.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The honourable member for Elizabeth cannot, any more than any other member in the House, defer his right to speak upon the call other than to seek to continue his remarks, when the matter may be considered. The honourable member for Elizabeth has not sought to continue his remarks. He has been called for the purpose of debating the motion before the Chair.

Mr McRAE: I move:

That this debate be now adjourned.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Elizabeth.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier has no greater responsibility in this debate at this juncture. The honourable member for Elizabeth has been called, unless the honourable Premier has a point of order.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: No, Sir.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I have moved dissent from your ruling in this particular matter because your ruling contains two limbs. The first limb was an allegation which you made off your own bat, interrupting proceedings of this House, I suspect again in contravention of the Standing Orders.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin interjecting:

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: We are moving dissent. Just calm down. If the Premier will calm down and not let the wine he has had over dinner overtake him—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I take very strong exception to the words uttered by the member for Elizabeth and I want not only a withdrawal but also an apology.

The SPEAKER: The words are not unparliamentary and therefore cannot be required to be taken from the member.

Mr McRae: This is an absolute set up.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Playford will remain silent. The honourable member for Elizabeth will be asked by the Chair whether he will withdraw the words that have cause umbrage to be taken by the honourable Premier.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: If the Premier will contain himself for a moment, I withdraw, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Elizabeth has withdrawn.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: As I was saying, the situation is clearly that in the first instance you have ruled—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Go over the other side.

The SPEAKER: The member for Mitchell and the member for Playford will please contain themselves or they will suffer the consequences of their actions.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The Deputy Premier was not mentioned in that, of course.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Piss off.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Elizabeth will please resume his seat. The honourable member for Mitchell used terms which are unbecoming of this Chamber and I ask him to withdraw those terms unreservedly.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I will withdraw immediately and substitute the words 'mizzle off'.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: As I was saying, there are two limbs to the complaint you have made in this matter. The first was that the material concerned was not statistical, which was your opinion. The second was your complaint that the material was too long. If I have not misinterpreted you, that was exactly your complaint. When one looks at Standing Order 138, one sees that there is no mention of the Speaker. The House is the master of its own destiny in these matters. We make the decisions in these matters and the decision has already been made in relation to the statistical material that I sought leave to have incorporated last night and for the insertion of which I had leave granted to me by this Parliament.

If the Speaker wishes to take umbrage at that tonight, the correct and proper procedure for him to take is to move that the decision of the House taken last night should be set aside in such manner as may or may not be provided by the Standing Orders. Let us look at rule of debate 138. It states:

Where a member, in speaking to a question—

which I was doing last night, as no-one would deny—

refers to a statistical or factual table—

and there was no reference in your allegations tonight to factual matters—

relevant to the question, such table may, at the request of the member and by leave of the House, be inserted in the official report of the Parliamentary debates without being read.

My simple point is that the House granted me leave. It was granted to me last evening, and that clearly is the end of the matter.

The Hon. H. Allison: You misled the House.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I did no such thing. That Standing Order could not be clearer. If the Government or the Speaker or any other member of the Parliament wants to change the Standing Orders, so be it. That is entirely a different matter, but this clearly is a case where the Parliament has concluded consideration of the matter. The Parliament's power, or more particularly the Speaker's power, in this matter is *functus officio*. That means that the Speaker has no power once the Parliament has given leave, which it had clearly done in this particular case.

Mr Becker: For statistical matter.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I am quite happy to have the debate range as it may or may not in relation to whether it was statistical or factual material. In my opinion, it is quite clearly statistical material. The matter that completely outrages me about the Speaker's ruling is his dicta about whether or not the material can be included because of length. There is absolutely nothing anywhere in Standing Orders that permits the Speaker to take it upon himself to have such powers and I challenge any member opposite to raise that matter and point to where in Standing Orders the Speaker has power to determine whether or not statistical or factual material can be entered in the record of this place because of the fact that the Speaker finds it is too long.

There is nothing in Standing Orders to require that and I am quite sure if this matter had not been sprung on us tonight—and it was certainly sprung on me, because the Speaker saw me for half a minute before Parliament resumed tonight and told me he was going to make this statement: no prior notice was given to the Opposition—we could have shown that *Hansard* is full of examples of long statistical tables that have been inserted in the past.

Mr Keneally: The member for Light.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The verbosity of the member for Light, now Speaker, is only too well known, and I am quite sure that statistical tables which every member of this Parliament have had inserted could be found in *Hansard* given the opportunity, and I believe that this Parliament has been treated quite unsatisfactorily in not being given notice of the fact that this so-called ruling was going to be made.

I see nowhere in the Parliamentary rules of debate which gives the Speaker any rights to make such a ruling once leave has been granted by this Parliament. The Speaker's power, of course, only derives from the power given to the Speaker by the Parliament. Nowhere in the rules of debate is power given in these circumstances. Sir, I believe that at the very least the Opposition ought to be given the opportunity of giving much greater consideration to this matter, and that it should be the subject of a full-scale and detailed debate later. To enable that to be facilitated, I move:

That the debate be now adjourned.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has moved that the debate be adjourned. He may seek leave to continue his remarks.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I do so, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Is leave granted? Leave is not granted. The honourable member for Elizabeth.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: That is hardly surprising, with the unanimity with which voices were raised on the other side. It is clear that the Government has decided that the material I sought to have inserted in *Hansard*, which dealt with the more than 400 nuclear accidents that have occurred around the world, is far too embarrassing for it to want to have on the record of this Parliament. That is the guts of this matter. It is a disgraceful situation. The Government is attempting to apply the gag to members of this Parliament to ensure that the official record cannot contain all the matters that ought to be applied in this debate. I have no doubt that a numbers-crunching exercise will be entered into here tonight, but it is a plain disgrace, and anyone reading the rules of debate and the *Hansard* report of this debate I am sure would agree that the Opposition's rights in this matter are being trampled upon by the Government and the Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. Does the honourable Premier intend to speak against the motion?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes, Mr Speaker. If any evidence was needed by the people of South Australia of the total disarray which presently exists in the ranks of the Opposition, they need only look to the proceedings tonight.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I rise on a point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable Premier to keep to the purpose of the debate at present, which is in respect of the Speaker's ruling. Does the honourable member for Mitchell still wish to raise a point of order?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Yes, Sir, only to reinforce that point, and I am grateful that you have observed the point I was about to raise.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am very much doing that, but there are two threads running through tonight's proceedings which are very significant. First, the ruling you have given tonight, Sir, is entirely and absolutely proper, and there is no questioning that. One has only to read Standing Order 138:

Where a member, in speaking to a question, refers to a statistical or factual table relevant to the question, such table may at the request of the member and by leave of the House, be inserted in the official report of the Parliamentary debates without being read.

The material that has been incorporated, and I believe incorporated under false pretences—

The Hon. Peter Duncan: You haven't even seen it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I take a point of order. The matter before the Chair is the dissent from your ruling, Sir, and the content of the material, its nature or character, is not a matter before the House.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot uphold the point of order. If the Premier or any other speaker were to continue on any issue beyond setting the scene for the statement which one would expect to follow, and the honourable member for Elizabeth has very clearly indicated that the content of his speech last night is vital to the action he has taken tonight, then action would be taken. But, until such time as I determine that the Premier or any other member in any circumstances is proceeding beyond setting the scene, that member may have the call.

Mr McRAE: I rise on a point of order.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: Shut up, Terry.

Mr McRAE: I take exception to being told to shut up by the Premier.

The SPEAKER: Order! The point of order!

Mr McRAE: Yes, the point of order is very clear. I want to know whether the words which you used, Sir, namely, a 'flagrant breach'—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr McRAE: I want to know whether there is implied in that a threat that the member for Elizabeth, if this motion is passed, is guilty of a contempt of the Parliament.

The SPEAKER: The simple answer is 'No', and I will debate that issue with the honourable member in due course. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: There is no question at all that the material which was handed to me about two minutes ago, which is the first time I have seen it, is not in any way a statistical table. In no way is it a table: it is a dissertation. It contains assertions.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I rise on a point of order. Standing Order 138 says that the matter which we are debating may be statistical or factual, and the point being made by the member in the debate is that it is not statistical; therefore, it is irrelevant.

The SPEAKER: Order! Until a person has concluded his or her remarks, it is not possible to hold a view on a few words. I do not uphold the point of order.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Earlier this evening on this very same matter, before I got through one-and-a-half sentences, the ruling was that the Chair could determine a matter in its own discretion. I have no quarrel with that. Let us make that quite clear. I ask you, Sir, to reconsider the point that I have put before you.

The SPEAKER: Order! I accept that the member for Mitchell has now raised a point of order. I do not uphold his point of order.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Mr Speaker, I repeat unequivocally that the ruling you have given is entirely right. If one looks at Standing Order 138 and at the material for which leave to insert was sought (in my view under false pretences), there is no question that your ruling is correct.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: What about the length?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The length has nothing whatever to do with it. The length of that incorporation simply compounds the felony.

Mr McRAE: I take a point of order. The word 'felony' was used against a colleague of mine. A felony is a deliberate crime committed against the law of the State, and I say that that must be withdrawn and apologised for.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Elizabeth will please resume his seat. There is no point of order. The honourable member for Playford would well know from rulings previously given in the House that the words used by the honourable Premier directed at a particular member may be redressed by that member, but not by the House at large. That position was quite clearly spelt out on Thursday last week in relation to the honourable member for Albert Park.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Members opposite know full well that it was only a figure of speech.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Elizabeth.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I was also on my feet when my honourable friend, the member for Playford, leapt to my defence, for which I thank him. I take a point of order that the words 'compounds the felony'—

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that the honourable member not take a point of order but ask that the words which are causing him concern be withdrawn.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I ask for those words to be withdrawn.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I assure members that the terminology was used in its general sense, and I am happy to withdraw. I am absolutely amazed that members opposite should be so concerned with taking points of order that they have, in fact, destroyed six of the seven minutes which have now been available to me for speaking. That highlights, beyond any doubt, the enormous turmoil that exists opposite.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I rise on a point of order. On my study of Standing Order 138 it contains no reference to time involved in the debate. The question which must be debated is that before the House, which is dissent from your ruling, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! For the same reasons I have given previously I do not uphold the point of order raised by the member for Mitchell.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: So, generally speaking there are two points at issue here: one is the ruling which you, Sir, have given which I totally and absolutely support. The evidence that you have given is irrefutable, and indeed the authority of the Speaker in these matters is fundamental to the process of Parliamentary democracy.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I seek your ruling as to whether the words in Standing Order 138 'by leave of the House' include rulings of the Speaker has as just been suggested the Premier. Do you have some difficulty in the handling of this?

The SPEAKER: I have difficulty in understanding the point of order that the honourable member is seeking to make.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I will endeavour to speak more slowly. Standing Order 138 states that by leave of the House a member may have a certain privilege. The present speaker was debating the issue on the basis of the Speaker's ruling. It does not seem to me to be relevant to this matter.

The SPEAKER: Order! The motion which is currently before the Chair, as moved by the honourable member for Elizabeth, is dissent from the Speaker's ruling, not the matter which the honourable member is trying to develop. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I intend to move that Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to complete the speech that I have to make in opposition to this motion, the speech which has been interrupted now by eight minutes on points of order being taken.

The SPEAKER: Order! What is the precise motion of the Premier?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to complete my speech in opposition to this motion.

The SPEAKER: Order! Does the Premier seek to put a time limitation on that?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Depending on the agility of honourable members, yes, I would say five minutes.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the House and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole, I accept the motion. Is it seconded?

Government members: Yes, Sir.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Mitchell may at this juncture speak against the motion or take a point of order and then be called upon to speak on the suspension of Standing Orders.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I have no point of order at this stage, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: I call on the honourable member to speak against the motion for the suspension of Standing Orders.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I oppose this motion.

Mr Ashenden: Democracy at work!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: This motion has been moved by the Premier in an endeavour to sustain arguments which he put forward in an earlier motion—and I hope to God that is allowable in this crazy place. The Premier has demonstrated tonight, particularly in the motion before the House—

The SPEAKER: Order! The motion before the Chair concerns the suspension of Standing Orders. I ask the honourable member for Mitchell to stay with the reasons for the suspension of Standing Orders.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: We have a set of Standing Orders in this House which allow for the orderly conduct of business. We also have a provision in this House that, when that system breaks down in some way, appears to be under threat or is not working, a member may seek to suspend the normal routine of this House (that is, the Standing Orders) in order to procure a certain result. In seeking to set aside the normal provisions which prevail by suspending the Standing Orders, there needs to be good reason for such a suspension. What are the reasons before the House at this stage? They are nil. The Premier simply sought to suspend the Standing Orders of this House, without any reason whatsoever being put before the House. Let the Premier deny that.

Mr Mathwin: You wouldn't let him speak.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: That is not the question before the House. The question before the House is the suspension of the standing discipline in this place, which is such that to suspend Standing Orders is to depart from the normal routine wherein members apply reasonable sense and decorum in these matters. What are the reasons behind the moving of the suspension of Standing Orders by the Premier? Without notice, dropped upon the Opposition without any notice at all, a member who had the leave of the House has been told that he no longer has that leave.

Where were the members opposite, 24 hours ago when he had leave of the House, saying 'No, you do not have leave'? Not one of them said a word. At the time they said 'Aye', or they acquiesced without making a statement. Now, on recollection, they are prepared to come in on the side of a ruling which has been made, and I have no quarrel with that. The Speaker has the right to make rulings that he wishes to make, but the mechanics and the machinery of this situation require acquiescence by a number of members of the House. It is not merely acquiescence that we are faced with, but a concerted effort, and that needs some consideration. It is no good the Premier's looking at the Speaker and blinking his eyes, because the Speaker is impartial in these matters, and he will make his own rulings. I have every confidence in him in that sense.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: What are you talking about?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Try not looking at the gallery for a change, and I will not be so suspicious of your motives. What has happened here tonight ought never have happened. I believe that the Speaker is entitled to make a ruling in these matters, and I have held that belief for 12 years, otherwise I would have been thrown out of the Chamber on occasions. However, it is the manner in which the Government has behaved in this matter that concerns me. The Government has sought to make political capital, as it were, out of a Speaker's ruling, which is not how a Speaker's ruling is meant to be used. I thank you, Sir, for the opportunity to make my point on this matter and to clearly indicate that there is no real reason for the Premier's seeking an extension of time and suspending the whole routine of the House by his motion to suspend Standing Orders, which I thoroughly oppose.

The House divided on the Hon. D. O. Tonkin's motion:

Ayes (20)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin (teller), Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (15)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon, M. J. Brown, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Keneally, Langley, McRae, Payne (teller), Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, and Whitten.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Evans, Glazbrook, Olsen, and Schmidt. Noes—Messrs Corcoran, Hopgood, O'Neill, and Wright.

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.

The SPEAKER: Although there is a majority of 5 for the Ayes, the motion lapses for want of an absolute majority.

Mr Slater: Where is the disarray now?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Elizabeth has moved a motion in relation to the Chair. It has been spoken to by a person opposing his point of view. Opportunity exists for the Speaker to contribute if he wishes. I believe that the contribution made by the Speaker in the various points of order and other issues which have arisen is sufficient but for one thing; the honourable member for Elizabeth indicated that he was concerned that the Opposition was given no prior notice. He accepted that the courtesy was given to him by myself of advising him before he came into the Chamber that I wanted him to be in the Chamber, because I had a statement to make. I want it to be known by the whole of the House that no member of the House, other than the member for Elizabeth, was aware of the content of any statement that the honourable Speaker was going to make to the House.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitchell accorded me the courtesy during his contribution to the suspension debate of indicating that the honourable Speaker was impartial. He is and will remain so, so long as he has the confidence of this House.

The House divided on the Hon. Peter Duncan's motion:

Ayes (15)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon, M. J. Brown, Duncan (teller), Hamilton, Hemmings, Keneally, Langley, McRae, Payne, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, and Whitten.

Noes (20)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin (teller), Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Corcoran, Hopgood, O'Neill, and Wright. Noes—Messrs Evans, Glazbrook, Olsen, and Schmidt.

Majority of 5 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1) (1982)

Second reading debate resumed.

(Continued from page 4474.)

Mr ABBOTT: I want to refer now to the battle that appears to be developing over child-care centres and facilites and the finances for those facilities. The whole question of child care has become one of crucial importance to a great percentage of Australian women who depend upon cheap child care for their economic survival. Despite the economic problems and the lack of employment opportunities overall, women are still entering the work force, and for these women access to child care is a very serious issue. The changes that are being contemplated in the children's services programme would affect the standard and availability of child care services. The Federal Minister announced that users of child care facilities would be means-tested and this, of course, will cost families extra money that they cannot afford.

The Federal Government refused to make funds available in 1981-82 for new and expended programmes, which means that dozens of applications for new programmes, some of which have been lodged for up to two years, will not now be funded. It also means that many low-income parents that the Government purports to care about will experience difficulty in finding places for their children before they reach school age. The Federal Government's performances

on means tests in other areas, such as the disadvantaged health cards, makes it likely that the established cut-off point for subsidy will be fairly low. Therefore, many existing users of child-care centres will find that their fees will rise to around $85 a week, which few families, even with two incomes, can afford. Many children will be withdrawn and put back into the informal and unsupervised private minding system.

The young family is provided with no relief at all. Women will find that without a second income they will not be able to meet their weekly bills and mortgage repayments. Lone parents trying to raise their income by finding paid work will be forced to stay poor and dependent on the Government if they have no access to dependable, affordable care. Parents using community-based care will have to plead disadvantage and have their fees set centrally. Many children could be forced out of centres and many women out of the paid work force to become dependent on one inadequate wage or on Government pensions and benefits.

The bulk of Australian families who fall between rich and poor will be back to fund-raising to try to support their centres, paying fees that they cannot afford or using care with which they are not satisfied. Such policies are regressive and divisive. Children are themselves vulnerable and should not have the type of services they receive determined by their parents' income rather than their own needs. All families should have access where possible to publicly funded programmes at a reasonable cost. Subsidies should be provided to those whose standards are satisfactory and who provide for a cross-section of the community, not a clientele based on ability to pay with a token representation from the disadvantaged.

There has been much publicity recently over the battle that is developing currently over child-care centres. I read with some interest the article that appeared in the *Advertiser* on 4 June, written by Alex Kennedy, in relation to the rumours that are flying around over subsidised child-care centres. She reported that many of the child-care centres are panicking and private centres are jubilant and large groups of middle-class mothers could end up leaving work or paying upwards of $85 a week for child-care in the next financial year. Her report related to the Federal Government changes that are pending in relation to child-care services. In that article the reporter also referred to the Spender Report on children's services. That report they refused to release, but I would like to quote some of the recommendations, which are as follows:

1. The Commonwealth should retain responsibility for the Children's Services Program, and no attempt should be made at this stage to devolve it to the States.

2. Where it is considered to be administratively feasible, components of the Children's Services Program which are funded via the States, should be brought back to direct funding. This includes neighbourhood centres; out of school hours and vacation care; and women's refuges.

3. An additional sum of $5 000 000 should be allocated in 1981-82 for the commencement of high priority projects.

4. *(a)* Application for which funds will not be available in the 1981-82 financial year, should be rejected.

(b) The procedures to be followed in the future for the lodgment of funding applications should be publicly and clearly stated.

5. The emphasis of the Children's Services Program should be mainstream child care, i.e., day care for young children, particularly pre-school aged children.

6. Mainstream child care should have reserved to it not less than 75 per cent of future funding under the Children's Services Program.

7. Within mainstream child care emphasis should be given to:

(a) facilitating access for children in priority needs categories and to locating services in high need areas;

(b) the development of family day care as the most cost effective area for the Government subsidies.

8. A one year trial costing not more than $300 000 should be conducted to assess the feasibility of providing a subsidy to enable the children of low income parents to attend commercial child-care centres. Additional funds should be allocated for this purpose.

9. Child care services provided under the Children's Services Program should benefit children predominantly because they are children. Services whose purposes relate mainly to other functions and only secondarily to child care, should be administered by more appropriate functional areas, for example, services for Aboriginals or handicapped children.

10. *(a)* The Family Support Services Scheme, for which there is a 3-year, $10 000 000 election commitment, should continue during that period, to be funded by the Commonwealth.

(b) Additional funds should be allocated for this purpose.

(c) The future of Family Support Services, including the Family Support Services Scheme, should be examined in the context of cost-sharing with the States with a view to devolution in the longer term.

11. The Youth Services Scheme is another example of non-mainstream child care. It should continue its period as a pilot study, but its continuation beyond that should depend upon the outcome of evaluation and the inquiry into youth homelessness by the Senate Standing Committee on Social Welfare.

12. All other non-mainstream projects should be reviewed to determine if funding can be reduced or terminated.

13. Standard accounting procedures should be introduced for funded organisations.

14. The Child Care Act, 1972 and the Children's Commission Act should be repealed. No recommendations of this review concerning new funding arrangements and delegations can be wholly implemented until the Child Care Act is repealed.

15. New funding formulas are essential to simplify administration and to redistribute existing recurrent expenditure on a more equitable basis.

16. A common means test should be devised for all mainstream child care services.

17. All applications for capital grants (for other than equipment) shoulld be assessed in the light of the capacity of the sponsoring organisation to contribute.

18. While recognising the desirability of the Minister retaining power to approve new projects, there is considerable scope for delegation of the more routine administrative matters under the Children's Services Program, and all such matters should be delegated.'

Although there are some sections of the Spender Report that have serious implications for the Children's Services Program, the real problems lie in the attitudes and commitments of the Minister, Senator Chaney. It is these that have led the Minister to make a series of statements which indicate his priorities. These do not include maintaining a broad programme with an on-going Commonwealth commitment to the quality care of children in non-profit centres. I hope that the State Government will see fit to assist the State child care facilities in future to the extent that we see in this State child-care facilities that can meet the incomes and the requirements of the working class people in South Australia. I support the Bill.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): In speaking to this Bill, I would like to address myself to a question that I have come across and which, no doubt, every member in this Chamber has probably come across every day of the week and every week of the year, namely, the incidence of crime and violence in society. I believe that all honest members of this Parliament would express their concern at the amount of violence and crime in the community. In researching this subject, my attention was drawn to a paid newspaper advertisement by the infamous Nigel Buick in the *News* on Monday 10 September 1979. It says:

Mr Premier, tell it the way it is. Why has crime and violence grown by a shocking 263 per cent in seven years since Labor came to power?

The inference in that paid advertisement was that crime and violence were the fault of the Labor Party and because of its policies and attitude.

Mr Lewis: That's right.

Mr HAMILTON: I find that one of the most disgusting and sickening advertisements that I have ever come across. Obviously, by the interjection from the member for Mallee, he supports that advertisement. That advertisement is saying is that the Police Force is not doing its job. We have heard

Government members standing in this Parliament since October 1979, every time that Opposition members raise questions about the Police Force, saying that we are trying to put the Police Force down, and that we are trying to restrict them in their duties. I will demonstrate later on the attitude of this Government in relation to its views on crime and violence. The article continues:

Shame, Mr Premier. Don't blame Fraser for that.

The inference is that it was the attitude and intention of the then Premier to allow that to continue. In a moment, I will demonstrate the attitude of the present and past Chief Secretaries in South Australia in relation to the incidence of crime and violence in this State. An article appeared in the *News* on 15 February 1981. The report, headed 'Fifty break-ins a day in crime boom', stated:

More than 20 000 premises were broken into in South Australia during 1980. Almost 11 000 were houses, about 4 000 were shops and more than 5 000 other types of premises. The figures mean that 400 premises were broken into every week, more than fifty a day.

The article goes on to say that these statistics were released by the Law Department in the December quarter of 1980. The figures also went on to show that 5 949 motor vehicles were reported stolen during the year, almost 115 per week. There were more than 400 robberies, including those with weapons, during the year. A total of 23 100 other types of thefts, including shop stealing, were reported during the second half of the year. Figures for the first half of the year were not available. Fraud offences totalled 2 930 for the year. There were 236 rapes reported, more than four a week. The report goes on:

There were 415 assaults which caused 'grievous or actual bodily harm' in the year. About 2 000 other types of assaults were reported in the second half of the year. Twelve murders and eleven attempted murders were investigated.

The December quarter figures show police cleared up less than 10 per cent of reported breakings. The Police Crime Director, Senior Chief Superintendent Sid Shepherdson, said police were not satisfied with the low clear-up rate.

It was difficult to know how to improve the number of clean-ups, but police were working on plans to do so. It was becoming increasingly difficult for police to detect offenders in certain types of crime, particularly breakings and rapes.

Yet this filthy, rotten article, written by this man from Kangaroo Island, who, as a person pointed out to me, was lower than shark droppings in the bottom of the ocean, appeared. I could not agree more with that statement. What a disgusting, filthy rotten article it is, yet when we read this article in the *News*, do we now say that that is the fault of this Government? Do we say that? Do we draw the analogy between what happened in 1979 and what happened in 1980? Of course we do not! The situation is quite clear. The reasons why we have these problems in the community—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: There is a multiplicity of reasons as to why we have these problems in the community. Many of them are as a result of the attitude of the Federal Government, because of the increasing unemployment in this country. That is one of the reasons why. There is a multiplicity of reasons why we have crime here in this State. It grieves me when I see an article as filthy and despicable as this one. Yet, what do we hear from this infamous Nigel Buick, who has suddenly vanished from the face of the earth? Where is he now? Is he concerned about the rapes, robberies, thefts, break-ins, and assaults on young children in the community? Where is this man? We have heard nothing from him. I can only repeat what a filthy, despicable man he is, in my opinion. I have pursued this line ever since I have been in the Parliament, raising questions time and time again with the Chief Secretary.

In December of last year, in response to a question I put on the Notice Paper, I received information from the then Chief Secretary, against whom I harbour no feelings. I have always found him outside this Parliament to be a very nice chap, but when we come back to the figures in this disgusting article, it makes me sick to my gut every time I look at it.

The figures in the north-western suburbs are quite revealing. This relates not only to the north-western suburbs, but to all the divisions here in South Australia, Division B1 and B2, and Division C1, which encompasses my own electorate. I refer also to Divisions C2, D1 and D2—the whole of the metropolitan area. I asked for and received this information from the Chief Secretary. I seek leave to have this purely statistical document inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable member assure the Chair that it is purely statistical and that, with due respect to previous events, the length of the material is reasonable?

Mr HAMILTON: Yes, Sir.

Leave granted.

HOUSEBREAKING (INCLUDES BURGLARY) FOR JULY, AUGUST, SEPTEMBER, 1981

Area	July		August		September	
	Reported	Value	Reported	Value	Reported	Value
		$		$		$
'B.1' Division	60	18 359	51	23 245	61	22 265
'B.2' Division	146	177 000	184	124 000	152	57 507
'C.1' Division	179	110 000	163	87 239	164	64 856
'C.2' Division	159	74 922	140	64 407	108	52 436
'D.1' Division	101	25 834	141	30 359	152	29 859
'D.2' Division	88	48 546	125	46 280	89	41 886
Metropolitan	733	454 661	804	375 530	726	268 809
State	868	506 000	960	412 000	873	326 000

Source—Monthly Managerial Reporting Subsystem File.
28 October 1981

Mr HAMILTON: House breakings, including burglary, for July, August and September 1981 in the north-western suburbs are as follows: 179; the value of damages incurred and losses was $110 000. In August, 163 cases were reported, the value being $87 239. In September, 164 cases were reported, amounting to a total loss of $64 856. Being concerned as a member, not only for my district, but in respect of the north-western suburbs, I said, in a newsletter that I put out to some 11 500 of my constituents on 18 December 1981:

> Burglary and vandalism—residents are advised to keep their homes properly secured. Port Adelaide C1 division reported 5 061 cases of house breaking, including burglary during July, August and September 1981. Losses incurred, $263 000.

I received more than a favourable response from my constituents in relation to that newsletter. I pointed out to them that we have so much vandalism and burglary because of a multiplicity of factors.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: If that inane person on the other side would listen, he might learn something. In my area, I had some discussions with the Woodville council, which issued the following paper on vandalism:

> Vandalism: What is it? There appears to be no common or universally acceptable definition of the term 'vandalism'. There is no offence which is legally categorised as vandalism. While there may be a general belief that vandalism is a clearly recognisable type of behaviour and that vandals conform to a particular stereotype, the general conclusion is that vandalism is neither a precise behavioural description nor a recognisable legal category, but a label attached to certain types of behaviour under certain conditions.
>
> The Community Welfare Advisory Committee on Vandalism accepted for working purposes the following definition of vandalism:
>
> > Any illegal act of deliberate destruction, damage of defacement of the property of another, or any similar act likely to result in danger to human life.
>
> It has proved impossible to find a meaningful definition of vandalism—the underlying concept is wilful damage to public or private property and amenities. Vandalism tends to be blamed for any damage which is not known to have another cause.
>
> Vandalism is thus not a single or simple concept and has no single or simple solution. Its causes (and their remedies) in a particular situation are likely to need separate analysis.

This article goes on to demonstrate the amount of vandalism in the Woodville council area, which encompasses all my electorate. It describes in this pamphlet put out by Woodville council some of the major factors commonly relating to delinquency and the reasons why we have vandalism, house breakings, etc. Factors commonly related to delinquency are stated:

> 1. Most students of delinquency consider poverty as a major cause.
>
> 2. Many authors consider that the low income of young people and their unstable pattern of employment force them into delinquency. In a more severe form unemployment as such is directly responsible.

It goes on to demonstrate overcrowding in homes, problems among the working class, the incidence of delinquency within the family, the importance of the poor father, authority in the home, and so on. As I pointed out, we have crime in this State and throughout this country because of a multiplicity of factors. However, I return to that filthy, rotten article by this man whom I consider to be one of the most despicable men in this State.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: One can easily see the reason why the member for Mallee interjects so continuously, because I have quite clearly drawn blood. I was so moved by the problems within my community, and having seen them, I put other questions on the Notice Paper, requesting that a crime alert programme be implemented within the districts in the north-western suburbs, and in particular within my electorate. In Question on Notice 322, I asked:

> Is it the intention of the Government to increase the staff of the Police Force, and, if so, when, by how many, and in what specific areas, and, if not, why not?

Part (2) of that question was:

> How many representations during 1981 had been made to the Government to increase police numbers, and what organisations and community groups made such representations?

As I pointed out, on 1 June of this year I received the following reply from the now Chief Secretary:

> The matter is receiving consideration.

Big, big deal. The same response has been there from the previous Chief Secretary, but in the Liberal Party platform in 1979 they stated that they would increase the size of the Police Force in this State. Where have they been for the last two and a half years? In making that statement, I certainly make no reflection on the Police Force in this State—contrary to what members on the other side (and their ilk) did with their filthy advertisements, in September 1979. In question No. 322, I asked how many representations during 1981 had been made to the Government to increase police numbers and from what organisations they had come. The response from the now Chief Secretary was:

> Andamooka Progress and Opal Miners Association, Coonalpyn Progress Association, Corporation of Jamestown, District Council of Spalding, District Council of Willunga, Central Yorke Peninsula Liaison Committee, Corporation of the Town of Thebarton, Nangwarry Primary School, Corporation of the City of Mount Gambier and the Flinders Ranges Regional Association Incorporated.

Many of the problems we have in this country result directly from unemployment. Here we have a clear demonstration of it. I have three teenage children. I am concerned about young people. I took it upon myself, soon after coming into office, to contact a police inspector and ask if I could do two eight-hour shifts from Friday night to Saturday morning to see what problems were encompassed in his duties. He picked me up at 8 p.m. on the Friday and we did an eight-hour shift. I went right around my electorate and outside it on the northern and eastern sides, to try to get a clear understanding of problems that the Police Force in this State encounters. They were many and varied. That caused me to ask for another trip with him, which I subsequently did. Time permitting, I would like to go again to see present problems, which would be rather interesting.

I come back to the most important issue pertaining to my electorate as I now see it, and that is the need for a crime alert programme within the western suburbs. In the past three weeks with a colleague I door-knocked 3 000 homes in the Woodville South, Woodville West, Seaton and West Lakes areas. One of the common complaints directed to me was about the amount of petty crime, vandalism, and other crimes committed in the area. One example was given to me by a woman whose husband could have been killed because of the stupidity of some person who loosened the nuts on the wheel of his truck. I could relate many more such instances if I had half an hour to continue. Only a few months ago, on 7 April, I was reported in the *News* as alerting people to crime as follows:

> A full-scale crime alert programme was urgently needed in the western suburbs, Albert Park M.P. Kevin Hamilton said today.

I related the figures given to me by the then Chief Secretary. On 2 December last year, after a shooting in the Seaton area, I made it my business to contact the local government authority. We had discussions at the Woodville council chambers about problems with vandals and crime in the area. At that first meeting, I was disgusted at some of the comments made by some of the people represented. One person's attitude (and I would not like to reflect on some of the others) was all that was needed was a good thumping for some of these young pups to straighten them out. At a

subsequent meeting the man's attitude rapidly changed when a social worker addressed the Woodville council.

I see that the Chief Secretary is in the Chamber now. I plead with him to reconsider his statement that there is no intention to conduct a crime alert programme in the north-western suburbs. I understand from his statements that that is dependent upon the number of cadets at the Largs North Police Academy. If that is because not enough cadets are available, which may well be the case, I would ask him to honour his Party's promise to the electorate, leading up to the 1979 election, to increase the size of the Police Force. Perhaps, with the number of well-qualified unemployed people looking for jobs, this may assist those people concerned about crime in the north-western suburbs, in my area particularly.

I recognise at the same time that a token gesture was made the other day when the member for Henley Beach asked a question about blue light discoes in Victoria. I do not knock that. It is a good thing, but it is only a token gesture put up some time before the election, whenever it may be. We have seen this before—make it look good and it may placate some of the people outside. That may be the Government's intention.

Mr Russack: You are criticised for not doing something and criticised when you do something.

Mr HAMILTON: I am not criticising, but the thought crossed my mind when I saw the Minister on television. I am just being cynical because I believe that, given the nature of those articles that appeared in the press prior to the 1979 election and all the hoo-hah about crime and vandalism in this State, perhaps the present Chief Secretary has, with respect, done more than the other Ministers did, but, surely, there is still much to be done for the Minister to now honour his Party's promise in 1979 to increase the size of the Police Force. I will certainly be watching the matter with great interest. I hope that the Minister will respond within the next week or so to criticisms and comments I have made here tonight, because I know my constituents will be most interested in the Chief Secretary's reply, which I hope will be detailed.

Turning to other matters pertaining to my electorate, it is time to be critical of the Government. I related in the Parliament some time ago, in regard to a question asked of the Minister of Transport, that I had written to him early in 1980 about the proposed extension to West Lakes Boulevard. That was the subject of a very heated public meeting with the previous Government in 1973, which I attended. Feelings of the people at that time were running high. They are now in the same vein. I asked the Minister in 1980 whether it was the Government's intention to extend West Lakes Boulevard. His response was, 'Nothing before 1990.' I asked a question on this and the Minister said, in effect, that when he was good and ready he would supply that information. I can tell him now that I have that information from another source. Of course, that other source details the extension in a report submitted to the Woodville council, which states:

> The Highways Department now advises as follows: the drawing P1-171/RT2D forwarded to you on 4 November 1981 shows a scheme for extending West Lakes Boulevard eastwards from Tapleys Hill Road to Port Road. It is a concept plan only and seeks to show that the link is feasible.

Why could not the Minister advise me of that? Information from councils leak out. I have the detailed information here of that report that was given to the local government authority. Why could not the Minister provide me with that information and attempt to allay the fears of many of my constituents and business people in the Seaton area, who are very concerned about the way in which this proposal could affect their respective businesses? However, the Minister wanted to play politics. He was not prepared to give me that information, but I will impart it to my constituents concerning the recommendations of the council. That just goes to show the sincerity of the Minister.

During the remaining three minutes I have left to me, I will refer to a matter concerning small businesses. Correspondence forwarded to the Minister by me as well as by the Corporation of the City of Woodville expressed criticism and concern about the installation of a pedestrian crossing at Royal Park that affects many small businesses because of a lack of consultation between the Highways Department and those involved concerning the department's intention to install this crossing and the associated fence.

It is pointed out in correspondence forwarded by the Corporation of the City of Woodville that the installation of the fence is affecting the movement of pedestrians along the footpath as well as the viability of goods handling. It makes me wonder whether the Government is really sincere when it is not prepared to consult small businesses in relation to how such an installation could affect them.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): I was pleased to hear the previous speaker mention the matter of working with the police in his area. I also have taken the opportunity to travel with the police on their patrol, as there is a headquarters at Glanville, in my district. I support what he said; I think that the police we have are remarkable people and I think we are very lucky in this State to have the police that we have. In regard to the cadet training system, I was disturbed to hear the other day that the system is being varied somewhat. At one stage there were continuous programmes at Fort Largs, but they are now not continuous, which I think may explain why the cadets are not available, which is a bad aspect.

I want to raise a subject concerning schools in my area. I am pleased to see the Minister of Education here tonight, because I am sure he is aware of the problem. I want to restate the situation in regard to the Largs Bay school. This school has been in operation since 1924. From its very beginning there has been a shortage of play area for the students. I have some facts relating to the history of the school. It is situated on an area of 0.82 hectares. In 1927, three years after the school was established, the parents of students complained to the Minister of Education about the lack of playground space, and the problem has prevailed since that time. Since the end of the Second World War the school has used Almond Tree Flat Reserve as a play area during lunch periods and for sporting activities. That reserve is several hundred yards away and to reach it students must cross Fletcher Road, which is a very busy road. Parents have continually objected to the shepherding of hundreds of children across that road each day.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Is there not a crossing?

Mr PETERSON: There is a crossing there but travelling via the crossing reduces the children's recess and lunch times and, of course, there is also the matter of organising getting the children there and back. Peak enrolment for the school occurred in 1969, when some 1 300 children were enrolled; that is, 1 300 children on a school area of 0.82 hectares. At that time the area was just about all covered with buildings.

From 1980 to 1982 there was a reconstruction of buildings and the total area of the play area at the end of this work, which is now completed, is 0.52 hectares, which is the area to be used by some 480 children and which in effect leaves them with only 10.92 square metres per child. I believe that that is the smallest play area per child for any school in this State, and I am sure the Minister will correct me if I am wrong. The allowance for new schools is something like 53 square metres per student, so the area is substantially

less for students in an existing school than for those in a new school.

For some years the school council has been urging the Education Department to extend the southern boundary of the school to incorporate part of Centre Street, which is adjacent to the school. As a matter of fact, in 1980 the Minister approved an approach from the Port Adelaide council. At that stage, I understand, the council indicated that, if the school owned property on the other side of that street, it would be more favourably disposed to the closure of the street. I understand that officers of the Education Department approached the owners of properties on the southern side of Centre Street and indicated to them that, if their properties ever went on the market, the department would be interested in purchasing them provided that the price asked was not outrageous.

Soon after that an officer of the facilities section of the Education Department displayed a site plan to the school officials and neighbouring residents which showed that area of Centre Street taken into the school area. Also at that time the Principal was requested to notify the Education Department if any of the adjacent properties were put on the market. Earlier this year a property was put on the market and the Education Department was notified. However, the school received a response that the Education Department had changed its mind, that it was not interested, and that it would not be interested in the foreseeable future.

Last year students at the school took home a questionnaire to parents. There was a 97 per cent response, and 98 per cent of those who responded supported the extension of the play area across Centre Street. The main reason for that was that parents were concerned about children having to cross a road to get to the reserve during lunch and recess periods. It is a fact that the rate of accidents concerning children at the school site is many times higher than the rate when they moved Almond Tree Flat, which is because they are much more crowded.

As I have said, this problem has been in existence since 1927. On 25 June 1972 it was reported to the school committee that the additions to the school were nearing completion and that arrangements would be made for the Minister of Education to open the building. At the July meeting it was suggested that, at the opening, the committee should ask the Minister to do something about increasing the playground area of the school. However, the approach was apparently not a triumph and at the September meeting the Minister replied that the Government had no money, that it would make no promises, but that the committee should keep the matter coming forward. It has been doing that over and over again. Only this year I received a letter from the school council which I shall read to the House. It is as follows:

The Largs Bay School Council wishes to draw your attention to the inadequate nature of the playground at this school. It has one of the smallest, if not the smallest playground area per child in South Australia. There is no area where children may run or play games without hurting other children. Children spend half their lunch hour being crocodile [I think that needs no explanation] over a busy road to a district o[illegible]. A survey of parents has revealed that 96 per cent are very dissatisfied with this situation. We have made representations to the Education Department for many years on this subject. In 1976 the Director of Educational Facilities visited the school. Subsequently plans were made to renovate the school and remove temporary buildings. While we appreciate greatly the splendid new extensions which are almost completed we feel the area of playground has not been noticeably increased. The problem remains.

At the same time plans were made and, we believe, approved by the Minister to gradually increase the playground as adjacent properties became available. We were assured at several meetings by departmental officials that this was the department's policy, and in fact property owners were advised by departmental officials that the department had an interest in their properties. In March 1982 an adjacent property, which is marked on the P.B.D. redevelopment plan for this site, came on the market at the amazingly low price of $30 000. This was the breakthrough the council had waited for for years, yet the department refused to buy the property, the opportunity was lost and we are left with a $1 600 000 building but inadequate, overcrowded playground.

This is not an area of markedly declining population. We see a long future for this school and feel that future school children should not have the overcrowding our children have had. Would you please take up our case with the Minister of Education and if possible arrange for us to meet with him at some time in the near future.

I wrote to the Minister on 3 May, as follows:

Enclosed you will find a copy of a letter that I have received from the Largs Bay School Council concerning the lack of playground area provided for pupils at that school and a history of attempts to have additional adjacent area provided. I fully support the school's proposals to enlarge the play area and am surprised that the Education Department has reversed their attitude especially in view of the excellent record of extension to school grounds that has been achieve at other local schools, i.e., LeFevre Primary, Ethelton Primary and Alberton Primary. Largs Bay School is centrally located upon the LeFevre Peninsula and its significance as a result of that location can only increase enrolments in the future. Recent extensions have provided excellent building facilities but have further reduced the play area available at the site.

To overcome this lack of area children are taken from the schoolgrounds during their lunch hour to the nearby Almond Tree Flat Reserve; to reach this reserve the children have to cross a very busy road, i.e., Fletcher Road, and lose a great deal of time just getting there and back. A recent survey of parents indicated a rejection of this system and support for a scheme to extend schoolgrounds by the closure of Centre Street at the southern boundary of the school. The Education Department also until very recently supported the extension proposal. The rejection by the department of an opportunity to purchase a nearby property has indicated a change of direction in this matter.

I request the opportunity as soon as possible for a small delegation from the school council and myself to discuss the future expansion of the schoolgrounds with you. We would fit in with any arrangements that you wish to make regarding the timing of a meeting... On behalf of the Largs Bay School Council, I await your reply.

I thought we might at least be able to talk to the Minister, put the case to him and explain the changed situation, but it was not meant to be. I received a letter from the Minister as follows:

I refer to your letter of 3 May 1982 concerning the limited play area on the Largs Bay Primary School site. I understand that, despite a reduction in the play area on the northern side of the school resulting from the building extensions, there has been a considerable increase in the area available on the southern side, which is now consolidated and from which buildings have been removed.

This is not quite true, but I can clarify that later. It goes on to say:

There has been a number of approaches to the Port Adelaide City Council in recent years, seeking the closure of Centre Street, and all have been unsuccessful.

I think the next sentence covers the situation:

Furthermore, the council has given no undertaking that Centre Street would be closed if the department acquired properties on its southern side. Hence, the use of public money to purchase such properties would be imprudent and difficult to justify.

I think that that is clarified by what I said earlier, namely, that the council did give an undertaking that it would be much more inclined to close Centre Street if the properties were owned by the Education Department. The Minister's letter continues:

Your letter mentioned the acquisition of property to extend the playing areas at a number of othe primary schools. Unlike the Largs Bay Primary School, the LeFevre and Ethelton Primary Schools do not have access to grassed play areas within easy walking distance. At Alberton Primary School, the closure of adjacent streets was agreed to by neighbours and made possible by the consolidation of the school's only play areas.

Of course, they did not ask the residents and they did not own the properties at Largs, so that is not valid. The letter goes on to say:

You referred also to the possibility of an increase in enrolments. However, the department's demographic projections indicate clearly that a fall in enrolment can be expected.

On my understanding, that is not quite true. I believe that there will be a decreasing need for primary school facilities in the area, but I also believe that there are long-term plans to close one of the schools, so that point does not lie easy with me. The letter goes on to say:

I appreciate your concern and that of the Largs Bay School Council, but consider that the school's play area, though not ideal, is adequate.

My information is that it is the smallest play area in the State, and I hope that the Minister will check that out. The letter continues:

For the reasons given, I am not willing at the present time to support the acquisition of properties with a view to possible extension of the school site as previously proposed.

Again, there is a change of stance. Officers of the department have actively canvassed people living in the area about the purchase of their properties. The letter concludes:

Given this situation, there would seem to be little to gain in my receiving a deputation at this stage.

That does not make sense to me, either. Surely, just to be polite, the Minister should speak to these people and explain the change of stance, but we cannot even get to see the Minister, and that is a mark against him.

I refer now to what has come to be one of my favourite subjects, and that is Taperoo beach and the performance of the Department of the Environment, or the Coast Protection Board under the department's aegis. I came across a report, dated November 1977, by a project officer, D. J. Walker, a civil engineer in the Coast Protection Board. It is a report concerning the seaweed problems at Taperoo beach. I would like to go through that report, many of the points that I am still making being obvious when the report was published five years ago.The terms of reference of the report were as follows:

1. To determine the rate of accumulation of the seaweed.
2. To study the feasibility and cost of removal and dumping.
3. To investigate the potential use as a mulch.
4. To study possible on-site disposal—composting and covering, then development for recreation.

By the way, that was a plan drawn up by the Pak Poy people many years ago, and it has never been looked at since. Let me go on with the terms of reference:

5. To investigate any other disposal methods.
6. To determine the proportion of weed mixed with underlying sand.
7. To study the possible methods of sand removal in the presence of the weed.

No. 8 is a significant one, to which I hope I can come back. It states:

To study the stormwater and tidal pool drainage.

That problem is still being ignored. I wrote to the Minister of Environment and Planning about this pool and the danger to health, and I have also written to the Minister of Health about the problem.

Everybody knew that this accumulation of seaweed and sand would take place to the south of a breakwater that had to be built for the North Haven project, but they are all running for cover now, and no-one will accept the responsibility. I say again, as I have said previously and will say again in the future, that if this situation occurred at Glenelg, Brighton or any of the 'Liberal' beaches, action would be taken within a year, but nothing has been done in this area. The accumulation of sand and seaweed because of the North Haven breakwater has created a wall, which was predicted in this report to which I will go back, preventing the flow of storm-water to the sea. The drainage of storm-water is the responsibility of the local council, and until this accumulation of seaweed and sand the system in use was quite effective.

Since this accumulation, the water cannot get to the sea: it has built up ponds of stagnant water in which mosquitoes breed, and I am sure that the water is not healthy. Whether or not it is a source of infection I do not know, because tests are not made on it regularly. I know that there is one public toilet with a septic system that is very close to one of these pools, and it could be a health hazard. The wall of seaweed and sand has built up, and this water cannot mount it over to the sea. I wrote to the Minister of Environment and Planning, referring directly to the Coast Protection Act and quoting the clauses that I thought defined the responsibility of the board. I will read the submission that I made to the Minister, starting with the background, as follows:

A major storm water drain discharges on to the foreshore area out from Moldavia Walk in the south-eastern corner of the relevant section. Prior to the establishment of the southern North Haven revetment mound, the discharged water flowed into the sea. As you are well aware, since the mound was constructed, sand and seaweed have built up creating a 'sea wall' along section 389 that acts as a dam wall and prevents the discharge of water from flowing to the sea. This has created a large permanent pond of stagnant, stinking water upon the foreshore.
Reasons for concern: The pond is dangerous to children as it is quite deep in parts, it is 'down beach' of a public toilet that has a septic system and there is considerable concern over the possibility of disease from the water and there are the problems of mosquitoes and stench.
Restoration: Under the Coast Protection Act, 1972-1975, the following terms are pertinent:
Part 1—Clause 4
'Coast' means all land that is
(b) above and within one hundred metres of that mean high-water mark.

The cause of the problem is within that distance, as obviously the seaweed and sand build up at high-tide mark and the problem created is within this definition that is laid down. The other situation concerns the duties of the board, namely:

To restore any part of the coast that has been subjected to erosion, damage, deterioration, pollution or misuse.

I stated in my submission:

There is no doubt, if deterioration is taken to mean worsen, then this has taken place. This coast was previously clear, clean sand. Pollution is being created as water and stormwater borne objects are not prevented from running to the sea. They are now trapped upon the foreshore creating stench, providing breeding grounds for insects and creating visual pollution.

I went on to say that the duties of the board are:

to develop any part of the coast for the purpose of aesthetic improvement . . .

I continued:

Any action taken to remove the ponds of black stagnant water must improve the aesthetic appeal of the area and would complement work already completed to remove noxious plants and leave native growth.
Part 11—Clause 14 (1)
to carry out research, to cause research to be carried out, or to contribute towards research, into matters relating to the protection, restoration or development of the coast.
Action requested: That the Coast Protection Board undertake the following course of action under the provisions of the Coast Protection Act, 1972-1975.
1. Part 11—Clause 14 *(e)*
Have the problem of waste water held on the foreshore/beach areas as defined researched with a view to dispersing the water in the sea.

The other action that I required was under Part 11, clause 14 (1) *(b)*, as follows:

Undertake to restore the coast that has been subjected to deterioration and pollution or to provide a remedy to the situation that has developed and to develop the aesthetics of the area.

In summary, I stated:

It is acknowledged that the responsibility for the dispersal of storm water is vested in the Corporation of the City of Port Adelaide. This responsibility had been met and existing arrangements prior to the development of North Haven were satisfactory. The changes that have occurred were totally out of the control of

the council, and the work that is now necessary should not fall upon the corporation, nor should the expense be borne by the residents of our city. The coast has deteriorated, creating this situation, and your attention to this matter is requested.

I would like to quote the reply that I received from that letter.

Mr Becker: Have you had an acknowledgment?

Mr PETERSON: Yes, the reply states:

This matter has been referred to the Coast Protection Board, which has advised that there are similar situations elsewhere in the State—

I do not know where they are, but if there are problems elsewhere in the State the people concerned should be objecting, too. The reply continues:

... the board has the power, under the Act, to protect, restore and research such areas and problems. Nevertheless, the Act and funding does not imply that the board should take over all such problems—

that shows the attitude to areas whose residents are not necessarily (shall I say) politically inclined towards them—particularly those that relate to the responsibilities of other agencies.

As I said in the submission, the local council had completed its responsibilities and had a perfectly effective system until actions of other people created a situation that was not effective. I believe that this is the responsibility of the Coast Protection Board. The letter continues:

However, the board considers that this particular matter should be investigated and has recommended a site inspection by officers of the Coastal Management Branch, Department of Marine and Harbors, Corporation of the City of Port Adelaide and yourself to consider the need for research into potential solutions and the relevant responsibilities involved. The Coastal Management Branch is making arrangements for the joint site inspection and meeting, and will be in contact with you. I hope that the proposed action will result in an acceptable solution to the problems you have outlined.

Then I got another letter referring to the previous letter, and stating:

I refer to my letter of 19 January. In the interim, the matter has been further discussed between representatives of the Coast Protection Board and the Department of Marine and Harbors, who now advises that it is an obligation of the City of Port Adelaide—

we all knew that before; even they knew that—

to effectively discharge that city's accumulated stormwater in an effective manner.

They did that, and it was effective right after up until the time of this build-up. The letter goes on:

Nevertheless, it is the intention of the Department of Environment and Planning and the North Haven Trust that, when dredging of the breakwater entrance takes place, dredged material will be placed in the shallow depressions which created the ponding of stormwater. Tenders have been called for the dredging, but I am not yet in a position to say when the work will take place.

The letter concludes:

In view of the above, I have been advised that the joint site inspection recommended in my letter of 19 January is unlikely to be of benefit to the parties concerned at this time. I will, however, ensure that you are kept informed of progress on the matter.

Again, I come back to the point that here is a report, to which I will not be able to refer, because of time, raised in 1977, recognising the ponding problem. It was clearly in this report. They acknowledged that there would be a build-up of seaweed and sand. There was no doubt that it would take place. The 1977 report states:

Besides covering the beach, the seaweed accumulation has upset the natural drainage of stormwater and tidal flows leaving pools of stagnant water.

They recognised that in 1977. The report goes on:

The condition of the beach at this stage was considered by local residents to be unsuitable, not only from a recreational point of view, but from the health aspect. These feelings were conveyed to the board by way of a local resident group in the hope that something could be done to reinstate the beach.

Five years later not one thing has been done. I still cannot get the Minister in charge of the Coast Protection Act to take a responsible look at it. Where does that leave an area such as mine? To whom do we turn? Does that mean the city itself has to pay again to do a job which it has done very successfully?

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Lewis): Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable Minister of Health.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health): I move:

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

Motion carried.

Mr LANGLEY (Unley): First, I congratulate the member for Mitcham on her election to this Parliament. I took an interest in the election and I did some doorknocking in an area called Colonel Light Gardens, but I did not see one member of the Liberal Party in Colonel Light Gardens. The Labor Party achieved a record vote of 38 per cent in an area where the Liberals should have got 38 per cent, but they did not. The Labor Party preferences sealed the fate of the Liberal Party. Steele Hall is the Federal member for the district and he would win that quite well. When we look at the votes in the Federal election for the Liberal Party in the district of Mitcham, I can see why that Party should not have won that seat. I congratulate the member. Had it not been for a couple of wet days, the Labor Party could have come second. I must say to the Liberal Party that, if it had gone out and done some work, it might have got a little further, but I cannot take it away from the honourable member for winning the seat. I am not sure that the odds were against her when she stood, but I am sure the battle will be on again very shortly.

Mr Mathwin: When is it?

Mr LANGLEY: I am not sure. My daughter rang me from Melbourne and said, 'It won't be long, Dad, before you are out of Parliament.' It is all over Australia. It is no secret. I am not perturbed, because I have had a good life in this Parliament.

Mr Mathwin: When is it? Tell us.

Mr LANGLEY: I am not sure, but I will regret it when I have to leave this House.

Mr Becker: We will miss you.

Mr LANGLEY: I am sure the honourable member will miss me. There is no need to worry, because a Labor member will win Unley and he will retire undefeated, as I will.

Mr Mathwin: And he will still be on that side of the House.

Mr LANGLEY: Yes. I have one thing in my favour. We have doorknocked very thoroughly. I can assure members opposite they are behind schedule and have no chance of winning Unley. I am not allowed to make bets—

The Hon. R. G. Payne interjecting:

Mr LANGLEY: I would not go against Standing Orders. I was in Queensland at the time of the Mitcham by-election and could not believe the result, but that is what happened. I see the member for Todd is in the Chamber, and the Minister of Industrial Affairs, and I apologise for my interjection the other day when I said that South Australia had the highest unemployment rate in Australia. I admit that I made an error, but they both laughed at the time. No person should laugh when there is so much unemployment in this State. South Australia has the highest unemployment rate of any of the mainland States. I will remember what happened.

Everybody is allowed to make an error. I am willing to admit that I did make an error, but one should not laugh about unemployment in this State. I can assure each and every member opposite that they do not like unions in any State at all. They get up in this House and say that unions are necessary, but when it comes to the crunch and they have something to put before arbitration, the Government immediately opposes it.

Mr Mathwin: I am a union member myself.

Mr LANGLEY: Yes, I think the storemen and dockers. I can remember it was mentioned when I was first in the House. He did not deny it.

Mr Mathwin: I remember it well.

Mr LANGLEY: I was a member of a union, and I still abide by what the Industrial Court says and what happens. Recently the Minister of Industrial Affairs moved into an area where he thought he could win and he tried in many ways to stop the P.S.A. from getting the rises which its members deserved, which they later did receive, and which he opposed. He mentioned the person standing for Unley, who was Acting Secretary of the P.S.A. at the time. The Minister of Industrial Affairs lost the case. He tried to move into an area, but he missed out. It has cost the Minister and the Government a lot of votes.

Mr Mathwin: Because of—

Mr LANGLEY: Because the Minister of Industrial Affairs tried to interfere with the court, and he missed out. It is one of the worst things he ever did. He did not want to go through the right channels. That will have an effect in Unley. I know, when we are out doorknocking—

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

Mr LANGLEY: The honourable member and most members on that side would not know what doorknocking was. Some sit in good seats. I will say that the Minister of Health, I am sure, has doorknocked very strongly when she was elected, and I give her full credit for it.

Mr Mathwin: What about me?

Mr LANGLEY: If the member for Glenelg and the member for Coles doorknocked every house in their districts in their three-year term, I would be able to check it. There is nothing like getting close to the people. I can assure honourable members opposite that the people of Unley know Gil Langley and they know Kym Mayes, but they know nothing about the Liberal candidate, because he has already admitted defeat when he has been out doorknocking.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: What is his name again?

Mr LANGLEY: Robert Nicholls. He is a great follower of the Sturt Football Club and has followed them for 20 years. In his pamphlet he says, 'Ring me about anything, especially about the Sturt Football Club.' He wouldn't know if I played croquet, football, or bowls.

I mention now unemployment in this State. I admit I made an error the other day, but since that time the building trade has lost its lustre. There is no doubt about the number of people out of work in the building trade and the fact that good tradesmen cannot get a job at all. What brought that about was this Government. The Premier is always saying this or that about employment—and I must admit we barrack for the same team—but there are more people out of work now than ever, even though there are all these supposed jobs but they are fictitious jobs. As fast as somebody gets a job, somebody gets the sack.

One example is the Public Buildings Department. The other day someone threw a stone through the window of my office. The Public Buildings Department did not have anybody to fix it because the person responsible was on holidays. There was only one person to look after the area. How many people in the Public Buildings Department have retired or have not been replaced? The Public Buildings Department has been run down, and that is acknowledged in that department.

I could go further but I do not want to use Parliamentary privilege. I have never done that in my life and I will not start now. Following a recent episode, I could name several members of the Government; I am good enough not to mention names, but it has been done by present members of this House.

When the Government of the day gained office, I was very pleased about one thing, and very worried too, and that was succession duties. If ever a Government has put forward something, it is succession duties. I lost votes on that. When I spoke to the people in my electorate about succession duties, they thought they would not have to pay, but suddenly they realised differently.

I have received a list from the Leader of the Opposition concerning taxes increased during the tenure of this Government. They said they were not going to increase taxes, they did not need to introduce new taxes, but all of a sudden something has happened. The Hon. Mr DeGaris has talked about this, and he is a member of this Government. I have spoken to the member for Hartley, who was the Treasurer at the time. Members opposite can ask him if they like, but when this Government took office the coffers were left in good condition.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Have a look at the other side.

Mr LANGLEY: The honourable member who has just interjected was at Alice Springs at the casino. The Premier did not mention that he was there. Perhaps he did not know. If he has got enough money to go to the casino, good luck to him.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: I will go again.

Mr LANGLEY: That will not worry me at all. I cannot afford to go. On 7 June 1982 we saw this heading, 'Liberals slam casino'. Nobody has yet refuted that. The Government was left in a good position financially, but what has happened? We are getting nothing done, not even my window. Honourable members know that they are transferring money from loan funds, and the member for Semaphore and all members on this side have said, 'What have you done? You have taken it from one to the other and we cannot get anything done.'

At the Black Forest school the Government has transferred the money which should be used there and it is cutting back, cutting back so far that it will cut itself out of Government. If ever anything hit the former Government it was the matter of succession duties. I lost much of my personal vote, but there were enough Labor people there to put me back. The document given to me by the Leader of the Opposition refers to 'highest State charges'. There are three pages detailing 94 areas that have gone up not by 5 per cent or 2½ per cent; they have increased by 25 per cent and even 200 per cent.

Mr Becker: You increased some taxes 1 300 per cent.

Mr LANGLEY: I never knew the Labor Government to increase taxes in 90 areas and I have never known the increases to be so great. People know we are a Party of honesty and we have a good Leader. That makes all the difference. When I doorknocked recently a person described Mr Tonkin as 'the mirror'—he is always 'looking into it'. That is exactly what one of my constituents said to me. One great thing in my favour is that everywhere I go in my district people talk about John Bannon.

An honourable member: And Peter Duncan.

Mr LANGLEY: Yes.

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

Mr LANGLEY: No-one in my Party would ever stab me in the back, whether the honourable member likes it or not.

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mr LANGLEY: The honourable member will have an opportunity. Peter Duncan's name has not been mentioned. Uranium has not been mentioned, either. When I door-knocked 5 000 homes, two people were mentioned: the Hon. Mr Tonkin and the Hon. Mr Fraser. Mr Tonkin is No. 1 in the Sturt Football Club, and No. 2 is Mr Fraser. No, it is the other way around; they have switched places now. Mr Fraser is No. 1 and Mr Tonkin is No. 2. Mr Brown is No. 3, and Mr Gil Langley is No. 21. I am not even in the interchange. I am going like a bomb with people in my district. You can say what you like, my name is good in Unley, but the Liberal's name is not. I hope I can put this in the paper in my district.

Mr Mathwin: You've got a good shop next door to you, Gilbert.

Mr LANGLEY: I have not been in there, but I can get an invitation for the honourable member to go in there. I nearly fell over when I read this in the newspaper about the Premier.

Mr Mathwin: One could have knocked you over with a feather.

Mr LANGLEY: I know the honourable member barracks for Glenelg. I hope to give him the right advice. I will not be door-knocking in his district, because he is a good member. The Tonkin Government was elected on 5 September 1979. I am surprised that the *News* printed this statement on 8 September 1981:

Tonkin: We are sick but do not give up.

I nearly fell over when I saw that. Then we had the slogans, 'It's Our State, Mate' and 'The Great State'.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr LANGLEY: I am very pleased that the member for Mount Gambier has come in. I have never seen a fellow with so much worry on his brow in the last two or three weeks. I will mention later a question I asked him the other day. I assure the Minister of Education that he will know he is on the downgrade if he goes around schools in my district.

Members interjecting:

Mr LANGLEY: I am not getting anything from him. One great thing in my favour is that if I try hard, people know about it. I can tell the honourable member that the schools in my area are in very good shape.

The Hon. H. Allison: You just said you were not getting anything.

Mr LANGLEY: It is the three-card trick. We have not got anything from the Liberal Government in the three years since it was elected. The schools in my district were very good before then. I do not ask for things I do not need. The Black Forest school has trouble. It is not very happy with the Minister's answer, but I will speak about that later.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: How much later?

Mr LANGLEY: I do not care how much later. I am here to do a job for my district. Look, the Minister could run a duck in his seat. The member for Mount Gambier wants what they call a two-up game—maybe, maybe not. I assure members that I work in my district, where people have been happy with me for 20 years. This is one of the greatest things, because I am interested in sport. The *News* is trying to prop up the Premier all the time. On 2 November 1980, under the head 'Interested in sport', is the following statement:

South Australia may bid for games.

Then there is a little story about that. On 5 May it was almost given to someone else. One would not read about it! On our State birthday, the Premier may not be in office, because that is in 1986. I remember the Morgan Gallup poll on the popularity of political leaders. I should insert this in *Hansard*, but it is too good, so I will read it. It states that Tonkin's approval in October and November 1980 was 54 per cent. I will not go through the others, but they are not very good. From February to April 1981 it was 44 per cent, a slight drop, only 10 per cent. It would be more than that, 25 per cent. Then we go to June to August 1981, 45 per cent. That was a big increase. In November 1981 it was 45 per cent, which is again very stable. In February 1982, it was 40 per cent, which is a decrease. Something has gone wrong. I would say that the Morgan Gallup poll is wrong; suddenly it is 36 per cent, which is a slight decrease.

Mr Becker: It sounds like a cricket score.

Mr LANGLEY: It is like the football scores, the way Sturt has played tonight. But, they are definitely decreasing their score. The funny part is that the Leader of the Opposition is being very consistent. That is one of the biggest trophies that one can get: for the most consistent. I would not want to be the fairest and most brilliant, like the Premier tries to be. He has lost a few Magarey votes in this little run-down. The figures, in the years to which I referred, were 41 per cent, 42 per cent, 41 per cent, 43 per cent, and 46 per cent.

Mr Mathwin: It's like Cross Lotto.

Mr LANGLEY: Yes. That is the only thing that the Premier will be able to play in the future, Cross Lotto. I hope his numbers come out. The member for Todd laughed the other day about unemployment. He is not laughing much tonight. He would like to win Labor, the Labor plebiscite, but there is no chance of that. We possibly could not trust him. I will speak for another 10 minutes on two other subjects. One of the greatest things of all time that I have learned since I have been here during the last 20 years concerns Question Time and Dorothy Dixers.

Mr Becker: What about the ones that you used to ask on water resources?

Mr LANGLEY: That was in the public interest, and members opposite ask such questions, too. The only trouble is that they were very good questions. I know that the Hon. Bert Teusner, who was a Liberal, used to ask the same question. The day that the Minister of Agriculture takes over as Premier will be the day! Together with the member for Fisher, I went across to the Cook Islands to Rarotonga. I enjoyed his company and the time that we spent there. The seminar was non-political.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Where did you go?

Mr LANGLEY: To Rarotonga, in the Cook Islands. I really enjoyed it over there, but I must admit that when I mentioned Dorothy Dix questions they said, 'How do you do it?' After I explained everything to them, they said that they did not have Dorothy Dix questions in their papers. Thereafter, they called me Dorothy Dix for the rest of the seminar! However, I can say that in all my 20 years in this House I have never known anything like the number of questions that are put forward by the Minister—Dorothy Dixers.

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

Mr HEMMINGS (Napier): I find it hard to follow the last contribution from my colleague, the member for Unley, as he is always very sincere and eloquent in what he says. It rather surprises me that during the debate on the Supply Bill that not one Government speaker has been prepared to stand up and talk about things that affect his or her electorate or about the way the State economy is going. I am inclined to think that the gag has been applied. The Premier wants us all to go home fairly early, so no Government members have been allowed to speak. I am pretty sure of that, because I checked the list and there is no Government speaker to follow me. So, perhaps, my being the last speaker in this

debate, I can put the cap on the Government's performance in respect of the people of this State.

During the early hours of this morning I incurred the wrath of the Deputy Premier, who frothed at the mouth, jumped up and down and said that I did not really know what I was talking about after I made the simple statement that this Government was not concerned with workers' health and safety in regard to Roxby Downs. The Minister, when posturing at that time, did not really answer the question, although that is a matter of history. Hopefully in another place the Bill that we had before us last night will be defeated.

I make a similar complaint tonight in regard to housing. The Government has no concern whatsoever about people seeking homes, whether they be people wanting to buy a house, or renting a house through either the private rental market or the South Australian Housing Trust. The Government is not in any way concerned about how those people are suffering as a result of Government decisions in Canberra or in this State. The Liberal Party in its 1979 policy speech (preceding an election which I am sure the Liberal Party did not expect to win, as I think all members would agree—and I make no apology for saying that) made the following points concerning what it would do to assist people in South Australia in the matter of housing. I shall quote directly from that policy document. Under the heading of 'Housing', it stated:

A Liberal Government will ensure that housing information services will be upgraded, promoted and made more readily accessible to home seekers.

It was stated that it would:

Ensure an improvement in the availability of housing finance; provide incentives for people purchasing a home; introduce legislation in support of the Home Owners Protection Scheme developed by the building industry; constantly review provisions of the Residential Tenancy Act to ensure that both tenants and landlords get a fair deal; provide opportunities for tenants to purchase Housing Trust rental accommodation, including maisonettes; and maintain support for the work of the Aboriginal Housing Unit.

If one looks at those points, one realises that the Government has failed abysmally; it has failed to deliver the goods. Today in South Australia housing has become the major social issue. However, as yet not one member on the opposite side of the House has recognised that fact. There has not been one speech from a member of the Government about housing during the two and a half years that the Government has been in office. In fact, members would recall that at the last Housing Minister's conference, when our present Housing Minister was away on an overseas trip, and the Acting Minister for Housing was invited to attend, he declined. He said that it was not necessary that there was no need for this Government to be represented at a joint conference of Housing Ministers. He said that it was premature. That is an indictment of the Government in relation to what it thinks about the problems of housing in this State.

Let us look at the facts. The matter of home ownership has become a cliché. I think all politicians tend to talk in clichés, and I make no apology for using one in regard to housing. Home ownership used to be the great Australian dream. That was the sentiment put to all the people in this State and all the people in this country. However, now the cliché of the great Australian dream has become that of the great Australian nightmare. That is very true; it has become a nightmare.

Some 70 per cent of the people in this State are buying or have purchased their own homes. Interest rates have risen sharply over the past two years forcing many people to abandon any chance of buying their own home, and creating a desperate situation for existing home buyers, who have to meet an ever-increasing mortgage repayment burden. The restrictive economic policies of the Fraser Liberal Government, supported by the Tonkin Liberal Government, have excluded thousands of young South Australians from home ownership. As a result of these policies, many hundreds have been forced to give up their own homes.

People have reached the situation where they cannot meet their repayments, and the banks and building societies have been prepared to help them. I congratulate them on that, but not one of those societies or banks has been prepared to give details, because they are frightened of what effect it might have on the industry if they have to reveal the details. In the past few months the Federal Treasurer, Mr Howard, has defended the increase in interest rates on the grounds that more money will be available for those people wishing to purchase new homes. What a farce that is. He, like his Government and this State Government, is so out of touch with reality that they cannot really comprehend what is happening.

There are those people who at the first, second or third increase decide, 'Right, let us cut our losses and get out,' and they have done that. They have sold their homes at a loss, but at least they got out of the situation. What about those people who have decided to hang in and keep their homes? They have decided to battle on, despite the action of the Federal Treasurer, and not to sell their homes. Now, however, they are starting to do away with the necessities of life. I have received letters, as have my colleagues, from people who have decided that to meet the increase in interest rates they have to cut down on their food and clothing bills and to do away with certain items of furniture. They have been selling them off hoping to meet their mortgage repayments. That cannot go on forever, and eventually those people will have to face up to foreclosure. They have been seeking some form of assistance from either this Government or the Federal Government, but all they have been receiving up to now is words.

Let us look at the much vaunted and publicised Home Buyers Protection Scheme introduced by the Fraser Government and, if I might say, endorsed most heavily by the present Minister of Housing. That scheme—we must bear in mind that there are 160 000 people in this State buying their own homes through either the banks or the building societies—would only affect 25 per cent or 40 000 people, who will be getting some 'benefit' over the five years but will receive literally nothing compared with the increased interest rates and will be no better off. The other 120 000 will be even worse off. Yet this Government backed that scheme to the hilt. If that scheme fails, this Government deserves to be condemned. That scheme will fail, because it does not do anything for the people of this State. What has the Tonkin Government done to assist those people who are buying their own home? Its only response has been to introduce the Home Purchasers in Crisis Scheme. That scheme was introduced by the Premier and the Minister of Housing, some three months ago with a great deal of publicity, but when you really look at the scheme what does it have to offer those people who are in crisis?

There are plenty of people in crisis. I live in a Housing Trust area, but 80 per cent of queries received by my office deal with housing. Not all problems involve mortgages: many involve rental problems. So, 80 per cent of the queries in my office deal with housing, and I am sure that that is a similar case in every member's office in this House. What about that scheme? It was introduced and the people of South Australia were told, 'If you are in crisis or need assistance, come to us and we will help you.' However, it did not really work out as the Government intended. Under the scheme, the Housing Trust in extreme circumstances (I stress 'extreme circumstances') would take over the mortgage. It would draw up a new schedule of payments for the home

buyers and then help them along their way. However, the eligibility criteria are so severe that only a handful of people have received any assistance.

The funny thing (I use the word 'funny' in a derogatory way) is that people who were seeking assistance found that if they were unemployed they could not receive assistance, because there is no way they could repay the money. If they were sick they could not receive assistance. So, in effect, this scheme was engineered in such a way that there were very few who could receive assistance. To my knowledge, up to now there are only eight people who have received assistance under this scheme. I sent along someone who was having real problems. He had a job; his wife had a job until she became pregnant and had to give it up, and I thought they met the criteria. He went to meet the people who were to consider any assistance he should be given, and what advice did he receive?

He was told to go and get a second job—go moonlighting. That is not the answer to the problem. Another person whom I sent there was told, 'Sell your television set; sell your deep freeze, and that will help you out of your problem.' That is not really the answer. I think that it is fairly obvious that home buyers in this community might as well face up to the fact that they will not receive from this State Government an assistance or relief in buying their own homes.

In the time remaining to me I would now like to turn to the public sector. This Government came to office with the avowed intention of reducing the South Australian Housing Trust's role to that of providing only welfare housing in this State. Prior to the election of the Tonkin Government, the Housing Trust had been able to offer the South Australian public a chance to get into home-purchase areas, to enter into rental purchase-schemes whereby those people could rent and then buy when their earning capacity could meet that situation.

This Government stopped that, in its blind ideological view that housing, apart from welfare housing, should belong to the private sector. It stripped the trust of all its powers and in doing so, compounded the problems facing the trust and the community. It cut back revenue raising projects affecting home-purchase and rental-purchase schemes, and the trust has had to raise rents with, I might add, the avid co-operation of this Government. When we were in Government, every time the Housing Trust intended to raise rents it had to come to the State Labor Government and put a case to raise rents. That is not the case any more.

The Housing Trust has been given an open go to raise rents whenever it wishes and whatever the situation. I am not criticising the trust—it needs to raise revenue—but this Government is dictating, as the Minister of Housing has said, that the rents of Housing Trust homes should be 80 per cent of those in the private sector. Of course, with the increased interest rates and the fact that there are few homes available for rent on the private market, the rents are increasing, and consequently the 80 per cent will continue to increase. So I, along with my colleagues, have had many, many people come to me and say, 'why are our rents being increased?'

I requested the research service in the Parliamentary Library to ascertain whether rent increases by the South Australian Housing Trust were in line with the c.p.i. increases. The reply that I received was astonishing. The total percentage increases in Housing Trust rents from June 1978 to December 1981 amounted to 69 per cent, as opposed to 39.4 per cent in the c.p.i. That perhaps does not worry the Premier or the other members opposite, but people in Housing Trust accommodation are paying Housing Trust rents in effect double the c.p.i. increase. They are the figures up to December 1981. On 3 July this year there will be another 9.8 per cent increase. So, this Government has encouraged the trust to increase rents to such an extent that people are paying more on any increase than they receive.

A pensioner now is paying more in increased rent than he is getting in increased pension. That does not seem to worry any member of the Government, because it is their old principle that they are using now—the user pays. So all those people in Housing Trust accommodation must pay the increase, bearing in mind that the increase in rent in many cases is more than or at least equal to what they are receiving in increased pension. However, that does not seem to worry this Government. When the Labor Party regains Government, I assure members that it will not allow rent increases freely to run beyond the c.p.i. That is a promise that I make now, and I will keep it when I am a Minister in the next Labor Government.

The situation regarding demands on the Housing Trust has been exacerbated by housing interest rates. As I said, the private rentals have increased beyond the capacity of the ordinary person in South Australia to pay. Time and time again I have received evidence that sharp landlords are demanding exorbitant rents to meet the demand for accommodation. Rents in the private sector have sky-rocketed from $45 a week 18 months ago to in excess of $100 a week. These landlords, because there is such a demand for the private rental market and there is only a 0.7 per cent vacancy rate in this State, apart from demanding exorbitant rents can also pull the strings and dictate that there will be no children and no pets, etc.

Time and time again on this side of the House we have asked the Minister of Housing and the Minister of Consumer Affairs to look into the situation, and the advice we have been receiving has been, 'It is out of our control. The free market should reign.' That is all the Government intends to do. I think the Government should be condemned for that. I think that privately the Premier would not agree with the fact that people are being forced to pay exorbitant rents, but I think the Government should reinforce the existing legislation so that those landlords should not be allowed to charge that kind of rent, where those people are in effect being held to ransom.

There are many more things I would like to speak about and perhaps I will make use of the 10 minutes grievance that I have available to me at some later date, but the points I have put before the House I think are important. I think the Government should take notice of them and, if it has any idea of the problems and the suffering in this community caused by housing difficulties, it should act upon it immediately.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): Normally, it is traditional not to hold up this debate. It is a matter of tradition that Supply, for the benefit of the Public Service, is passed through without delay and, therefore, I do not intend to delay the House. A number of matters have been raised which more appropriately should have been raised at Question Time. I would ask honourable members to provide answers to the various topics that have been raised and various questions that have been asked.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the Bill.

The SPEAKER: Will the honourable member for Salisbury advise the Chair whether he is the designated lead speaker for the Opposition?

Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): Yes, I am the designated leading speaker for the Leader. In speaking in the grievance debate tonight, I wish to make a number of comments on

some of the findings of the Keeves Committee of Inquiry. Members will know that I have spoken on a number of occasions about this, the earliest occasion being 4 March in this Chamber. At that time I raised some queries about the presumptions that were taken into account by the Keeves Committee with regard to its enrolment projections for the decade ahead. You will know, Sir, that the Keeves Committee has a finding in its contents summarised in table 16.1 on page 252 that up to $50 000 000 could be saved over the next 10 years cumulatively if the pupil/teacher ratios were maintained and, with declining enrolments, of course, resulting in declining teacher commitment.

I made the point that I felt the population projections contained in that report did not give very much confidence as to their accuracy. I have been making the point since that time that, to really have confidence in the extent to which those figures may reflect reality, we would have needed to know the presumptions upon which they were arrived at. And it would not have been unreasonable, I would have thought, that the report would not have established one set of figures, but it would in fact have established the normal practice of looking at a high estimate, a low estimate, and a medium or most likely estimate that was expected to take place. That did not happen and yet the report was said to be a blueprint for education, not only for the next decade, but until the end of the century, or so said the Minister; but the Director-General said something different. I suppose that is a matter for the Minister and Director-General to sort out between themselves.

Concerned as I was about these student population projections, knowing full well that, even as of two weeks after the release of the report we had the first information that it was inaccurate because of last year's birthrate being significantly higher than was anticipated, which indicates to us that we will have an increase in primary enrolments in the years 1986 and 1987 and not the year 1988 as the Keeves Committee said and, furthermore, that that increase in primary enrolment will be greater in that 1986-87 set of yours than the 1988 increase suggested by the Keeves figures, I put on notice a question to the Minister some time ago, (question No. 537), and last week I received a reply to that. I do not propose to incorporate that in *Hansard*, because it is contained at page 4319 of *Hansard*, but those figures confirm my fears about the accuracy of the figures contained in the Keeves Report. In my question I asked:

> What are the current high, low and expected estimates of enrolments in Government primary and secondary schools respectively for each of the next 10 years.

I furthermore asked what were the presumptions. I said:

> What assessment has been made of
> *(a)* The projected migration to and from the State;
> *(b)* The birthrate;
> *(c)* The move to private schools; and
> *(d)* The retention rates at senior secondary level.

The answer I received from the Minister was very edifying, and I appreciate the detail to which that answer went. I could but wish that the Keeves Committee went to the same detail and the same trouble in its figures, because we see that there are some glaring differences between the two.

Perhaps I may summarise. Taking the information contained in table 16.1 at page 252 of the second report of the Keeves Committee, we find that the Keeves Report estimates that there will be a loss between 1981 and 1991 of 19 700 students at the primary level, and in the secondary level there will be a loss of 19 400, indicating a total loss of 39 100. It is on that basis that the estimate was made that cumulative savings could be achieved over that 10-year period of between $33 600 000 and $50 900 000, depending upon how we enacted the reduction in pupil/teacher ratios.

The information gleaned from the answer to Question on Notice No. 537 gives us quite a different picture. Let us take the highest estimate first, the optimistic estimate of what may happen in this State over the next 10 years. Quite contrary to the 19 700 students loss at the primary level, the high estimates tells us there could be a 5 300 student gain, while at secondary level there could be a 11 700 loss, leaving a net loss of 6 400 students, roughly, one-sixth of that estimated in the Keeves Report. I appreciate it may not be a reasonable presumption to take the high estimate figures as the ones most likely to happen, so we go to the other end and be pessimistic and take the low estimate. The low estimate, as indicated in that question, tells us that, at the primary level, there will be an 18 300 loss in students and, at the secondary level, 19 400, giving a total loss of 37 700 in the primary and secondary sectors of Government schools, a very interesting figure indeed, because that, being the most pessimistic projection on whoever drafted the answer for the Minister to my question, indicates a smaller loss than the Keeves Committee.

The most significant of all is the information contained about the most expected result. My question asked:

> What are the current high, low and expected estimates of enrolments in Government primary and secondary schools?

For the primary schools, the expected was a 7 300 student loss and for the secondary schools a 15 800 student loss, giving a total student loss of 23 100 over that 10-year period. That is only two-thirds of the figure estimated in the Keeves Committee of inquiry.

Criticisms were made of the Carmel Committee of inquiry for its student projections, and it is true that it became evident that they were inaccurate by about the mid-1970s, some four or five years after the report was released. Yet, here we have an answer from the Minister coming only months after this blueprint for the decade or to the end of the century and already it is showing that the expected enrolments will drop by only two-thirds the rates that report indicated.

How does that impact on potential cost savings? I repeat that the Keeves Committee estimated the cumulative cost savings could be of the order of $33 600 000 to $50 900 000. Working on the higher figure, $50 900 000, what would be the cumulative cost savings for the high, low and expected enrolments as indicated by Question on Notice 537? I have not had the time to go through these calculations in great detail. They deserve to be gone through in great detail, and I appreciate that the figures I am about to quote are more of the order of magnitude type rather than specifically accurate. They indicate that, if the high estimate proves to be correct, the cumulative savings will amount to no more than $7 800 000, only 16.3 per cent of that estimated by the Keeves Committee. If the low estimate takes place, in other words, the most pessimistic one, they still will amount to only 96.4 per cent of the Keeves estimate, but the expected one, if that were to take place, would amount to only 59 per cent of that indicated in the Keeves Report.

I believe that the Minister does owe an explanation to the House of why the report which he lauded so much, and paying attention to this $50 000 000 saving that could be achieved, should come out in one month and in a very short space of time later we should receive an answer to the question from the same Minister that indicates figures quite different from those contained in the first report. It is critical. It is not just a matter of an academic exercise. It is not just a matter of the statistical interest for those who enjoy puttering around with calculators and watching the figures shine up on the screen. It is critical because it affects the planning for the decade ahead. It affects the planning for the number of teachers we want to take into training. It affects the planning for any moves we may want to make

regarding class sizes and class size maxima. It affects the planning for our building programme, the extent to which we feel needs have to be met, and the time in which they may have to be met.

I want to go even further than that. I want to suggest to this House that even Question on Notice 537 does not necessarily represent what will really happen. The enrolments may in fact be higher than that, and there are a number of reasons for that.

The Hon. H. Allison: Twins.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Twins may well be part of the reason for that. It is true that in five years a certain primary school will contain 5 per cent of its enrolment from one family, but that will not be the entire cause of changes in the enrolment structure of the State. The Minister has indicated that there will be introduced a Bill to alter the Public Examinations Board. I commend him for that. There is a need for a change to the Public Examinations Board. The problems of senior school retention rates have for far too long been allowed to go on unchanged and it is timely that a Bill will be brought before the House, presumably in the not too distant future, but the outcome of that is that surely if the Bill is to be a success when enacted into legislation the senior school retention rates will increase.

The criticism that has been made of senior school retention rates is that, for 85 per cent of students at the senior school, the courses are not directly relevant to the sort of options they wish to follow, and thus students are literally voting with their feet and leaving school. This proposed Bill would seek to change that and make the course offerings more relevant to the students at the school, and if it is to be more relevant then surely if it is a success more of them will stay at senior school. In fact, we have a very long way to go.

Australia does not have a particularly good record with regard to senior school retention rates. Figures published in the most recent journal of the O.E.C.D. available in this library gives some figures for the number of full-time students among the 15 to 19-year-old age group. I appreciate that that is not just the secondary level of education; that includes the tertiary level, but it reflects a situation. The figures contained in that latest publication indicate that in Australia we have only 59 per cent of the participation rate in full-time education that applies in the United States. It is 62 per cent of what applies in Japan, 68 per cent of what applies in Canada, 79 per cent of what applies in Sweden, and 96 per cent of what applies in the United Kingdom. Our retention rates at that age group are higher only than the following member countries of the O.E.C.D.: Italy, Spain, Luxemburg, Portugal, Austria and Turkey. Iceland was not included in these figures.

We do indeed have a very long way to go, and yet the information contained in the answer to 537 indicated that they are estimating only an increase of 1 per cent in the participation rate of 16-year-olds in secondary education. I would put to this House that that is a very pessimistic expectation and casts in doubt the provisions of the Bill that may come before this House. My assessment is that, if the Bill that finally is enacted into legislation really is successful, we could expect to achieve a higher increase of participation rate than merely 1 per cent. Likewise, on the matter of migration from the State, the answer indicates that it is assumed that the high rate of recent years will be maintained from 1982 onwards. We know that since 1979 the migration rate from the States has doubled what it was previously. Surely we are not estimating that to be an ongoing trend.

I point out to you, Sir, of course, that many of the people who leave the State are the children of people looking for work. Of course, then there is the point about the fertility rate indicated in that. We know that last year's fertility rate was markedly higher than previous years and was indeed the highest since 1975.

Mr Slater: You have made a significant contribution.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: We all have our part to play. Likewise, there is much subjective assessment made of the estimated move to the non-government school system. The answer to Question on Notice 537 would have us believe that, by 1988, 19.6 per cent of the primary enrolments will be in the non-government sector and at the secondary level, 27 per cent will be in the non-government sector. Overall, it is 22.3 per cent. I do not know that that really tallies up with the indications from the Schools Commission. It tends to suggest that there may be a levelling out in the growth rate of the non-government sector somewhat earlier than 1988.

I therefore repeat the contention I made on 4 March that, in that respect alone, there can be serious doubt cast on the accuracy of the report and, by consequence, serious doubt cast upon the role it has to play in education, not only for the next 10 years but maybe, as the Minister has indicated, for the next 20 years. There was another question that I put on notice and it also reflected the sentiments that I expressed in March regarding the amount of time spent on teaching what are known as the basics. I asked the Minister what percentage of schools was estimated to spend less than two-thirds of total time on teaching the basics, including social learning, and how the estimate was getting on. I asked that question for a very good reason, not just pure whim.

I asked it because recommendation 7.3 of the Keeves Second Report stated that approximately two-thirds of the time available for learning in schools should be given to learning in the four curriculum areas of foundation learning in language, science, maths, and social learning, the point being that the recommendation does not say that it acknowledges that two-thirds of the time available is spent on those matters. It states that two-thirds of the time should be given, which is an implicit comment that the committee did not believe that it was being given, hence my question. I received an answer when those concerned had sorted out what we meant by basics or foundations of learning and the Minister's reply incorporated the Keeves Committee understanding. I appreciated that, because it makes the comparison relevant. The Minister, in his reply, made this point:

> No primary school spends less than 72 per cent and no secondary school spends less than 63 per cent of time on basics.

Presumably that means that some secondary schools spend between 63 per cent and 66⅔ per cent of the time, but that is a very minor margin and one can assume that the bulk of secondary schools are above the 66⅔ per cent. Basically, what the recommendation in the Keeves Report states is not that two-thirds of the time should be given. It should have been worded something like this:

> We recognise that already two-thirds of the time at least is being given in the primary and secondary schools of this State to the learning of basics. We commend that and call for it to continue.

In the present wording of the recommendation, I believe (and I have stated this previously: I stated it on the day after the release of the report) that there is a slight upon the well-intentioned and hard-working efforts of a great number of teachers in this State.

One other matter that I wish to raise again is the matter of school fees. Members will recall that last week I asked a question of the Minister about the change of name from the free book scheme to the Government-assisted students scheme. The Minister advised us that the reason for that was as follows:

> I think it was more a recognition of the fact that school after school has pointed out to successive Governments that those Government-assisted scholars were entitled to a number of things like stationery and school books but that also on the annual

school syllabus was included a range of additional items such as, for example, an indeterminate number of school excursions.

That is a very positive answer, and if that is simply the reason for the change of name, I cannot quibble at it, because that is quite reasonable, but I interjected at the time and said that that was not the sort of feed-back that I was getting from the Education Department about the change of name. I was getting quite a different philosophy and that is why I asked the question. I will read the sort of philosophy that I had received. It was forwarded by a parent who had received a letter from the Director-General of the Education Department and it states, when commenting on the change of name, as follows:

> This change reflects the policy that the Government contribution of $30 per approved student per annum is not meant to cover all possible costs related to assisted students.

That means that the change reflects policy. The fact of a change of name from the free book scheme to the Government-assisted students scheme is a policy in itself, and the policy is that there is no longer the recognition that the scheme should cover all possible costs. The letter, which went on at length, concluded by stating:

> In view of the policy described above, which does not require schools to cover all costs on behalf of assisted students, I regret to advise that I am unable to be of assistance to you.

That correspondence to this parent had resulted because she was put in a situation of some considerable financial worry. She had written to one of my colleagues as follows:

> I am writing for help for free school books. I have been to the Education Department and they told me to write to you.

That was my colleague, the member for Florey. The letter continues:

> I am a widow with four children the youngest being—

I am talking about general issues here and do not wish to attack a particular school. I will not name the school. The letter continued:

> . . . doing year 12 and they have only given her $10 worth of free books for the year, which isn't enough. The school has been given $30 for each free school student. She should be given the books she needs. How can a pensioner keep children at school if this is the way we are treated? Surely something can be done about it. I will have to take my child from school if she isn't given the books she needs. I went to see the Head Master . . . He told me he runs a business there and to get out of his office, so now I am writing to you to see if you can help me to keep my child at High School.

That is a tragic situation for a person to be in, and it is on the basis of that correspondence from that parent, with a real problem with a particular school, and being advised of the reason for the change of name that I asked the question last week.

I therefore hope that the Minister will give the matter further consideration and advise us whether the change is as neutral as he suggested last week or whether it means more than that. I raise the question because of the context of the Touche Ross recommendation, and that has serious problems for us all, because now is the time when departments are making plans for the next Budget and, therefore, the Touche Ross recommendation will be taken into consideration now. One recommendation is:

> There are compelling grounds for legislation to be introduced allowing the Minister to require payment of fees by parents up to a maximum prescribed by regulations or by proclamation, particularly in view of the arrangements for eligible parents to be provided with Government assistance.
>
> The notion of 'free education' has not been a reality for many years and the local community cost burden for schooling should be borne equitably by all parents, particularly if their direct responsibility for school costs will increase.

I repeat that this is a matter of some urgency. The Minister did not address himself to that issue in his answer last week, yet I believe that we need some indication of what the likelihood is of that recommendation being enacted in the Budget presently being drafted.

In the time left I wish to raise one matter regarding education of a more important nature. I wrote to the Minister late last year about a resident in another electorate who was complaining about a problem of noise generated from a local school that was being used by a band after hours. The person had written to me after having done the appropriate thing in contacting the local member and found that the local member was most unwilling to do anything.

Mr Whitten: It must have been a Liberal.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: The member is quite right. After having followed through the appropriate channels and having achieved nothing, the constituent wrote to me. I wrote to the Minister and put to him that I thought residents near schools had some rights that ought to be respected and that there should be something in the *Gazette* outlining the sorts of use to which schools could be put and some delineation of the rights of nearby residents.

I cannot quote to the House the reply I received from the Minister, as I do not have the full file with me. The Minister gave me an undertaking that there would be a delineation of the regulations in the *Gazette*, and that it would take place in March. The person who wrote to me wrote a letter of thanks for my efforts but I have now received another letter. He states:

> My letter of 13 May, in which I thanked you for materially assisting us with the noise problem at—

I will leave out the location of the school, but the Minister is aware of it—

> has unfortunately proved premature. After a break of six months, the pop group whose percussion caused us such distress last year has returned with permission to practise twice a week (this is in addition to the brass band). The young man who leads the group came to see us and explained their dilemma: they have tried another practice place but have found it unsatisfactory—

He then puts a very cryptic, cynical comment in brackets, '(they probably disturb the neighbours)'. The letter continues:

> and so return to torment us. However, my quarrel is not with him, for at least he is courteous, but how the Principal can sanction such a move when he is aware of the distress and illness it has caused in the past, is beyond my understanding.
>
> I understood from you letter of 3 March that new administrative guidelines on after-hours use of school premises, and incorporating many of the suggestions we had made to the Minister, were to be gazetted in March. Has the Minister in fact done what he said he would do, and if so, would it be possible to draw his attention to this latest development (which appears to be in breach of the guidelines), and to have the guidelines brought to the notice of the Principal [at the School] and his regional officer.

He goes on:

> I am sorry to have to bring this matter to your attention again but I do not want to risk another breakdown for my wife.

His wife had already had a breakdown as a result of the noise. The letter continues:

> Moreover, I am now at risk for I have had two mild strokes, which exhaustive physical tests made over the past month show to have their origin not in any physical factor (such as a blockage of an artery) but in stress, clotting and haemorrhages.

I have checked the *Gazette*. I have been right through the *Gazette* for the previous six months of this year. I might have missed it; I might have been careless—I have been through it only three times. However, I cannot find anywhere in the *Gazette* this year, let alone last, the administrative guidelines to the schools as to what they can or cannot permit groups hiring the premises to do after hours.

That is not to say that there is not anything in there about after school use by community groups. Indeed, there is a very big section in the first edition of the year, from pages 20 to 25. Much of that concerns fees, money that schools will get from such groups, how much they can charge—the cash register again. Nowhere is there anything complying with the undertaking given to me by the Minister in March.

I hope he will have another look at that matter, make the appropriate corrections, and indicate those corrections to the school. In fact, I give the Minister credit, because last year when I asked him to do a similar thing in regard to the *Gazette* concerning the matter of interest rates being charged on unpaid school fees that was undertaken and it did appear.

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

Mr SLATER (Gilles): It is often said, quite rightly, that tourism is a very important industry to this State. It is, however, a very complex and diverse industry that directly and indirectly covers a wide range of areas involving the accommodation, entertainment and restaurant industries. There is no question that tourism is of economic importance because of its labour intensive nature. I have made the point previously in this House, but I want to repeat it again, that one of the most important factors in the tourist industry concerns good will. Customer services is very essential to the industry; first impressions are important, and courtesy and service and value for money are important factors in the tourist industry.

This State's tourist product is extremely varied, with some unique features to offer a visitor. If we are to sell this product, it will depend very largely on all those involved in the industry ensuring that interstate or overseas visitors and those who seek to travel within the State are given the essential ingredients of service and civility and are not ripped off, as unfortunately happens on occasions when one travels within Australia and overseas. I believe that South Australia needs to develop a theme that, when persons are travelling to or within this State, they can expect not to be hassled or ripped off and to receive value for their money while on holiday or visiting South Australia.

Unfortunately, because of the very diverse nature of the industry, it does give rise in some instances to some entrepreneurs seeking to make quick financial gains without providing service and without fulfilling travellers expectations. They try to cash in on tourism. This brings me to an item that appeared in a publication entitled *Small Business News* of May 1982. This is a publication of the Small Business Advisory Bureau of the Department of Trade and Industry. The excerpt to which I refer is as follows:

> The business people of the Mallee turned out in strength to a meeting in Tailem Bend to discuss the tourism potential of the area. 'Cash in on Tourism' was the theme of the night, and Peter Daniels and Dick Glazbrook, M.P., drummed up a lot of enthusiasm for the Lower Murray Regional Tourist Association.

I was quite intrigued by that little excerpt and thought that I would investigate further to find out exactly what the meeting was about. I came upon an advertisement in the *Murray Valley Standard* of Thursday 18 March 1982 advertising this particular meeting. Under the heading 'Top Australian Motivational Speaker—Peter J. Daniels—How to Succeed in Small Business—Tailem Bend, 14 April, it states:

> Peter J. Daniels, a self-made millionaire, is recognised as one of Australia's leading motivational speakers. His own life is an inspiration, a rags-to-riches story—Mr Daniels is South Australia's top real estate man, and as a motivational speaker lectures throughout Australia and the U.S., commanding high fees for his services to the business sector. It is therefore with great pleasure that the Lower Murray Regional Tourist Association Inc., presents a razzamatazz night, featuring Peter J. Daniels, and supported by Mr Dick Glazbrook, speaking on 'Cash in on Tourism'.

Members of the House may remember that Mr Peter J. Daniels was a former candidate for the Liberal Party in the seat of Mitchell in 1973. I do not know whether at that time he was a self-made millionaire, but he was a candidate for that seat. His campaign slogan on that occasion was 'Put a Christian back into Mitchell'. The constituents of the District of Mitchell certainly did that: they re-elected my colleague, Mr Ron Payne, the member for Mitchell. They re-elected him on several occasions, so indeed they did put a Christian back in Mitchell. As indicated in the advertisement, Mr Daniels is involved in the real estate industry, although he is not associated, as I understand it, anyway, with any tourist enterprise. I make the point to the House that the very theme involved at this meeting conjures up an impression of the business sector taking advantage of people who may be tourists. I think that that is the wrong emphasis.

I was not privileged to be at this meeting, with an all star cast, but the theme itself suggests quite blatantly that the business sectors involved in the tourist business should take advantage of the travelling public only for financial gain. I believe that this is the wrong approach. In South Australia we ought to be selling the State on the basis of honest, fair and decent enterprise, without encouraging people to cash in on tourism. I abhor that aspect of business enterprise, whether it be in tourism or any other aspect of business. It is more important in the tourist industry to encourage goodwill, so that people are assured that they have the opportunity to travel. No doubt many people who have travelled within Australia and overseas know that often the traveller, because of his lack of knowledge and his inability readily to understand the local situation, is taken for a ride. I believe that South Australia should be selling the theme of its quality of life and its ability to give a fair deal to every visitor to this State.

I believe that this attitude, rather than cashing in on tourism, will provide an impetus to the tourist industry in this State. Nothing will better sell the State than if a person comes to South Australia, receives a fair go, goes back to his own State or overseas and, by word of mouth, tells friends and relatives to visit South Australia. I believe that this emphasis, which was promoted by Peter J. Daniels (a self-made millionaire) and the member for Brighton, Mr Dick Glazbrook, at this meeting was the wrong emphasis. Instead of cashing in on tourism, the emphasis should have been the value of money for the tourists.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I take this opportunity to raise a few points of concern to me in relation to the operations of the Electoral Act. Over recent years there has been a growing trend within Governments and the Opposition, particularly the major Parties, to use the system, as we have, to their own advantage. Although that may be considered by some to be correct, I have an underlying concern as to what the ultimate outcome of that will be. My greatest concern is for the future of the preferential voting system that we have—a system which has served South Australia well and which should be retained because it does reflect a fair and true attitude of the community in the election of their candidates. The only way in which that could be further improved is by the introduction of multiple representation on a Hare-Clark basis.

I understand that there is considerable opposition to that system, particularly by the major Parties, and I can understand why major Parties would oppose that proposal. All honourable members would understand and appreciate that, if we are looking for an equality of representation that is equal to the situation that exists among the voters, that is the system which would bring about the fairest return.

I understand that there are within this House operational methods that would cause further problems, but my greatest concern now is for the future of the preferential voting system. During the recent Mitcham by-election I was unfortunately dragged into a public dispute.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Not really, you entered into it by standing a candidate.

Mr BLACKER: Some would like to think that. Unfortunately, I was dragged into a public dispute because the right of a political Party was questioned in regard to whether it should be involved in a by-election. Not only was that right questioned but also the method by which the preferential voting system works was questioned. That system was placed under question, yet there is no possible way in which a candidate of any other political persuasion, especially with the transfer of preferences, could have affected the ultimate outcome of the election.

Without going into any further detail on that point, I am concerned that, because of that dispute at that time, the general public will be further confused about the operation of the preferential voting system. If this situation is allowed to persist, I believe that eventually a first past the post system will be encouraged which will result in minority Governments taking their place in this House.

That is a matter of the utmost concern to me, because honourable members know that, if we had a first past the post voting system, for example, if there were five candidates in each contest with each candidate being relatively equal, each would receive about 20 per cent of the vote. If one candidate obtained 19 per cent, three obtained 20 per cent and one obtained 21 per cent, the candidate obtaining 21 per cent would be elected under a first past the post system.

To further simplify the situation in terms of round figures, if this House had 50 seats, in order to form a Government a Party would need to win 26 seats. That winning candidate, having been elected with 21 per cent of the electorate's vote, would have received, in effect, .4 per cent of the total State-wide vote. If one multiplies that by the required 26 seats required to form a Government, the Government could be formed with 10.4 per cent of the total State vote.

I realise that that is a simplistic view of the situation that could occur, and that it is highly unlikely that those circumstances would ever arise. However, it is theoretically possible under that system for a Government to be elected with only 10.4 per cent of the State-wide vote. It is for that reason that I raise this point: anything that takes place in the community, be it a public dispute or any other campain about the rights or wrongs of candidates or political Parties to be involved in a general election, undermines the view of the general public.

Consequently, I believe that there should be a requirement in all schools that the preferential voting system, or even all election systems, should be taught to schoolchildren as a mandatory prerequisite in the curriculum. If all students left school with a full and complete understanding of the electoral system, they would be in a better position to understand the complexities that confront people from time to time.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: And vote for the A.L.P.

Mr BLACKER: If they understand the system and are fully informed of that, let them make that judgment. It is up to the political Parties to persuade the people that they have a better platform one way or the other. I am not arguing on the course of Parties. I am saying that the democratic voting system under which we operate should be taught in schools so that a fair and correct analysis can be made by all concerned. The other point that has come up in the press of late is the operation of the new amendments to the Legislative Council voting system.

As all members would be aware, instead of just putting a mark or number against the group or candidate of our choice we will now be obliged to number each candidate, at least up to the number of candidates so required for the election. We would all appreciate that at the next general election 11 candidates will be required. Therefore, all voters will be obliged to put at least numbers one to 11. That sounds very nice, but it has been rumoured in the press that the two major political Parties at least will be running 11 candidates. The very purpose of that is to ensure that those who vote for either one of those Parties will not have to vote for a preference of any other political Party. The implication is that it is an encouragement by the major political Parties towards a system of first-past-the-post voting. It is the foot-in-the-door attitude. It is another step towards that objective.

Mr Trainer: That is not the reason, Peter.

Mr BLACKER: The honourable member says that it is not the reason. I believe I know the reason.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: What is it?

Mr BLACKER: Trying to force out the effect of smaller Parties and thereby lessening the effect of those Parties on the general overall Parliamentary system within the State. I think members are forgetting one thing.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Who made those changes?

Mr BLACKER: The Upper House—the Government of the day. I think both sides share equally on this point.

Mr Trainer: We objected to it.

Mr BLACKER: I would be pleased to take up the challenge by members, but I think we all know the reason why it has been done. There is a section in the community prepared to vote for Parties other than the two main political Parties. There are at least two electorates where more than 30 per cent of the people vote against the two major political Parties. One could go on and on. There is only one Parliament—

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

Mr MAX BROWN (Whyalla): I raise a matter affecting my own electorate, namely, the aged people in Whyalla. It is a wellknown fact that this Government has considerably reduced spending in the health area. Through that reduced spending, public hospitals have suffered. I was interested to read comments in this morning's *Advertiser* attributed to Mrs Adamson, the Minister of Health in this State. In part the article states:

> The budgets of Australia's hospital administrators were expected to become even tighter in coming months if South Australia and other States were to meet the challenge of providing health services that people and Governments could afford.

That is a very important statement. The article continues:

> Mrs Adamson said South Australia was still recovering from runaway costs which occurred in the 1970s because of emphasis on patient contribution funding rather than funding based on the principle of 'user pays'.

I find that an extraordinary statement. Hospitalisation in the main is required by the sick, needy, aged, and underprivileged people in our society. The Minister's statement that funding should be based on the principle of 'user pays' I find absolutely extraordinary. The article continues:

> 'If Australia is going to cope effectively with the aged we must find a new system of financing aged care,' Mrs Adamson said. The benefits will have to go with the person and not the bed. Since the present bed-benefits scheme was introduced in the 1950s there has been an enormous rise in aged care costs.

Bearing that in mind, I want to now bring to the attention of the House what seems to me to be an ironic twist to the whole situation. The L.C.L. endorsed candidate for the seat of Whyalla has continually pursued and is still pursuing the establishment of an aged nursing home for the City of Whyalla at a cost to people in that city of at least $500 000. This money that that candidate wishes the community of Whyalla to raise would be subject to a Federal Government grant of about $750 000. This money is supposed to be necessary to provide a 53-bed aged nursing home for the City of Whyalla.

I point out that the L.C.L. endorsed candidate has been very quick to say that the Whyalla City Council has made

the biggest mistake that it has ever made by not providing an interest-free loan of $500 000 towards this project. This candidate is referred to in the *Whyalla News* on 2 June in an article headed 'Delay put Yeltana in Jeopardy—Organiser', as follows:

> According to the President of the Whyalla Senior Citizens Welfare Committee, Mrs V. Cruickshank, an approach to council for support had been the 'biggest mistake' it had ever made. She blamed councils' procrastination for putting back the project by about a year . . . Mrs Cruickshank's criticism of council follows a statement issued on Friday by the Mayor, Mrs A. C. Ekblom. The statement said that after several months of 'protracted negotiations' with both Federal and State Governments, council had failed to get interest-free funding for the project.
>
> 'Disappointment' was registered by council at the lack of Government support for the project. But council said it was not prepared to borrow for the project because of its capital debt position. It would, however, provide 'a substantial contribution' to the fund-raising after recommendations had been received from its finance committee.

The statement I have just read by the Mayor of Whyalla is an important statement when lined up with what this candidate has said and done. I believe that the statement made by the Mayor of Whyalla represents the true position in regard to the ultimate funding of the proposed nursing home.

I find the attacks on the Whyalla City Council by the endorsed Liberal candidate very strange indeed when read in conjuction with the Minister's policy announced in the *Advertiser*. Indeed, the Minister's remarks in a letter, to which I will refer in a moment, are in line with what I have said. Before reading that letter I point out that the Minister in her statement in the *Advertiser* and in the letter itself sets out the Liberal Government's policy. I will read that part of the Minister's letter that particularly refers to the situation. Referring to me, she states:

> Your recollection that the Government promised an interest free loan for the construction of the home is not entirely accurate. The only undertaking given in relation to this matter was that the Government would consider, subject to certain conditions, a proposal to provide an interest free loan to the Whyalla Senior Citizens Welfare Committee Inc.

That is the important part, because the loan could only go to those people. The city council would have to make a local government grant and, therefore, there would be no subsidy from the Federal Government. That is the important issue. The Minister has failed to inform the people of Whyalla of that fact. Remarkably, since then a fellow who comes in from the wilderness now and again to make statements in the City of Whyalla, Senator Jessop, was mentioned in the local press as follows:

> The Whyalla Senior Citizens Welfare Committee will not be allowed to borrow to meet its proportions of the cost of the Yeltana Nursing Home. Senator Don Jessop said this morning he had been advised of this description by the Department of Social Security.

Senator Jessop said that, and the Minister has said the same thing in State Parliament. Obviously it is part of Liberal Party policy. However, the endorsed Liberal candidate for Whyalla is trying to hoodwink the people by saying that somewhere, somehow a loan will be obtained from local government. He knows full well that a Federal grant could not be obtained if a local government loan were received. I am annoyed about this, because the Minister has said she wants $500 000 from the people of Whyalla who, God knows, are under extreme financial pressure at the moment. Anyone with any knowledge of the present financial situation in Whyalla would know full well that there is no hope of their raising $500 000.

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

Mr TRAINER (Ascot Park): I refer to the problem of housing for mentally disturbed and confused persons and for those in our community who suffer from personality disorders that make it difficult to house them.

Mr Max Brown: Confused and disturbed, like members opposite.

Mr TRAINER: It would be easy to refer to members opposite, but I think they are quite well housed. I am referring to members of the community in a little more difficulty. I recommend to members a working party paper, entitled 'Housing for Mentally Disturbed People', which is available in the Parliamentary Library. It was produced by Phillipa Milne, of the Corporate Development Section of the South Australian Housing Trust, and is dated January 1982. It is an excellent paper, and I believe that Ms Milne, who I understand is now living in Sydney, should be congratulated. I hope that the Minister of Community Welfare, the Minister of Health and the Minister of Housing all study this paper closely. The problem centres on the inability of some individuals to cope with independent living, away from an institution, and the problems that that can create for the Housing Trust, which must cater for so many of these people. A whole series of problems is listed on page 28 of that report, but I will not deal with that at this stage. Members can read that for themselves. The role of the Housing Trust is to provide housing, rather than to act as a welfare organisation. However, recent changes have tended to make it necessary for the trust to move more in that direction. Nevertheless, the staff of the trust are not really qualified to decide whether or not people are mentally disturbed, suffer from personality disorders or are just eccentric. They must deal with people more or less as tenants. It is not easy to evict tenants, especially those who appear to have nowhere else to go.

In this context, I would like to relate a bizarre set of circumstances concerning one of my constituents whom, for the sake of her privacy, I will refer to as Mrs C. The lady lived in a Housing Trust maisonette at South Plympton. I do not intend to be too critical of the people in Government agencies who came in contact with her in the past, because I believe they were all people of good will, but there seems to have been some misunderstanding as to how to deal with Mrs C, as well as a lack of co-ordination between the different Government and local government agencies, which seemed to be uncertain about their own authority and the authority of other agencies in this instance. They strove to be very careful of the civil liberties of Mrs C and were fearful of how their disturbing this old lady might be seen by the media. Therefore, she was left undisturbed, with perhaps unfortunate consequences, as I will illustrate.

The problem was brought to my attention by Mrs C's neighbour. He and his wife had complained about her to the Housing Trust and other agencies for quite a few years. Mrs C's section of the double maisonette was piled high with rubbish, junk, and so on. It was untidy outside, the backyard was ridden with vermin, and cats were running everywhere. Above all, the interior was a fire hazard. Her neighbour showed me a letter from the Fire Prevention Division which quoted file number F3446/8094 and which was dated 30 May 1979. There had been no follow-up action to the letter, which stated:

> Following your letter of complaint regarding a potential fire hazard at . . . please be advised of the following: an officer from this division gained access to the above premises and would inform you that conditions inside the dwelling are as you describe them. It is considered that the large quantities of highly combustible materials and rubbish stored throughout every room in the house not only constitutes a fire risk to your premises, but also a high life risk to the elderly female occupant living in No. 34.

However, nothing happened, even though there was a high fire risk not only to the lady herself but also to the neighbours in the adjoining maisonette, who had been surprisingly patient about all this.

I made a series of inquiries to a range of overlapping agencies, including the Housing Trust, whose local regional manager was most co-operative, the Marion Department for Community Welfare office, the Marion council, especially the welfare officer and the acting health inspector, the R.S.P.C.A. (and members will see shortly why I went to that body), and the Health Commission, which brought in some social workers from Glenside.

Mrs C, who is now 76, was originally one of six children of a Balaklava family which had a history of mental illness. In 1972, she and her infirm husband were due to be evicted from private rental accommodation in Fullarton. They obtained priority Housing Trust accommodation in South Plympton. Right from the beginning they were problem tenants, arguing with each other and with their neighbours. Her husband has since died and her two sons (both now in their forties) have disowned her. Mrs C is eccentric, but apparently not insane. She is able to feed herself in a way, to pay her rent on time, and to visit the market each day, but she is a hoarder. She collects cardboard, clothing, birds in cages, radios, television sets—anything. The house is piled up inside with junk.

She regularly visits the local mission shops, the Salvation Army, and so on, and haggles so well that the proprietors or managers of the shops thought that she was buying for a shop of her own. Then they discovered that she was a hoarder. She is anti-social and abusive to her neighbours: she turns hoses on them, throws stones, runs a stick up and down a corrugated iron fence, screams abuse at 2 a.m., and so on. She refused entry to her premises to the Housing Trust and agencies such as Domiciliary Care. About the time I contacted the trust, it had recently put in a mammoth effort to clean up the yard and bulldoze it. Three five-tonne truck-loads of rubbish were taken away. The backyard was rather hazardous. Mrs C would light fires in the yard, and then go out, leaving it to the neighbours to put out the fire when it spread.

Another problem was the cats she had. At the time the yard was cleared, the Housing Trust officers counted 30 cats—15 alive, with various eye diseases, and 15 dead cats scattered around the yard. She was accustomed to throwing the bodies of dead cats into neighbours' yards, littering their yards with dead cats. At one time, a Housing Trust officer visited Mrs C and said, 'There is a dead cat in the gutter.' She replied, 'No, it's not.' As he drove away he saw her pick it up, cuddle it, croon to it, and take it inside. At one stage, when she went to the local Central Mission on one of her buying sprees, she pulled a dead cat out of her handbag and tried to trade it on a coat.

It is all quite bizarre. In fact, it is rather reminiscent of the best seller *101 Uses for a Dead Cat*. What is rather horrifying is related to the way that she left the cats in the yard when they died. On 27 November 1977 her husband had a stroke in the yard. He was left lying there shivering in the rain, 'like a dog' (in the words of the neighbour who propped him up on the garden seat). He was left there for 48 hours until the neighbours eventually got an ambulance. Meanwhile, when the ambulance arrived, Mrs C had gone out shopping. Her husband died a few days later in Daws Road Hospital of bronchial pneumonia and a stroke.

The agencies at that time were not sure how to handle her. Her sons refused to commit her for examination and the trust let her stay on. He was the trust's official tenant, and the trust could have refused to transfer the tenancy to her but was unwilling to do so, because where could she have been put? In those circumstances that I have outlined, it is rather outrageous that the husband should die, just like that. It is amazing that nothing was done about the matter at the time, as there was a series of complaints to various agencies about her. No-one seemed to be aware of whose jurisdiction she was in or who was responsible.

Eventually, we were able to get the sons traced and some sort of action taken. A health order was posted by the Marion council on 1 March, but it was not sure who was authorised to move in and clean up. There were difficulties in sorting out the rubbish. How do you distinguish mementoes from rubbish that had to be thrown out? I went on one tour of the house. The paws of the dead cat I had seen on a previous visit were still protruding from the soil in the south-east corner of the yard. Several skinny kittens were too weak to move, owing to sickness, when I approached them. There was a small shed jammed with clothes and junk, including what appeared to be a plastic bag of dried cat faeces. Another small shed contained a large number of birds cramped in small cages. One small budgie cage contained seven budgies, and two other budgie cages contained two pigeons in a battered condition.

As far as the interior of the house was concerned, you had to stoop to get through the doorway from one room to another. The only clear place in the house that was not covered with rubbish and accumulated junk piled to a depth of five feet was an area about three feet by one foot in the kitchen that was covered with screwed up paper and cat faeces. There was material that had collected over many years, including about 14 years accumulation of Christmas hampers from the Central Mission. The bath had never been used.

There had obviously been a fire in the kitchen where the walls and ceiling had been seared. When eventually they were able to clean up the place mice ran out from underneath everything, so presumably there had been a mice plague for the neighbours. The *piece de resistance* was a dead cat under the kitchen table.

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

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): Previously this evening I have spoken of the problems on our beaches. I would like to speak now about a problem which we have and to which we should consider giving special attention. I think a worthwhile venture may eventuate if we look at the problem properly. That problem is seaweed. Over the years, I have spoken many times in the House about the seaweed problem on Taperoo Beach. At last I have come up with a programme from a gentleman who is part of an organisation known as the Port Unemployed Self Help organisation. This is a group of unemployed people in Port Adelaide with whom I have an association and assist as much as I can. These people look for projects to get a scheme going whereby they can help each other and perhaps eventually make a viable commercial venture of it. They have a couple of ventures going at the moment, and I think it is a very successful group.

I have received a submission from the Honorary Secretary of that group, Mr R. W. Badenoch. He has written to me giving details about a scheme for utilising seaweed with a veiw to perhaps setting up a commercial project. He wrote to the Coast Protection Board, so he has tried to get some reaction from a responsible body and has tried to ascertain its attitude towards the scheme. The letter I received from Mr Badenoch is as follows:

> At the request of Mr Nick Wagner, co-ordinator of PUSH, the following information is submitted for your attention and to use in any manner that you see fit, as I understand that seaweed accumulating on beaches with its associated problems has and is one of your interests in local affairs.

He is certainly right there. The letter continues:

> Circumstances leading up to my submission to the Coast Protection Board were:
>
> 1. As one of the possible self-supporting and means of employment for some of the numerous unemployed in

the area, the Management Committee of the PUSH organisation discussed the possibility of utilising seaweed, e.g. washing and selling it as garden mulch.

2. Subsequently both Nick Wagner and the undersigned waited on the Port Adelaide Mayor and Town Clerk and were referred to the Coast Protection Board.
3. Late in August I held brief discussions with the Coast Protection Board who forwarded sundry reports, etc., that I studied and attempted to evaluate over a two or three week period, resulting in my submitting the enclosed preliminary survey in late September [last year].
4. As I did not receive even an acknowledgment of my efforts I called into the C.P.B. offices late in January to ascertain whether or not anything had been done in the latter, to be informed that:
   (a) Surprise at not having my efforts acknowledged.
   (b) My submission had been tabled before the board in November.
   (c) Had been referred back to the people responsible to further check and as I understand it to make a submission to probably the Department of Trade and Industry for funds to enable the C.P.B. to employ me for a period of six months to initiate practical trials and research.
   (d) I was informed that the C.P.B. like everybody else is severely curtailed by lack of staff, etc., through a shortage of funds.

That refers to the Liberal Party's largesse, I suppose. The letter continues:

(e) When word was received regarding additional funds being made available I was to be notified. To date I have not received so much as a phone call—

so, they ignored this man completely—

or any correspondence in relation to either my submission or the outcome of possibly utilising the seaweed.

I have looked at the submission that he put forward, and I will refer to that in a moment. This gentleman was enterprising enough to attempt to make a building board out of the seaweed. A section of the letter to Mr D. Ellis, Manager of the Coastal Management Branch, which indicates his enterprise, is as follows:

The undersigned who is unemployed and secretary of Port Unemployed Self Help was referred to you. I visited him in relation to the possible utilisation of seaweed. Subsequently I had a brief discussion with your Mr Toohey who seemed rather surprised upon my showing him a sample of a building board made from seaweed, and when I informed him I have a fairly extensive knowledge of not only construction methods, etc., but soil and plant tissue testing and stock nutrition besides having done a number of cost analysis studies and some market surveys, he kindly offered to forward on a number of reports related to seaweed (*Posidonia australis*) which I received and have read and re-read a number of times.

[Midnight]

Mr Badenoch makes comments that are borne out in other reports. He thinks that the seaweed has uses for stock nutrition and wants to experiment with it in a lucerne project. His ideas were based on the use of seaweed in a building board of which he made a sample. He made comment about the feed unit which is borne out in another report. I have that I will not have time to refer to this evening. He also has an idea for baling seaweed and using it for a building material, or using it for soil stabilisation. He also referred to a Japanese report on how they compress seaweed to great density and use it as a road base.

Mr Hamilton: They also eat it.

Mr PETERSON: I do not think it is the same type of seaweed as ours, but they do eat it. He also mentioned the use of seaweed as a flooring material, in batteries and in evaporative cooling applications, and he also talked of the chemicals in it. He referred me to a C.S.I.R.O. report made in 1976 in which it was suggested by that august body that another possibility was to use the seaweed as fuel or as a source of methane gas from fermentation.

I think that there is an application for this seaweed. We have unemployed people who are looking seriously at lifting themselves out of the misery of unemployment and the hopelessness of their situation and who want to apply themselves to some project. Here is a costless raw material lying on the beaches, and it is believed there is an application for it in some form or another. They have approached a Government department for help and have been given reports to read, and they have read them. From that Mr Badenoch has made a study and believes he has a plan that will work. However, there has been no help from the relevant department; it has not even given the man a phone call. I would have thought that, in this day of supposedly enlightened attitudes towards helping people who want to help themselves, this group would have at least been given some firm technical advice.

They said that the Coast Protection Board claims that it has no money. That is a claim we hear from Government departments every time we ask for money. I ask the Government to seriously consider what help can be given to this group. For instance, there will probably be a building available soon in that area, as the North Haven Lifesaving Club is, hopefully, about to be relocated, and that will leave their current structure unused. That structure could be hired or leased on some basis and these people could be given a centre to work out of. With some hope and some encouragement perhaps they might find an application for this current nuisance of seaweed on the beaches.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Blacker): Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Peake.

Mr PLUNKETT (Peake): I would like to bring to the attention of the House some correspondence I have received from the Corporation of Woodville. I had occasion to make some inquiries about an announcement made by the Minister of Transport concerning the north-south transport corridor and on one occasion spoke to a Mr Ames from the Woodville council.

He told me of a problem that existed at Beverley that had been taken up with the Minister. I asked him whether he would send me the correspondence. The letter, addressed to me, is as follows:

In response to your telephone conversation with Mr Ames of today's date, please find enclosed copies of correspondence with the Hon. Michael Wilson, Minister of Transport, relating to the construction of the north-south collector route (William Street, Beverley) between Holbrooks Road and the Port Road in particular.

This letter is from the Town Clerk of Woodville, Mr D. Hamilton, and it is addressed to the Hon. Michael Wilson. It is as follows:

Over the past few years my council has been approached (increasingly) by residents of the Woodville South, Findon and Beverley areas regarding the ever increasing industrial traffic forcing its way through the residential streets past their homes. I am referring particularly to those residents living around the Beverley industrial area.

The original zoning of this area was based on the existing land use at the time, the drainage of the area, the estimated future development and with particular consideration to the existing road pattern and more particularly the proposals of the Highways Department at that time which indicated that there would be arterial road improvements carried out on the north-south collector route between Holbrooks Road and Hanson Road (William Street, Charles Road), as depicted on the drawing PR/28 submitted to council in the early 1970s.

Council negotiated with the Highways Department that the section of the route adjoining the Beverley industrial area would provide the main access road for the Beverley industrial complex.

Council in turn planned the development of Charles Road to be an industrial service road linking into the highways complex at selected points of ingress and egress and at that time was assured that the proposed route should be carried out within a 10-year period.

More than 10 years have elapsed and the latest information indicates that the construction of this road route is now some 15 years into the future. However, during the intervening period of time there has been very considerable industrial development within the industrial zoning.

All are of real benefit to the State economy. However, these industries are now being frustrated by lack of access and are in turn embarrassing council because their industrial traffic is travelling through the adjoining residential streets. This has forced council to look at traffic controls in:

(a) Birch Street area

(b) now in the Ledger Road area

and is so serious that council may be forced to reconsider rezoning some of the industrial area back to residential in an effort to safeguard its residents from the problems of this industrial intrusion.

Council's rate records indicate that there are over 60 industries established in the Beverley industrial zone; these include such firms as:

Simpson Ltd (S.A.) Appliance Sales
Simpson Ltd (S.A.) Clothes Dryer Factory
Simpson Ltd (S.A.) Washing Machine Factory
Exacto Plastics Pty Ltd
Kaiser Refractories Ltd
Australian Building Adhesives Pty Ltd
Telecom Australia Primary Works Section
Super Tooling Pty Ltd
White Engineering Pty Ltd

Council seeks your assistance in ensuring that at least the section of this road from Holbrooks Road, Grange Road to Toogood Avenue receives a high priority for construction.

Trusting you will give this matter your very serious consideration as it is of grave importance to both council's residents and for the future growth of industries within this industrial zoning.

It is signed by the Woodville Town Clerk. The thing that concerns me about this is the answer received by the Town Clerk from the Minister of Transport. I will read a portion of the letter that was sent to the Town Clerk of Woodville. It says:

The Commissioner of Highways has advised me that the arterial road, to which you refer is one of a number of projects which were proposed in the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study, which must now be the subject of critical review to determine not only their priority for construction, but indeed whether construction is warranted at all.

Further down it goes on to say:

Should it be found that the arterial road is still a desirable future project, the feasibility of constructing a portion of it, to improve access to the industrial area, at an earlier date than indicated above, could be considered. However, it would be unrealistic to expect even such a reduced length to be constructed within seven years at least.

Is this the Government that claimed that it had encouraged and brought new industries to South Australia, although in fact most of these industries had made those announcements prior to the Liberal Government coming in and while the Labor Government was still in office? Further, I would like to make sure that the Minister of Industrial Affairs and the Minister of Transport are made aware of the situation that exists off the Port Road in the Beverley area, where these 60 industries are. They are all viable industries that are very important to the economy of this State. In fact, if you try and pass another car in the street you have to pull into a driveway. Is this the Liberal Government that is assisting and encouraging industry? Maybe it has encouraged one or two industries from across the border with the offer of free land on the South Road. They are in the area where the remand centre should be, where land has been given to industry in some cases, but the Government has allowed industry that has been in established areas to put up with the inconvenience. Has it considered the cost to the residents of that area?

Mr Randall interjecting:

Mr PLUNKETT: The old kangaroo kid has always got to interfere. He has no knowledge but he likes to interfere with a member who knows what he is talking about. He has never assisted industry in his life, and earlier this evening I heard a person speak about a good friend of his named Buick. That is his class of person, and that is the person with whom he should deal. I am speaking about industry—

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Blacker): Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Price.

Mr WHITTEN (Price): I wish to speak on a subject tonight about which you, Mr Acting Deputy Speaker, would be well aware, as would the Minister of Education. I refer to the redevelopment and consolidation of Port Adelaide Primary School and Port Adelaide High School on the high school site. On 27 January, the Public Works Committee approved the consolidation of the schools. I refer to the Public Works Committee report of 27 January, signed by E. Keith Russack, Chairman. The last two paragraphs dealing with the proposals adopted and the recommendation provide:

The committee is satisfied that it is desirable to consolidate the Port Adelaide High and Port Adelaide Primary School on the high school site and the proposals of the department are adopted.

The committee recommends the proposed public work of consolidation of the Port Adelaide High School and the Port Adelaide Primary School on the high school site at an estimated cost of $1 095 000, based on costs as at October 1981.

It was only on the day after the Adelaide Cup holiday that I received a call in the evening asking me to attend a special emergency meeting at Port Adelaide Primary School. It had come to the knowledge of the school council that the Education Department had slashed the child-parent centre, which the Public Works Committee had recommended to be built on that new site, on evidence submitted by people from the Education Department. The school council was not notified that that was to happen. It came about from a leak somewhere in the department.

The leak was that tenders for this job would be advertised in the press the following Saturday and that there would be a deletion of certain sections of the proposal. I am greatly concerned that the department puts up a proposals to the Public Works Committee, and without any reference to that committee or to the school concerned, decides to take it out. There were a lot of irate people at the meeting, including members of the school council. They decided that they would send a letter off to the Minister of Education, and I am pleased that there was some alteration to those proposals.

I want to read a couple of excerpts from letters on this matter. On 11 May, without anything official from the department, the Port Adelaide Primary School Council was greatly concerned because it thought something was going on underhand coming from the Minister of Education. It wrote to the Minister and the letter, under the hand of the staff and parents of the Port Adelaide Child-Parent Centre stated, in part:

We sincerely believe that there are numerous positive benefits arising from the fact that our centre is an integral part of the Port Adelaide Primary School and not a separate entity. We therefore wish to bring to your attention, not only these positive factors, but also our sincere wish not to have any of them changed in the future. It has taken eight years of extremely hard and dedicated work to get our centre where it is and any change would meet with adverse dissatisfaction.

The letter concluded:

Because of our concern we would ask that we be kept well informed of any recommendations and any relevant information.

They heard nothing more on the matter except by way of the grapevine. They called a special emergency meeting of the school council and the child-parent centre. They had had previous discussions with the Regional Director, with various people in the department, and the council and parents agreed to the consolidation at the Port Adelaide High School. They were so irate that, when they found out that something underhand was going on, they sent a further letter to the Minister on 19 May, stating:

This council does not accept the decision to delete the child-parent centre from the plans to consolidate this school with the Port Adelaide High School. This decision, taken unilaterally by the Education Department and discovered accidentally by this school, is a clear breach of an agreement reached between this council and the Education Department. This agreement is evidenced by a signature representing this school attached to plans that were considered and accepted by this council.

Evidence given before the Public Works Standing Committee was also based on the assumption that the plans accepted by this council were final. The deletion of such a major part of our school from the consolidation at this late stage makes a mockery of the notion that there is community involvement in decision making affecting our schools.

The letter has a lot more to say. It continues:

Not only were we not consulted, we were not even told the plans had been changed ... We were led to believe that this report—

and they refer to the report that comes from one of the directors—

recommends the closure of the Port Adelaide Child-Parent Centre.

The article then lists about 20 reasons why the Port Adelaide Child-Parent Centre should be retained in the programme of consolidation. The letter concludes:

We ask you to rescind this latest decision, and call tenders for the plans agreed to by the councils of both schools and submitted to the Public Works Standing Committee. We are convinced that we have right on our side, and have therefore decided to give you the opportunity of responding before we take further action.

The letter then goes on to explain that it was written as a result of an emergency meeting held at the Port Adelaide Primary School. In that letter they asked that they be notified if the Minister intended to change his mind and come back and do something honest and sincere, and to let them have an answer by 28 May. The letter said that failing that notification they would call a public meeting and that plenty of publicity would be given to the Minister of Education and the matter to which he had referred.

Fortunately, on 28 May they rang the department and were told that the department had the letter and that it had a letter in reply dated 27 May which it was going to put in the mail straight away. The solidarity of the school had a bit to do with the Minister changing his mind, because he had talked about a requirement to ensure that the most economical and effective use was made of funds and resources. In his letter the Minister says:

On balance, I have decided that the original plan for relocating the child-parent centre together with the primary school should proceed, and that decisions relating to the rationalisation of pre-school services in Port Adelaide and the surrounding districts should be deferred. The necessary building alterations will be included in the contract at the appropriate time.

As far as the school and the child-parent centre are concerned, all it involves is 75 square metres, which is the only thing to be deleted out of a total area of 6 981 square metres. This shows how penny-pinching and hard up this Government must be if it will knock off a child-parent centre that is doing such a great job when only such a small area is involved.

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

Mrs SOUTHCOTT (Mitcham): I am pleased to be speaking at this stage during a calmer time in the Chamber. Earlier I had considered that I might ask for my 10 minutes to be spent in silence so that people could calm down, but at least it is a little calmer now. While I have been waiting I have been reading today's *News* and discovered an interesting article headed 'Negotiation—the art of obtaining a good deal'. One of the things that Professor Brooks says in that article is as follows:

I tried to demonstrate there were placed ... a lot of importance on timing in negotiations. This covered a whole range of factors including avoiding around the clock sessions.

I believe that really has a message for us. The only advantage I can see in being here at this time is that we can read the *Advertiser* a litle earlier than usual. I assure members that I find it very difficult to believe that 47 intelligent people cannot find a better method of organising their business so that they get home at an earlier time. If someone is interested in arranging a walk-out at some stage, I will be happy to join them.

While waiting to speak, I have been listening to some of the contributions made tonight. First, the member for Salisbury spoke about education. I certainly hope that the prediction for enrolment figures, on which so many plans are based, will be more accurate than those in the Borrie Report. I was also interested in the comments made by the member for Napier, who spoke on housing. The problem of homeless youth and housing for homeless youth concerns me greatly. I wonder particularly how any unemployed person under the age of 18 can find any housing on $36 a week plus the $3 maximum that they are allowed to earn.

The member for Flinders spoke about the need for electoral reform and multi-member electorates. He referred to the need for education in schools in relation to voting procedures. I certainly agree with that, but I would also like to see compulsory education in schools in relation to the three-tier system of Government in Australia. Perhaps people would then begin to get some idea of the different duties and responsibilities of the three different tiers and would not be so confused.

The member for Ascot Park spoke on housing for mentally disturbed people. Although he referred to a highly unusual case, I believe that we can all identify with it. By the time so many of society's problems reach us, as members of Parliament, there really is no solution for them. Those sorts of problem are very difficult to solve.

I would like to add my comments to those already made by the member for Baudin regarding the clearance of scrub. Last week I was approached by members of the Bird Care and Conservation Society who are concerned at the threat of extinction to two populations of black cockatoos in South Australia due to rapid progressive land clearance.

The plight of the red-tailed black cockatoo in south-east and south-western Victoria is due to the scrub-clearing of brown stringy bark *(Eucalyptus baxteri)* and *Casuarina luehmanii*. The birds exhibit a north-south seasonal migration between these two habitats, the seeds of both trees being essential to their diet. The threat to these birds is particularly serious, as it is a sub-species that has not yet been described.

The population of yellow-tailed black cockatoos on Southern Eyre Peninsula is declining at a dangerous rate. The main factor is the clearance of large sugar gums to make land available for farming. As the population of trees is reduced, there is also heavy competition for nesting hollows by feral bees. Apparently commercial bee-keepers in the Southern Eyre Peninsula region are having to place their hives in reserves and national parks as there is so little natural vegetation available to them.

The Bird Care and Conservation Society is concerned that action be taken at least in this one area of conservation and preservation. There is a need for such studies and a thorough investigation of the incentives and reason for such clearance with a view to minimising it or preferably halting it altogether. Also, studies to determine whether there is a stage at which the food supply for the birds becomes inadequate, not only for the birds to maintain themselves but also for the population's breeding individuals to raise young at optimal rates. Basic aspects of the population's breeding biology are still poorly understood, and nesting requirements

need to be clarified. Grazing pressure is severely restricting the regeneration of the summer food source *Casuarina luehmanii* in the pastures, and the extent to which the cockatoos utilise this resource needs to be studied. However, there is a much broader issue related to the means available to the Minister of Environment and Planning to counter threats to a number of faunal and floral species through land clearance.

The theme of World Environment Day this year is Endangered Species, and the Museum, the Zoological and Botanic Gardens have all prepared special displays, posters, booklets and guided tours to educate the community about the danger of extinction of species if the present environmental factors acting on them continue. So, education is the primary means to be used. Other avenues include the encouragement of property owners themselves to preserve the areas (as many of them already do) or to have the areas listed under the National Heritage Act. However, if education and persuasion do not succeed, what then can be done? I am concerned that the Minister have sufficient funds available to purchase small areas of scrub which could serve as refuges for birds and other vulnerable populations.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I refer to a matter of which I believe most members in this place would have had experience at some time or another—the signing of land transfer documents. A number of my constituents, who were not well known to me, came to my electorate office and asked me to sign land transfer documents. Part of the document in question states 'being a person well known to me'. I advised these constituents that I was not prepared to put myself in a position where I believe I could be committing an act of perjury. In one instance, a young lady and her husband were most irate because I was not prepared to sign the document, and subsequently I was accosted by a rather angry father in a local hotel. It took me some time to explain the background to the problem.

I then took it upon myself to write to the Attorney-General asking how the problem could be solved, particularly with people transferring from interstate or within the State, for example, from Andamooka, Coober Pedy or the West Coast. Those people come to Adelaide and look for a justice of the peace to sign the document. In some instances, I pointed out the details I have just related to the House. I wrote to the Attorney-General detailing these problems, and his reply of 28 May states, in part:

> As you are aware the signature of the transferor, mortgagor, etc., must be witnessed by someone to whom the party executing is personally known. However, the Real Property Act does provide for 'a long form of proof' as well as 'a short form of proof' as referred to by you.
>
> The long form of proof is used in those situations where the witness is not an approved authority such as a justice of the peace. In these circumstances, the witness appears before a justice of the peace or other authority and acknowledges the signature of the executing party and declares that the executing party was personally known to such witness, etc. Set out hereunder is a specimen of the long form of proof, viz.:
>
> > Appeared before me at the day of 19 , A.B. of (insert address and occupation) (hereinafter referred to as the 'witness'), a person known to me and of good repute attesting witness to this instrument, and acknowledged his/her signature to the same; and did further declare that the transferor, the party executing the same, was personally known to the witness, that the signature to the said instrument is in the handwriting of the transferor and that the said transferor did freely and voluntarily sign the same in the presence of the witness and was at that time of sound mind.
>
> The long form of proof increases the range of witnesses and at the same time provides a measure of protection as regards the identity of transferors, mortgagors, etc., with whom another party is dealing.

I do not understand what the Attorney is saying. He certainly has not answered my question. I am not prepared to accept the Attorney's statement, and I will seek further information from him because, quite clearly, he has duck-shoved the issue.

He has not answered the question I put to him, and I want to know, because a number of my constituents want that answer. It will be on the Minister's head, not mine, if he is not prepared to answer that. I want clarification, because I understand the problems of people who come from the country, interstate, or overseas and who want a document signed and do not know where to go. They have to run from pillar to post and be pushed from department to department and cannot find out; nor can I. I telephoned the Justices Association, the Lands Titles Office, and the Attorney-General's office, and I cannot get anywhere with them, so I will certainly be pursuing the matter.

Another issue I raise involves constituents in the Woodville West and Seaton Park areas who reside in Housing Trust accommodation. In many instances the trust provides a driver who comes on Monday morning and toots the horn of the vehicle he is driving, and the local residents come out with the rent book and, hopefully, pay their rent. I make clear that I am not reflecting on the driver, but many tenants may be having a bath or shower, feeding the baby, doing something down the back yard, or washing, etc., and by the time they get to the front gate the driver has driven off and they have to journey from their areas to Mansfield Park or Bartley Terrace in the Semaphore Park area.

Many of these people are disadvantaged, particularly some aged and infirm. One chap has to hobble on a walking stick. I believe that the opportunity should be there for local residents to pay at either the local post office in the Seaton North shopping centre or at an adjacent property, the Mothers and Babies Health Association clinic, which I understand, is open only on Tuesday. The trust should provide at least one day a week in that area to cater for these Housing Trust tenants in the Woodville West and Seaton areas. It should act for these people who live in the Seaton area at Trimmer Parade, outside my area.

A constituent has told me that he understood that some time ago the Minister or the member for Henley Beach had said that the Grange railway station was to be relocated because of the problems of traversing Military Road. I said that I could recall that, and he asked me to find out from the Minister, when I could, when that relocation was to occur, because he had to traverse that road where the crossing is located. I hope that the Minister will give me that information, as my constituent is very concerned for his safety and, naturally enough, to find out when this relocation is to occur, if it is to occur, because considerable concern is expressed by a number of my constituents. That goes back to before the last State election, when concern was expressed that the Grange railway line would eventually be shut down. I hope that the Minister can allay those fears and point out that the railway station will be relocated and that the Grange line is secure for at least another three or four years.

There is another matter that I hope the Minister will take up. I refer to an incident that occurred at 8.15 p.m. on 27 May this year. Excavations were carried out along Tapleys Hill Road, Seaton, and a number of constituents complained that the private firm excavating there had not put up sufficient traffic lights to ensure the safety of drivers.

To be informed by the firm that one should telephone the police, and they can fix it up, is not good enough. I believe there is a clear responsibility on the excavation firm which has the contract to ensure that sufficient lighting is put there for the protection of motorists in that area and that it should not be said that problems exist because of local hoodlums or vandals in the area.

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

Mr McRAE (Playford): My remarks will be addressed to the need, in my view, to refer Standing Order 138 to the Standing Orders Committee, which should be done as a matter of urgency. This Standing Order was highlighted today in what I considered to be rather a regrettable incident. The Standing Order in question states:

> Where a member, in speaking to a question, refers to a statistical or factual table relevant to the question, such table may, at the request of the member and by leave of the House, be inserted in the official report of the Parliamentary debates without being read.

I have endeavoured to research this matter to see what the practice is in other Parliaments. It occurred to me that probably the most appropriate reference would be the Australian House of Representatives, because, as I understand, many of its Standing Orders were in fact modelled on the original South Australian Standing Orders. In *House of Representatives Practice,* at page 452 reference is made to a consideration by the Federal Standing Orders Committee of the question of incorporating unread material in *Hansard* and the specific conclusion that was reached by that committee is as follows:

> The committee supports proposals for the establishment of a rule to govern the seeking and obtaining of leave to incorporate material in *Hansard* but is of the opinion that this is inappropriate for inclusion in Standing Orders and can well be left for arrangement through Party channels, with the understanding that, consistent with the principles stated by the Chair on 17 September 1964, the final decision as [to] the practicability of incorporating material such as graphs, maps, blocks, etc., and incorporating matter of a libellous or improper nature or which is irrelevant shall be made by the Presiding Officer. A suitable arrangement would be that a Minister or member seeking leave to incorporate material should first show the matter to the member leading for the Opposition or to the Minister at the table, as the case may be.

Of course, as I understand it, that is the practice that prevails in the House of Representatives at the moment, but I accept that that does not derogate from the ultimate responsibility or discretion of the Chair. What alarms me is the vagueness of the existing Standing Order, part of which states:

> Where a member, in speaking to a question, refers to a statistical or factual table relevant to the question . . .

It seems to me that reference to a factual table can, given a broad and generous construction, cover almost anything. One might consider the *Advertiser* newspaper creation of the Smith family, which is a fairly famous family of which we all know in this State and which has been graphed out by the *Advertiser* over a number of years. The information about it is certainly not statistical in the true sense of the word, but it is certainly factual. It seems to me that the Standing Orders Committee ought to deal with this matter.

Mr Lewis: It's the Jones family, isn't it?

Mr McRAE: If it is the Jones family, I apologise to the member for Mallee. Whatever family it is, I just give that as an illustration of the point I make. It is terribly difficult to determine what is a factual tale. In making these remarks, in no way do I want to inflame this situation. What I want to do is get a positive resolution of the matter and put it to bed once and for all. It is probably a sound idea that the member in question in the first instance show the material involved either to the Minister in charge of the debate or to the shadow Minister. Regrettably, if one does not develop such a practice, incidents such as those that occurred tonight will inevitably occur. As I understand it, a dispute such as that which occurred tonight led to the House of Representatives practice.

I want to make one or two other points, and make them with great deference in the hope that incidents such as this can be differently handled in the future. First, I express my view that it is far preferable that if the presiding officer takes exception to a particular matter, whatever the circumstances and whoever the member, in the first instance he refer the matter to the leader of the honourable member's political Party and to the honourable member. Or, if the member is a Party of one, as three of the honourable members of this House are at the moment, that the matter be referred to the member in person and in advance. I think it was unfortunate that I, for one, was misled into thinking that tonight's incident was a set up by the Liberal Party. I have apologised in private to the Deputy Premier for saying such a thing. I have not apologised to you, Sir, as I have not had the opportunity. I now apologise in public to each of you.

However, I think that any reasonable person who was present at the time might well have understood my reaction and the reaction of the member for Mitchell, in the circumstances. Of course, as the argument became more inflamed the more difficult the whole matter became. In short, I believe that there is a need for positive action and, with great deference, I call on you, Sir, to announce tomorrow at the beginning of our sitting, or, if you wish, at some appropriate time next week, that you will be calling an urgent meeting of the Standing Orders Committee and that, in the meantime, the major Parties and members who are Independents or sole representatives of a particular political Party, will be given adequate notice so that they can provide an input into the whole situation.

Let me wind up by saying that it is terribly regrettable that this huge number of committees that has been sitting during the last year has led to the activities of the Standing Orders Committee coming to a grinding halt. That is unfortunate. I do ask you, Sir, in all sincerity and with great deference to respond to me tomorrow, or at an appropriate time, and to endeavour within the limitations that are on you to resuscitate the meetings of the Standing Orders Committee.

Mr LANGLEY (Unley): Maybe during the course of an earlier speech I did make an error. I am only too willing to admit that fact. There have been some things done by the Government in helping people in my area. I refer to the lights in my district. I said that nothing had been done. I must admit that in my area there have been three lighting constructions, so I must apologise to the Minister of Transport for not mentioning them at that time.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: If you keep going on like that, you might get some more.

Mr LANGLEY: During the course of the next few months, there may be another Parliament by then. I will not have to talk to anybody else for the simple reason that I will be out of office. I do thank the Minister for what has been done, and that is more than I can say for the Minister of Education. The Labor Government looked after my district and other districts very well. Since that time things have deteriorated a good deal, and so has the Minister in his area deteriorated, too. I want to let him know right from the start that I am not door knocking in his area this time. He reckoned I was the kiss of death last time. We have a better person this time.

I refer now to the Black Forest Primary School, which at one stage was a demonstration school. I can assure the Minister it will cost the Government plenty in maintenance, if the Government continues not to look after this school. Any honourable member can go to Black Forest Primary School to see the conditions existing there, and they can go further and see the toilets out in the open. The toilets break down so often that it does not matter, and it is still costing the Government plenty to maintain that school.

Everyone associated with the school was unhappy with the Minister's comment the other day that the school might get something after 1984. I will be telling that to the people

of the area. That comment will not help the Government's candidate in the district in any way. The Government candidate has tried to move into the area, and I hope that the Minister of Education, like the Minister of Transport, will do at least one great thing and let the local member know when something happens in his district without going behind his back. I hate that and I have never been involved in such action in my life. I do not intend to start it now.

It has happened and it is always on the cards. The Premier knows it as well. However, I can assure the people of my district what will happen when a Labor Government gains office. The people need not worry about that. Certainly, the Minister knows as well as I do the backhand work that is going on. I have always respected the Minister of Transport and his promises. He would not go behind my back; I can assure the House of that. Whether the Minister of Education likes it not, I can make that assurance. There is a tendency to go behind the back of the local member, but I hope that it does not happen.

Certainly, if it does, I can assure the Minister that it will bounce back. Anyway, he will not be the Minister after the election and I have no need to worry. I can assure the House that it will not be long before the Labor Government gains office. Government members know that I have abided by the umpire's decision, yet I have been disappointed with the way that the Minister has gone about this situation in regard to Black Forest Primary School.

Do members realise that one must walk out through the rain to go to the toilets at that school, yet I have seen other schools receive many more amenities? I do not know whether this situation is politically motivated, but I can assure the Government that a remedy will be part and parcel of action by the future Labor Government. I will be telling the people of my district of the Minister's reply the other day which was shocking. Further, I know what the Liberal candidate in the district said, and I contrast that with the willingness of the Minister of Transport to help at all times as much as he can and not go behind the local member's back.

The Hon. H. Allison: That's an insinuation.

Mr LANGLEY: It is an insinuation that I am willing to make. I have no worries about making it. I have heard the Minister's comment, and I tell the Minister of Education that when we want something done in the district—

The Hon. H. Allison: The Minister said that no commitments had been made to anyone.

Mr LANGLEY: The Minister will know when the next election will be held. If the Minister wants to carry on like that, I can carry on just as he is doing. I have represented the district for 20 years and know what has happened. I move around the district quietly, but I do not carry on like the Minister. Earlier I referred to increased charges by the Government. True, sometimes I am a little childish at times, but at least I am honest. I refer to increased charges and taxes on the people. I refer to succession duties. I seek leave to have a table showing increased charges and prices during this Government's period in office inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has assured the Chair and indicated to the Chair that it is purely statistical. Is leave granted?

Leave granted.

PRICE INCREASES

List A:

1. Licensing of private hospitals, homes (up 140-200 per cent)
2. Pilotage and wharfage (25 per cent; 12½ per cent)
3. Boat haven fees (50-82 per cent)—Robe, Port MacDonnell, North Arm
4. Boat registration (71 per cent)
5. Fees for new buildings (new)
6. Chiropractor registration (new)

PRICE INCREASES

7. Company takeover documents (new)
8. Electrical goods testing (27-74 per cent)
9. Abalone permits (308-485 per cent)
10. Hairdressers' licences (40 per cent)
11. Ru Rua nursing home in-patient charges (11-13 per cent)
12. Registration of commercial premises (25 per cent)
13. Registration of industrial premises (25 per cent)
14. Application for and renewal of liquor licences (100 per cent)
15. Local court fees (8-16 per cent)
16. Ships' masters certificates (1 000-1 900 per cent)
17. Driving instructors licences (150 per cent)
18. Personalised number plates (20 per cent)
19. Learners permits (11 per cent)
20. Driving tests (67 per cent)
21. Registration m/cycles, towtrucks, trailers, etc. (12-22 per cent)
22. Permits to keep native animals (33½ per cent-50 per cent)
23. Train fares (17-100 per cent)
24. Sewerage drainage charge (14-20 per cent)
25. Northfield Ward charges (11-13 per cent)
26. Restoration water supply, extending services (25-33 per cent)
27. Price of *Government Gazette* (100 per cent)
28. Price of *Hansard* (1 225 per cent)
29. Acts of Parliament, copies (140 per cent)
30. Advertising in *Government Gazette* (200 per cent)
31. Birth certificate extracts (100 per cent)
32. Fees for boiler vessel designs (33-122 per cent)
33. Boiler attendant competency certificate (233 per cent)
34. Welder's certificate (108 per cent)
35. Licence to keep LPG (100 per cent)
36. Fishing boat registration (150 per cent)
37. Boat haven charges (500-1 000 per cent)—Port Pirie
38. Certificate for competency as rigger (150 per cent)
39. Fees for court depositions, evidence (10 per cent)—third rise since 1979
40. Lift installation fee (36-167 per cent)
41. Festival State slogan number plates (new)
42. Wildlife hunting permits (20 per cent)
43. Fauna dealer permits (50 per cent)
44. Cleland Park entry (100 per cent)
45. Belair Park oval hire (25 per cent)
46. Standard West Terrace cemetery burials (36 per cent)
47. Government supervisor for totalisator (50 per cent)
48. Property sale registrations (50-83 per cent)
49. Strata title deposit, cancellation amendment (22-53 per cent)
50. Club liquor licence fees (100 per cent)
51. Outdoor liquor permits (1 000-2 000 per cent)

List B:

52. Driver's licences (33 per cent)
53. Land subdivision applications (200 per cent)
54. Liquor licences for festivals (100 per cent)
55. Crown Lands Grants, leases, agreements (up 33-44 per cent)
56. Pastoral Act lease documents
57. Valuation fees (20 per cent)
58. Teacher registration (40 per cent)
59. Registration of craypots (200 per cent)
60. Poison Act permits (67-150 per cent)
61. Medical registrations
62. Water connections (50 per cent)
63. Abalone fishing licences
64. Hospital in-patient fees (70 per cent), Professional service (60 per cent)
65. Fee for obtaining extract of rate assessment (1 900 per cent)
66. Fee for depositing survey plan for opening, closing roads (26 per cent)
67. Fee for maintenance of compensation recipient in hospital (33 per cent) and outpatient attendance of compensation recipient (100 per cent)
68. Motor vehicle registration (12-20 per cent)
69. Driving licences (33⅓ per cent-50 per cent)
70. Firearm licences, renewals, dealers' licences (20, 50, 140 per cent)
71. Surveyors registrations, certificates, accreditation (233-900 per cent)
72. ETSA, fees for work
73. State map prices (75 per cent)
74. Harbour charges
75. Plumbers' registration (50-60 per cent)
76. Opticians' registration (50 per cent)
77. Septic tank proposed plan fee (50 per cent)
78. Nursing Home (Ru Rua) fees (25-29 per cent) (2nd rise: last 1980)
79. Hampstead Centre (R.A.H.) fees (25-29 per cent)
80. Slogan number plates (12½-15 per cent)
81. Enfield cemetery interments (6 per cent)

PRICE INCREASES

82. Local Court fees (17-25 per cent)
83. Registration of business name, renewals, searches (50-150 per cent)
84. Cost of legal practitioners certificate (567 per cent)
85. Class A petrol and diesel franchise licence (12.4-13.3 per cent)
86. Taxi licences, renewal (8.4-9.2 per cent)
87. Photocopying of Supreme Court evidence (100 per cent)
88. Fishing and boat haven charges (25-33.3 per cent) (second round)
89. Wharfage fees (16-25 per cent)
90. Pilotage fees (some reductions for smaller vessels, increases for over 2 000 tonnes 71 per cent)

Mr LANGLEY: I do not know whether I will be here after the next election, but I do want to comment on price increases. The Premier said that he would abolish succession duties, and that promise affected people in my district greatly. I refer to the major charges levied on the people of South Australia by the Government, which was not going to increase prices in any way. Water and sewerage rates to July 1980 increased by 5.6 per cent under the Labor Government and yet by July 1981 they had increased by 12.5 per cent. The price of water to July 1980 under a Labor Government was 24 cents to 27 cents a kilolitre, yet to July 1981 under the Liberal Government it was 27 cents to 32 cents a kilolitre. This is under a Government that was not going to increase electricity charges. In regard to electricity charges, in the year from July 1980 the increase was 12.5 per cent, yet from July 1981 it was 19.8 per cent and from May 1982 it was an increase of 16 per cent.

In regard to bus and tram fares, from August 1980 the charge was plus 25 per cent; from August 1981 they averaged plus 20 per cent. Motor vehicle registration was plus 12 to 20 per cent from January 1981, and plus 9 per cent to 16.7 per cent from March 1982. We can also look at bread prices, which rose from 60 to 82 cents; rents rose from $25 to $35.50; interest rates rose from $260 to $355; electric power rose from $243 to plus $400; water rates rose from $173 to $238. These figures relate to the period between 1979 and 1982.

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

Motion carried.

Bill taken through its remaining stages.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1) (1982)

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 4463.)

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): It is now 1 a.m. I will say a few words about the Appropriation Bill. This task has been made especially difficult this year by the complete lack of information provided by the Premier in his paltry second reading explanation in support of the Bill. The Appropriation Bill, and more particularly the second reading explanation to which I have just referred, is clear evidence that the disastrous financial management of the Tonkin Government has continued throughout the financial year 1981-82. It is stark evidence that under the Tonkin Government South Australia is edging closer to bankruptcy. Let me say at once that the Premier's explanation contains a disgraceful lack of detail about the State's general financial position. Where explanations exist, they are very often misleading.

It is no defence for the Premier to say that detailed explanations will be given later in the year. A year ago, when introducing the supplementary estimates on 2 June 1981, the Premier's speech contained details of changes in the revenue account; details of which items of revenue had exceeded Budget expectations and which had not; reasons why the Government believed the Budget result had departed from its earlier predictions; an itemising of where cuts had been made on the loan account; and a considerable amount of explanation on the effects of predicted pay increases on Government expenditure.

None of this is provided this year. We are entitled to ask whether this lack of detail is a result of the Premier's incompetence or an attempt to hide from the Parliament the parlous state of our finances. If that sort of cover-up is going on, it will not work.

Anyone familiar with the way in which the Tonkin Government has mismanaged South Australia's finances will be able to see just what this measure means. There are four major aspects of this supplementary appropriation measure which cause the Opposition concern and which, I believe, should be made clear to the people of South Australia. For a start, there is yet another sham surplus: not a surplus of funds available to the Government after it has met all of its commitments; not a surplus that can be applied by the Government for the benefit of all South Australians after it has fulfilled its obligations to the people who elected it, but a sham surplus, generated purely and simply by cutting back on essential Government works and services and by cosmetic transfers. It is a surplus generated by using precious Loan funds to prop up its day-to-day operations.

Secondly, there is concealed in this measure a real deficit of some $54 000 000. That is the rip-off from capital works funds after one takes account of this sham $10 000 000 surplus that I have just referred to. That $54 000 000, South Australia's real deficit for 1981-82, represents more than $100 for every taxpayer in the State. Thirdly, the Government's deficit is clearly growing at a time when it is doing less and less for the community. Constantly throughout the past year we have seen all sorts of groups and organisations in our society complaining and protesting about the way in which Government services and support are being cut back in this State. Fourthly, over the past two years the Tonkin Government has propped itself up by transferring over $100 000 000 of capital funds.

It is little wonder that the Premier does not want to make too many detailed comments about the State's general financial position this year when one considers his abysmal record. Indeed, this Bill before us should be considered within the context of what is now almost three years of Liberal mismanagement. We have already seen—

An honourable member: Come on!

Mr BANNON: I will enumerate them. We have already seen record Budget deficits on recurrent activities; it is an undeniable fact. We have already seen record transfers and diversions of funds to pay day-to-day bills; it is in the records. We have seen record cuts in school buildings, hospitals, and other public works. We have seen record increases in charges for vital public services, including electricity, water and sewerage, and public transport. One of the particular charges mentioned under the Appropriation Act, special sections 7 (1) and (2), refers to the way in which electricity tariffs have increased at a rate greater than that provided for in the Budget, greater than the rate of inflation.

In short, we have seen a Government, the like of which has not been seen in South Australia since the days of the great Depression in terms of financial management. The figures are there. I defy any member opposite to prove me wrong. Even judged by its own low standards, the Government has failed. It claims to be a Government of low taxation, but since the last year of the Labor Government, State taxes have steadily risen and in this financial year per capita tax collections are 27 per cent higher than they were in 1978-79. The carefully husbanded reserves built up by

the former Labor Government are being run down, as has been made clear by official Treasury documents, a document tabled in this House recently by the Government itself.

That document, which I invite members opposite to study very closely, a Treasury document prepared for the Government and tabled in this House, discloses that the run-down for 1981-82 will be a record $82 000 000. It is that record that we must bear in mind whenever we examine a financial Bill brought before the House by this Government. What are the financial details of this measure? What can be deduced from the paltry amount of information that we have been given? To support that, I invite honourable members to refer back to the Premier's speech last year.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr BANNON: The Minister of Education interjects about a deficit inherited. The Government inherited a surplus. The Government inherited well-stocked reserves and a $600 000 surplus. The deficit the Government inherited, indeed! What utter nonsense.

The Hon. H. Allison: I said the debts we inherited. Those debts are substantial.

Mr BANNON: They are substantial! I will refer to debts in a moment. In examining this measure I suggest that honourable members opposite look at what was provided for the House in last year's document—look at the details. The Government's problem in providing those details is that we were able to cut a swathe through the arguments put forward by the Government to patch up its dismal financial record. What has happened this year? We will not receive those details. However, the Government cannot hide all the facts. The Government still must produce some figures required by Parliament under the various Acts. Originally, the Government planned an apparent deficit of $3 000 000 on its Consolidated Account. I use the word 'apparent', not 'real'. This was to be achieved by a massive transfer of $44 000 000 from capital funds. However, we are now told that there will be a surplus of $10 000 000, an apparent turn-around of $13 000 000.

That looks very nice and has created a headline in the newspaper today announcing that fact. How has that miracle been achieved? Is it an extraordinary piece of financial expertise by the Treasurer? First, there is to be a further cosmetic transfer of $10 000 000 into the Budget from other accounts—unspecified. This appears under the line Repayments and Recoveries. It is completely unplanned, completely last minute, and a transfer of which no mention was made in last year's original Budget. Secondly, the Premier has slashed payments, mainly payments on works, by a further $10 000 000. The argument he has used is couched in exactly the same glib terms as appears in *Hansard* of 2 June last year to explain his cuts in public works. This is a further cosmetic transfer. It is also a last-minute transfer, and it was completely unplanned. Taken together with the Premier's other fiddles it shows that under the Tonkin Government the concept of a State Budget running throughout a financial year has become nothing more than a joke.

Even accepting the Premier's own terms, that is, accepting these cosmetic transfers, the apparent deficit is now $10 000 000, not the $3 000 000 claimed by the Government. It is simple primary school mathematics. We start from a planned $3 000 000 deficit, add $10 000 000 in transfers and $10 000 000 in cuts, which would bring a cosmetic surplus of $17 000 000. Where is the $7 000 000? There is a missing $7 000 000 in that equation.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr BANNON: In reply to the Minister of Education, that $7 000 000 can be found somewhere amongst the details missing from this pathetic explanation. It is the net result of the various shortfalls and over-runs. Its importance would be apparent if the Premier chose to regard Parliament with sufficient importance in itself to put before it the detailed information to which it is entitled. We can guess where that $7 000 000 might be, and I will hazard some guesses in a minute, but the details are not supplied. The majority of State revenue items depend on economic activity. It is too embarrassing to admit that this essential indicator of our economic health has apparently turned down.

We have some assistance from the monthly financial summaries which are supplied by the Treasurer and which indicate that pay-roll taxes are well below Budget estimates. For the first 10 months of this financial year, according to the latest figures published in the monthly estimates, figures that we cannot get from any of the documents presented today, $168 400 000 was collected. The Budget amount expected for the whole year is $211 000 000, so in the last two months of the financial year the Treasurer must get in $43 000 000 to match his Budget estimates. That is well above the monthly rate. In fact, if one looks at the figures and the expected extra revenue that might come in, one sees that, unless there is some special upturn in business activities in the last two months that has not been apparent in the previous 10 months, the Treasurer will be about $7 000 000 down. So, $7 000 000 is missing already. That is just part of the story, and there is not enough detail in the explanation to find other anomalies.

What is the real deficit? To obtain the answer to that question, we must delve a bit beyond what is presented. I will start with the funds available for works of a capital nature. In 1981-82, $230 000 000 was available, and the Premier tells us that, from repayments and recoveries, he has found another $10 000 000, making $240 000 000 in all. However, it appears that in this financial year this Government will spend only $176 000 000 of those funds for the purposes for which they were intended. That means that $64 000 000 of vital capital funds, at a time of economic depression in this State, will not be used at all. No wonder building and construction in this State are at a low ebb. No wonder we are going through a major recession, when one of the key economic generators in the State the State Government, through its capital works programme, has already slashed this year $64 000 000 of the expected amount that it will spend.

Even leaving aside the extra $10 000 000 that the Treasurer has brought in from other accounts, we are still left with a massive real deficit of $54 000 000, the sum to which I referred a moment ago. That is more than $100 for every taxpayer in South Australia, as I said previously. That is the burden that each and every South Australian taxpayer must carry because of this Premier and his financial mismanagement.

The Premier refers to the budgetary problems of other States. Indeed, he made much of this in the explanation. I suggest that he gave more details about other States than he did about the financial position of this State. I suggest that a $54 000 000 deficit for a State the size of South Australia is quite horrendous, and on a per capita basis it certainly outstrips the deficits of New South Wales and Victoria, which were quoted by the Premier. Let us never forget that in just two years this Premier has taken over $100 000 000 from the State's vital capital works funds. That tactic does not find much support within his own Party. For example, the Deputy Premier, on 13 February 1979, is quoted in *Hansard* as referring to a $5 000 000 transfer. Good Lord, that sort of sum is dwarfed by what is happening at present and what has been happening over the past two or three years. It is a miniscule transfer compared to what is going on now. The Deputy Premier, when in Opposition, stated.

That is very poor economics ... it will have another very adverse effect on the future of South Australia ... far from seeking

to increase our Loan funds for developmental projects, on what are truly Loan projects, and capital development, by transferring these funds [the Government is] contracting the provision of Loan funds to this State in the future; that is a very poor economic policy.

That is right. It is a poor economic policy, although I suggest that the sum of the transfer then and the way in which it was planned were responsible, not this unplanned blowing out and raiding of the Loan works funds. The Hon. Mr DeGaris, in the Adelaide *News* on Monday, actually suggested, in the light of this appalling situation, that there should be legislation to prevent Governments from ripping off Loan funds in the way that this Government has done.

That was said by one of the Premier's colleagues in another place, and he is so alarmed at the situation that he suggested the need for legislation to prevent it going on. The effect of this type of budgetary tactic on the economy is well known. It has just about brought the building and construction industry to its knees. The figures are quite alarming. In 1978-79, under the Labor Government, $232 200 000 was provided for the capital works programme. In the following year, during the first nine months of which the present Government was in office, $226 100 000 was provided. In 1980-81, an amount of $196 900 000 was provided. The amount was going down alarmingly all the time, and this year it is an estimated $176 000 000. They are the actual figures, the money amounts. They have been going down but, due to inflation, what those amounts will purchase and the amount of economic activity they can generate are even less. A calculation shows that in real terms the annual reduction is well over $100 000 000. One estimate is that in real terms it is $133 000 000, based on a low inflation rate of 10 per cent per annum. Inflation, particularly in the building and construction area, has been running much higher and that would make the real reduction higher than the figure I have quoted; $100 000 000 that should have been pumped into the economy has been denied it.

A major aspect of this Bill concerns funds to be appropriated to repay moneys relative to the South Australian Land Commission, and let me deal with that in specific terms. The Premier tells us in his thin second reading explanation that, after considerable negotiation, the Government has reached an agreement to pay the Commonwealth $36 000 000 over three years. The House may recall that on 27 August last year I asked the Premier why he planned to pay the Commonwealth $36 000 000 when under the terms of the agreement, repayments were not due until 1983-84. Not one cent had to be paid until then. What was the response of this Treasurer, who never misses an opportunity to tell us that he is proud of South Australia and will stand up for our State? He replied:

I am quite certain that no-one would expect me to accept the first figure offered by the Federal Government.

So what did he do? He caved in. He did accept the first amount that Fraser offered. The sum of $36 000 000 was the figure which was quoted and which, he said, we could not expect him to accept because it was the first figure offered. He went on to say on 27 August in that reply:

I think that the Leader will see the enormous good sense of negotiating further and trying to get the best possible deal from the Federal Government.

I agree. It is a pity that the Premier did not live up to that pompous statement. Whether or not he negotiated, he certainly signally failed. Whether he did get the best possible deal can be judged by the fact that he is paying the precise amount that the Commonwealth put in as its first offer. That is revealed here today, with as little explanation as possible, in the hope probably that the Premier could get away with it and leave us with the impression that he would talk tough to Fraser. He was able to get some concessions. He is doing the same thing again to borrow. Off he goes to Canberra to stand up for South Australia, with the same results that he has had throughout his Premiership. He is taken for granted, as naturally the Prime Minister would do, because in this Premier he has one of his most ardent supporters and assistants.

The Premier, in relation to the Land Commission amount, took the first amount that Mr Fraser offered him last year, and he will probably take what is offered to him tomorrow. Ironically, there is no doubt that he ought to be in a stronger bargaining position, because Mr Fraser probably feels the need to prop the Premier up a bit because of his standing in the polls.

In fact, by paying the debt and by paying that first figure the Commonwealth put, and despite the vigorous negotiation, still having to pay that figure means that the State is losing out because we are paying prematurely. The $89 000 000 total debt was a liability over 10 years that does not even begin until 1983-84.

The Government has rushed headlong into dismembering the Lands Commission; it has rushed headlong into the Federal Treasury, where there are very canny and competent negotiators; the Government rushed headlong into a deal that means we lose out; we lose the returns that could have been earned on that money which we are prematurely paying out the Commonwealth. We lose due to now accepting a new repayment formula at a time of financial stringency. What a dreadful record! I now deal with another aspect of Supplementary Estimates, that which refers to the Minister of Health, Miscellaneous line. It was stated:

Revenues of health units from patient fees are now likely to be much less that we expected. We go to new fees and estimates in September 1981. All States were in trouble because their actual revenues are running well below the estimates determined by the Commonwealth after consultation with the States. It is likely that an additional $9 000 000 of State funds will be required by the Health Commission in 1981-82.

In fact, there is a real crisis in that area and yet it is interesting to note the performance of the present Government in the health and hospitals area. For instance, when on 10 May the Victorian and New South Wales Governments joined forces to press the Federal Government for more money for public hospitals (and they invited all States to join them in that and to attend the meeting), we had a statement from the Acting Health Minister at that time, the Deputy Premier, to say that everything was all right in South Australia, that he was having talks with the Commonwealth Government, and that it would be fixed up. He said that the approach of the New South Wales and Victorian Governments was obviously a political exercise aimed at directing attention away from problems of their own making, that the New South Wales budgetary situation was a shambles because the Government there had failed to exercise proper control over spending and that the Victorian Government was finding that many of the election promises made prior to the recent election campaign were simply too costly for Victorian taxpayers to afford.

That is what the Acting Minister of Health said; he dismissed the fact that those other States were in trouble and said that it had occurred in fact because they had mismanaged their budgets. What happened of course was that 10 days later there was a major increase in health and hospital charges announced, by, I might add, that very same Acting Minister. Hospital charges went up $20 a day and numerous other charges were added on. I thought it that was very interesting indeed that, following the Minister's rejecting the meeting, saying that it was only a means of distracting or directing attention away from problems of the making of those other States, we found that there was a note that Mr Goldsworthy would attend a meeting of all States and Federal Ministers in Sydney to discuss the South Australian and Victorian hospital rises. What sort of credibility is there? I

think perhaps we might look again at those statements. Apparently the blow-out of the health budgets was due to a shambles in budgetary control or the inability to deliver election promises. In that case, what is this $9 000 000 all about?

Let me say again that the lack of detail from the Premier makes debate on this measure very difficult. I can only conclude that the Premier does not want a debate on the economy and the State's financial performance. Therefore, we can only assume that the difference between the June 1982 statement and the June 1981 statements is due to the proximity of an election, whether it be within a few weeks or a few months, and that the less said in detail about the State's financial position, the better, the more that can be hidden. Each successive Tonkin Budget has been an admission of failure. Each successive Budget stands as evidence of financial incompetence, and this supplementary Appropriation Bill is no exception. It is distinguished by the Premier's speech—a scant and skimpy resumé of our parlous financial state.

The Premier says that we will have to wait until the Budget before the full picture is made clear, but I disagree. This Government, which is now committed to covering up the State's financial problems, is not about to come clean. We will have to wait until the next election, whenever that is, until a Labor Government occupies the Treasury benches, before the people of South Australia will be fully aware of what mismanagement and incompetence this Liberal Government has brought to the State.

Mr RODDA secured the adjournment of the debate.

FILM CLASSIFICATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

DRIED FRUITS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

CRIMINAL INJURIES COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

CARRICK HILL VESTING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

At 1.23 a.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 10 June at 2 p.m.