

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 15 March 1983

The **SPEAKER (Hon. T.M. McRae)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

DEATH OF MR J.W.H. COUMBE

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer):** I move:

That this House expresses its regret at the recent death of Mr J.W.H. Coumbe, a former member of the House and Minister of the Crown, and places on record its appreciation of his long and meritorious service, and, as a mark of respect to his memory, the sitting of the House be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

During the period in which the Parliament has been in recess Mr John Coumbe, former member for Torrens, died. He was 66 years of age. Mr Coumbe had a very long period of service in this House and that period of service, which commenced in 1956, was preceded by service at the local government level. As well as that, of course, he conducted a successful business.

His public record is certainly one which would do honour to any member of this place. He was, during that period in the House of Assembly, Minister of Works, Marine, Labour and Industry, and Education in the period from 1968-70. He was for a period between 1973 and 1975 Deputy Leader of the Opposition. As well as his wide range of interests and his involvement in community affairs in his electorate, for which he was well known indeed, Mr Coumbe also had an interest in education. He had attended, as a student, the Institute of Technology and subsequently became a member of the council of that institute, and, indeed, its Chairman.

I think that a mark of the respect paid to Mr Coumbe on all sides of politics was the action of the previous Labor Government in 1978 of appointing him as a member of the Electricity Trust of South Australia. In that post he followed the late Hon. Sir Thomas Playford and Mr Coumbe served well on that extremely important statutory authority on behalf of this State. To all of us who knew him, Mr Coumbe was certainly a man worthy of the highest respect.

If I may conclude on a personal note, Mr Speaker, I knew him and his family for many years (in fact, from childhood), and I knew him as a kindly, concerned individual. Subsequently, as I got to know more of his public function, I understood the depth of integrity, experience and consideration he brought to anything he did, and as always, I guess, the measure of a man's worth and contribution can be gained by the opinions of those who have dealt with him, and whether in situations of support or conflict, one thing always emerged, namely, that Mr Coumbe had the highest respect of those with whom he dealt. I pass on our regrets at his passing and our condolences to his widow and his family.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I support the motion. John Coumbe was certainly one of the best liked and most respected members to have sat in this Parliament. As the Premier has indicated, he was member for Torrens from 1956 until he retired in 1977. He served in Parliament for 21 years and gave distinguished service to this institution.

John Coumbe was a man of great integrity and ability whose service to the community was wide ranging. He was a thoughtful man with a genuine sincerity when dealing with people including his constituents. He served those constituents and the people of South Australia as a member of Parliament and as Minister of the Crown in Mr Steele Hall's Government from 1968 to 1970. He held four port-

folios, including Education, for which his successor (Hon. M.M. Wilson) is shadow Minister in this Parliament.

His other contributions in the public arena of South Australia included membership of bodies associated with the South Australian Institute of Technology, from being a student, as the Premier has indicated, to leading up and being closely involved with the direction of that organisation. He was also associated with the Northern Community Hospital and the Australian Broadcasting Commission. After retiring from Parliament, Mr Coumbe continued his involvement in service to his fellows, and he will be remembered for his valuable contribution to the Electricity Trust of South Australia as a member of the board. As State President of the Liberal Party, I first met John Coumbe as a member of that Party, for which he will be remembered as a tireless worker who gave over 30 years service to the ideals and principles that the Party supports. He has left South Australia a better place because of the help he gave his fellow man, and his family can look back with immense pride to the contribution he made to the good of society. I join with the Premier in extending condolences to members of the family of the late John Coumbe in their bereavement.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I support the motion on the basis of my close association with the late John Coumbe, who was a loyal and dedicated Deputy Leader while I was Leader of the Opposition in this place. John had known great personal tragedy but he always bounced back from such adversity to face the realities of the world about him. He was always available to help a new member who needed practical help; indeed, he would help anyone with whom he came in contact, both inside and outside this House.

Reference has been made by previous speakers to John's associations with various bodies since he retired as a Parliamentarian. The three associations which were foremost in his mind and about which he often spoke in this House were the Walkerville Sports Club, the Roosters Club, and the advisory group of the Australian Broadcasting Commission. In recent years he continued his association with the Institute of Technology and at the time of his death was Chairman of the institute council. He was often requested by members of the staff, the students, and others associated with that organisation to chair fact-finding committees, and the interpretations he gave in respect of matters placed before him were most acceptable to those who trusted him with that involvement.

I extend my condolences to members of his family, especially to his second wife, Millicent. I trust that the years of happiness John and Millicent shared in recent times will continue for her and that she can continue with her keen interest in china painting, an interest in which she was supported most ably by her husband. John Coumbe's service to the South Australian community will be long remembered.

The Hon. M.M. WILSON (Torrens): I support the remarks of the Premier, the Leader, and the member for Light. It was a tremendous honour for me (and I say so with the greatest humility) to follow John Coumbe as the Parliamentary member for Torrens. I believe (and have always believed) that the record of his service to the community, not only to the electorate of Torrens but also to the community at large, could hardly be equalled by any other member of Parliament. The sacrifice he made in presenting that service to the community stands as a goal for every member of Parliament to achieve.

He has been much honoured in his passing and, indeed, after his retirement. Other than joining the House and passing on my deepest respects and sympathy to Millicent and his family, I only wish to say that John Coumbe has been accorded probably the highest accolade that this House

can bestow; namely, the almost universal respect of members of all Parties.

The SPEAKER: I first knew John Coumbe when standing for the seat of Torrens in 1968. John Coumbe's personal reputation was very high in his own area, as I and other Labor candidates before and after found. Upon entering the House of Assembly I always found him to be a person whose contribution to the debate was positive and constructive at all times. In the hard world of politics I can truthfully say that he was universally liked. He will be remembered for his outstanding contribution in many fields, and especially for his cordial personality and personal integrity. I offer my sincere condolences to his widow and family. I ask honourable members to rise in their places and carry the motion in silence.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

[Sitting suspended from 2.13 to 2.22 p.m.]

PETITION: TRANSPORT CORRIDOR

A petition signed by 2 578 residents of South Australia praying that the House oppose any proposal to construct within or through or contiguous to the River Torrens Valley any transport corridor or other facility for private or public transport was presented by the Hon. R.K. Abbott.

Petition received.

PETITION: GOODWOOD PRIMARY SCHOOL

A petition signed by 384 staff, parents and friends of Goodwood Primary School praying that the House urge the Government not to proceed with the proposed displacement of staff at the Goodwood Primary School was presented by the Hon. Lynn Arnold.

Petition received.

PETITION: LE FEVRE PENINSULA PRIMARY SCHOOL

A petition signed by 138 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government not to proceed with the proposed displacement of staff at the Le Fevre Peninsula Primary School was presented by the Hon. Lynn Arnold.

Petition received.

PETITION: MIDDLE RIVER DAM

A petition signed by 52 residents of Penneshaw and American River, Kangaroo Island, praying that the House urge the Government to extend the water reticulation system based on the Middle River dam to provide water for the District Council of Dudley was presented by the Hon. W.E. Chapman.

Petition received.

PETITION: PRESCRIBED CONCENTRATION OF ALCOHOL

A petition signed by 22 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to reduce the 'prescribed concentra-

tion of alcohol' to .05 per cent was presented by the Hon. W.E. Chapman.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: ALCOHOL ADVERTISING

Petitions signed by 37 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to ban alcohol advertising from commercial television and radio were presented by the Hon. W.E. Chapman and Mr Ferguson.

Petitions received.

PETITION: PEDESTRIAN CROSSING

A petition signed by 165 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to review the decision not to improve the pedestrian crossing at the intersection of Lambert Road, Joslin, and Llandower Avenue, Payneham, was presented by the Hon. G.J. Crafter.

Petition received.

PETITION: PENONG TO PORT SINCLAIR ROAD

A petition signed by 235 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to regularly maintain and upgrade the Penong to Port Sinclair road was presented by Mr Gunn.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answers to questions, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: all questions on the Notice Paper except No. 56.

MINISTERS' WIVES

In reply to the Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN (14 December).

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There are no Ministers' wives employed by the Government.

MALLEE LAND

In reply to Mr LEWIS (14 December).

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: On reflection it is considered inappropriate to make public the names of officers of the Department of Environment and Planning who were acting on behalf of the Minister. Further, as the matter is one between the landholder and the Minister, the names of the officers concerned would seem to be irrelevant.

SCHOOL ASSISTANTS

In reply to Mr MAYES (8 December).

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I undertook to respond to my colleague regarding the reinstatement of school assistant hours to schools in the Unley electorate. The information is as follows:

| | Ancillary Hours | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| | Actual 1982 | Old for- mula for 1982 | New for- mula for 1983 |
| Goodwood Boys High School . . . | 242.5 | 264 | 275 |
| Black Forest Primary School . . . | 122.5 | 120.5 | 125.5 |
| Goodwood Primary School | 117.5 | 113.3 | 118 |
| Unley Primary School | 113 | 110 | 114.5 |
| Totals | 595.5 | 607.8 | 633 |

As can be seen from this table, this Government's new formula shows a marked difference to school assistants hours not only in Unley but the whole State.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

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

Re-equipment of Mount Gambier Dry Mill,
Victor Harbor High School Redevelopment—Stage I.
Ordered that reports be printed.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: GLENELG ACCIDENT

The **Hon. G.F. KENEALLY** (Chief Secretary): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. G.F. KENEALLY**: I find it necessary, in view of considerable public disquiet generated by a newspaper report on Monday of this week over a fatal accident at Glenelg North the previous day, to refer to some details of the accident and to the procedures that have been developed to deal with such incidents. The suggestion was made in the report that there was friction between the South Australian police and the Metropolitan Fire Service at the scene of this accident in Adelphi Terrace very early on Sunday morning, and that a possible consequence of this friction was the tragic loss of a young girl's life. This notion can no longer be sustained.

I have spoken to both the Commissioner of Police and the Chief Officer of the Metropolitan Fire Service, have received written reports, and have been assured that relations between the two services are in good shape. On the morning in question nothing occurred that got in the way of normal rescue operations. The information that I have received shows clearly that the circumstances at the accident were such that 'jaws of life' equipment, which is used to get people out of cars when the doors cannot open, was not needed. A police officer, in fact, asked a fire officer to unload and prepare his cutting equipment. However, about 20 seconds later the girl had been extricated by police and St John Ambulance personnel. This is important to state, as the impression may have been gained from the press report that some delay in operating such equipment could have contributed to the death of the passenger in the car. No fireman, I have been told positively, was stopped from helping. There was no 'resentment', as reported.

A set of procedures has been agreed between police and firemen on co-operation at the scene of accidents. Quite extensive work was undertaken last year in planning the co-ordination of emergency services at rescue and non-fire emergencies. Officers of both services were clearly intent on ensuring that the *modus operandi* at emergencies would be known in detail beforehand, so that there could be no misunderstanding, no duplication, and no confusion. It was

agreed that the first service on the scene of an incident could and should be used whenever possible. I have been assured that these procedures were adhered to on Sunday.

Of course, the paramount consideration guiding officers attending such accidents and emergencies is protection of life. I find it extremely unfortunate that there has been a quite unjustified and damaging reflection on the ethical and professional conduct of officers on the scene on Sunday. The prominence given to the account of the alleged incident on the accident scene must have proved upsetting, to say the least, to the parents and family of the accident victim, Denise Heidt. I am sure that I can convey to these people the sincere sympathy of yourself, Sir, and all members of this House.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal, Report and Determination, 1983.
- ii. Savings Bank of South Australia Act, 1929-1981—Regulations—Trustees Fees.
- iii. Stamp Duties Act, 1923-1982—Regulations—Credit and Rental Duty.

By the Minister of the Arts (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. South Australian Film Corporation—Report, 1981-1982.

By the Minister of Labour (Hon. J.D. Wright)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Industrial and Commercial Training Act, 1981—Regulations—Hairdressers Hours of Attendance.
- ii. Rules of Court—Industrial Court—Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972-1981, Worker's Compensation Rules—Callover Procedure.

By the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Botanic Gardens, Board of the—Report, 1981-1982.
- ii. City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976-1982—General Regulations, 1982.
- iii. Environment Protection Council, Report, 1981-82. Planning Act, 1982—
Crown Development Reports by South Australian Planning Commission on—
- iv. Proposed acquisition and transfer of land by Commissioner of Highways (5).
- v. Proposed construction of a Low Energy Display Home.
- vi. Proposed division of land and erection of a Gas Turbine Generating Plant by the Electricity Trust of South Australia.
- vii. Proposed development at Marion High School.
- viii. Proposed land acquisition for Diagonal Road.
- ix. Proposed development of the Murray Bridge High School.
- x. Proposed Division of land in Irrigation Perpetual Lease 1277.
- xi. Proposed new Police Residence at Bordertown.
- xii. Proposed transportable classroom, Stirling North, City of Port Augusta.
- xiii. Proposed redevelopment of Pinnaroo Area School.
- xiv. Proposed land acquisition, Raglan Avenue, Edwardstown.
- xv. Proposed division of land in Irrigation Perpetual Leases 446A and 638.
- xvi. Proposed land acquisition for Golden Grove Road.
- xvii. Proposed land division of Irrigation Perpetual Lease 61.
- xviii. Proposed division of land and erection of 275/132 kV Substation by the Electricity Trust of South Australia.
- xix. Proposed division of land and erection of a 33/11 kV Substation and 33 kV transmission line by the Electricity Trust of South Australia.
- xx. Proposal to upgrade and extend existing Centenary Building, Penola Primary School.
- xxi. Proposed development at Redwood Park School.

- xxii. Proposed temporary use of motor showroom for Technical Education.
- xxiii. Proposed division of land in Perpetual Lease 8669H.
- xxiv. Proposed erection of classrooms at Direk Primary School.
- xxv. Development Control—North Haven Marina.
- xxvi. Metropolitan Development Plan—District Council of Willunga—Reservation of Land for Acquisition for Education Purposes.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. R.K. Abbott)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act, 1956-1978—Regulations—

- i. Age of Vehicles.
 - ii. Appeal Committee.
 - iii. Fees.
- Road Traffic Act, 1961-1981—Regulations—
- iv. Vehicle Emission Control.
 - v. Traffic Prohibition Enfield.
 - vi. Random Breath Tests in South Australia—Report on the operation of, 1983.

By the Minister of Marine (Hon. R.K. Abbott)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Boating Act, 1974-1980—Regulations—

- i. Tumby Bay Zoning.
 - ii. Moana Swimming Zone.
 - iii. Semaphore Zoning.
- Harbors Act, 1936-1981—
- iv. Regulations—Pilots, Diver Down Flags and Speed Limits.
- Marine Act, 1936-1976—Regulations—
- v. Navigation Pass under Kingston Bridge.
 - vi. Examination for Certificates of Competency and Safety Manning.
 - vii. Stony Point (Liquids Project) Ratification Act, 1981—Port Rules.

By the Minister of Education (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Adelaide College of the Arts and Education—Report, 1981.
- ii. Education Act, 1972-1981—Regulations—Renumeration for members of Ministerial Committees.
- iii. Meat Hygiene Act, 1980—Regulations—Sale of Slaughterhouse Meat.
- iv. Metropolitan Milk Board—Report, 1982.
- v. Advisory Committee on Soil Conservation—Report, 1981-82.
- vi. Veterinary Surgeons Act, 1935-1975—Regulations—Registration Fee.
- vii. The University of Adelaide—Report and Legislation, 1981.

By the Chief Secretary (Hon. G.F. Keneally)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Architects Act, 1939-1981—By-laws—

- i. Seek to Supplant.
- ii. Subscriptions.
- iii. Chiropractors Act, 1979—Regulations—Chiropractors Board Election Procedure.
- iv. Criminal Law Consolidation Act, 1935-1981—Regulations—Prescribed Hospitals.

Food and Drugs Act, 1908-1981—Regulations—

- v. Advertising of Drugs.
 - vi. Child Resistant Containers.
 - vii. Food Additives.
 - viii. Poisons.
 - ix. Therapeutic Substances.
- Hospitals Act, 1934-1971—Regulations—
- x. Hospital Compensable Patients Charges.
 - xi. Hospital Charges.
 - xii. Long Stay Patient Fees.
 - xiii. Listening Devices—Report, 1980-82.
 - xiv. Mental Health Act, 1976-1979—Regulations—Mental Health Review Tribunal Summons.
 - xv. Correctional Services Advisory Council—Report, 1982.
 - xvi. Police, Commissioner of—Report, 1981-82.
- South Australian Health Commission Act, 1975-1981—Regulations—
- xvii. Incorporated Hospitals Compensable Patients Charges.
 - xviii. Incorporated Hospital Charges.
 - xix. Long Stay Patients Fees.
 - xx. Tea Tree Gully Health Centre.
 - xxi. Hospital By-laws—Flinders Medical Centre—Parking.

By the Minister of Mines and Energy (Hon. R.G. Payne)—

By Command—

- i. South Australian Uranium Enrichment Committee—Report, 1980-81.

By the Minister of Community Welfare (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—

By Command—

Credit Unions, Registrar of—Report, 1981-82.

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Building Societies Act, 1975-1982—Regulations—Prescribed Banks.
 - ii. Building Societies, Registrar of—Report, 1981-82.
 - iii. Hairdressers Registration Act, 1939-1981—Regulations.
 - iv. Board Fees.
- Land and Business Agents Act, 1973-1982—Regulations—Fees.
- v. Ramsay Trust.
 - vi. Land and Business Agents.
 - vii. Land Brokers.
 - viii. Legal Practitioners Act, 1981-1982—Rules—Legal Practitioners Disciplinary Tribunal.
 - ix. Licensing Act, 1967-1982—Variation of Regulations—Bona Fide Travellers.
 - x. Local and District Criminal Courts Act, 1926-1981—Rules of Court—Planning Act—Civil Enforcement.
 - xi. Planning Act, 1982—Planning Appeal Tribunal—Rules—Conference Dispensation.
 - xii. Residential Tenancies Act, 1978-1981—Regulations—Ramsay Trust.
 - xiii. Supreme Court Act, 1937-1982—Rules of Court—Service and Execution of Process Act.
- Supreme Court Act, 1935-1982—Rules of Court—amending Rules of Court Regulating the Costs.
- xiv. Admission of Practitioners.
 - xv. Admission of Practitioners (Amendment).
 - xvi. Registration of Judgment Costs.
 - Trade Standard Act, 1979—Regulations.
 - xvii. Puller Winches (Amendment).
 - xviii. Toxic Substances.

By the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Aboriginal Lands Trust—Report, 1981-82.

By the Minister of Water Resources (Hon. J.W. Slater)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. River Murray Commission—Report, 1982.
- ii. Water Resources Act, 1976-1981—Regulations—Transfer of Licensed Water Allotment.

By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. J.W. Slater)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Racing Act, 1976-1982—Rules of Trotting—

- i. Fees.
- ii. Flashing Light Starts.
- iii. 'Season' Definition.
- iv. Sire Stake Programme.
- v. 'Studmaster' Definition.

By the Minister of Local Government (Hon. T.H. Hemmings)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Alsatian Dogs Act, 1934-1980—Regulations—Exemption for Bookaloo Centre.
- ii. Building Act, 1970-1982—Regulations—Fees for Building Approvals.
- iii. Coober Pedy (Local Government Extension) Act, 1981—Licensing of Hire Vehicles.
- iv. Libraries Act, 1982—Regulations—Conduct on Premises and Institute.
- v. South Australian Waste Management Commission Act, 1979-1980—Regulations—Fees.
- vi. City of Elizabeth—By-law No. 29—Keeping of Dogs.
- vii. City of Glenelg—By-law No. 1—Bathing and Controlling the Foreshore.
- viii. City of Mitcham—By-law No. 34—Traffic.
- ix. City of Port Augusta—By-law No. 39—Licensing and Operation of Motor Vehicles—Drivers and Conductors.
- x. District Council of Kimba—By-law No. 23—To repeal By-laws.
- xi. District Council of Lacepede—By-law No. 22—Traffic.
- xii. District Council of Loxton—By-law No. 35—Poultry.
- District Council of Mount Barker—
- xiii. By-law No. 3—Petrol Pumps.
- xiv. By-law No. 4—Proceedings of Council.
- xv. By-law No. 9—Bees.

- xvi. By-law No. 10—Cattle and Horses.
- xvii. By-law No. 13—Inflammable Undergrowth.
- xviii. By-law No. 14—Meetings of Electors.
- xix. By-law No. 16—Tents.
- xx. By-law No. 18—Water Reserves.
- xxi. By-law No. 19—Stands and Sales in Streets.
- xxii. By-law No. 27—One-Way Streets.
- xxiii. By-law No. 29—Repeal of By-laws.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT: RAMSAY TRUST

The SPEAKER: I have to report that I have this day received from the Leader of the Opposition the following letter:

Dear Mr Speaker,

I desire to inform you that this day it is my intention to move:

That this House at its rising adjourn until 1 p.m. tomorrow for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgency, namely, that this House condemns the Premier for misleading the public about the Ramsay Trust.

(Signed) J.W. Olsen

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour): I move:

That the time allowed for this motion be extended to 3.40 p.m.

Motion carried.

The SPEAKER: I ask those members supporting the motion of the Leader of the Opposition to rise.

Opposition members having risen:

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That this House at its rising adjourn until 1 p.m. tomorrow, for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgency, namely, that this House condemns the Premier for misleading the public about the Ramsay Trust.

This Government has now been in office for 125 days, yet this House has sat for only five of those days. It is little wonder that the Government is so reluctant to account to this Parliament and the people of South Australia for its actions. It is difficult to remember a Government in so much disarray so soon after taking office. Even the Whitlam Government still gave the impression of competence after its first 125 days, but not so this Government.

The Bannan Labor Government is breaking election promises at an alarming rate. We are told that taxes are to rise, and hospital and electricity charges have already risen, even though, when in Opposition, the Labor Party criticised such charges as backdoor taxation. Pay-roll tax has not been reduced as much as the Premier promised, and Labor's pre-election pledges to teachers and to our children have been breached. Significant job losses are being recorded almost daily, yet we hear nothing about that from the Premier who, while in Opposition, constantly attacked the previous Government for the State's unemployment problems and promised to turn the economy around.

There are many vital issues on which the Opposition intends to question this Government now that this House is, at last, sitting. The Government has been trying to evade its responsibilities for too long, but the questioning by the Opposition on other matters and the answers the Government must give will have to wait until tomorrow because of the gravity of the situation involving the Ramsay Trust.

The situation of the trust is symptomatic of all that is wrong with this Government. Its credibility, its competence, its ability to implement practical policies: these are the issues this House is considering today less than five months after the people of South Australia put their trust in the Labor Party.

The people of South Australia are now becoming aware that their trust was misplaced, that this Government was elected as the result of a campaign of deception, and that it simply cannot cope with the pressing problems facing South Australia today. While the Opposition has not had the benefit of Parliamentary procedure to expose the Gov-

ernment's failings and deceptions, it has nevertheless been remarkably successful in forcing the Government to account to the people.

Last week I forced the Premier to release a document that revealed he had not been telling the public the full truth about his Budget difficulties. My Deputy has been instrumental in forcing the Government to seriously consider its position on the Honeymoon mine and other uranium projects. At the weekend, the member for Torrens brought into the open the Government's improper manoeuvrings on the Football Park floodlights issue, and yesterday the financial fiasco that the Ramsay Trust has become was revealed by the Opposition because the Government would not admit to it.

My statement yesterday produced a response from the Premier that was as astounding in its irresponsibility as it was lacking in truth. The Premier denied that the Ramsay Trust was a Government initiative. Instead, he said, 'It's a private enterprise scheme designed to assist low-cost housing.' The Premier knows that there would be no Ramsay Trust if he had not promised it at the last State election, and I assume that it was the Premier, as Treasurer, who authorised the spending of Government funds to establish the trust.

Before dealing further with this blatant refusal to accept responsibility where it properly and obviously lies, I make clear to the House that the Opposition regrets that the name and memory of Alex Ramsay are now linked with this failure. Alex Ramsay was a great South Australian who made a signal contribution to the provision of welfare housing in South Australia, and it is appropriate and essential that his work be marked in some meaningful way. I hope this will happen.

I also emphasise that the Liberal Party has no complaint with any scheme which provides more funds for welfare housing, provided that scheme is practical and viable. The former Government's record in this respect was outstanding and I will refer to that later. But I return to the position of the Premier and his Government on this matter. The Premier first indicated the Labor Party's intention to proceed with the Ramsay Trust proposal in the economic document he released on 27 May last year. At page 62 of that document, he stated:

Labor currently is considering the establishment of a body to raise housing funds through the issue of capital-indexed debentures which are guaranteed by the Treasury. Details of the scheme will be released later.

There is no mistake about that commitment: it was to be a Labor Party initiative. On 21 July last year, the Premier moved a censure motion in this House against the former Government on the general question of housing standards. He closed his speech with the following words:

What we can do at this level is not simply stand back or pass the buck. We can take action now. I would suggest on their record [and here he was referring to the Fraser and Tonkin Governments] that the best possible action we can take in this House is to get this motion carried, have the Government resign and go to an election so that we can get a change of Government and implement some policies on behalf of the people of South Australia.

This became a major theme of the Premier's attacks in the ensuing months leading to last November's State election. He wanted the public to believe that his Government would do much more in the housing area. The Ramsay Trust was a centre-piece of that strategy. It was mentioned as such in the Premier's election policy speech. It was referred to in the Labor Party's housing policy paper, as follows:

A fully developed scheme which will be activated to mobilise private sector funds attracted to a new, riskless, inflation-protected type of investment.

He also said:

The Ramsay Trust is an innovative financing mechanism which has enormous potential to increase and widen access to home ownership in South Australia.

Since the election, the Premier has continued to be closely identified with the setting up of the Ramsay Trust. He launched it on 4 February this year. In an interview in the *News* on 16 February about his first 100 days in office, the Premier said the trust was operating and was an example of the Government's real progress on several fronts. Some progress!

If the trust's first debenture issue had been fully subscribed, I suggest that the Premier would have been the person to hold the press conference to claim the credit for it and that it would not merely be the case, as is the hallmark of this Government, that the good news would be coming from the Premier and the bad news from senior public servants.

It is nonsense and cowardly to disclaim the trust as a Government initiative. Without significant State Government involvement, the trust cannot get off the ground, and that has been clear since the proposal for its establishment was first put forward in 1979. It was considered but not pursued by the Corcoran Government. It was considered and rejected by the Tonkin Government. The Tonkin Government gave the matter very detailed examination. Certainly the Minister, the Hon. Murray Hill, brought the matter to Cabinet. Cabinet gave it close consideration and rejected the proposal after a wide range of advice had been considered.

Advice was given by the Treasury that the trust would not succeed. Doubts about its viability were raised by the Public Actuary. The former Government also received advice on the commercial aspects of the proposal from the South Australian Development Corporation, which recommended against a Government guarantee for the trust. In a minute to the former Treasurer, dated 5 June 1980, the Development Corporation said that its opinion was that it was unlikely that the proposed debenture issue would attract the funds required and that the corporation had sufficient concerns as to the commercial aspects of the proposal to be unable to recommend that the Government guarantee repayment of the proposed Ramsay Trust debentures. The corporation's advice said, in part:

At even quite moderate levels of inflation, the Ramsay Trust agreements would be relatively unattractive in terms of total dollars paid to achieve home ownership, average percentage of average weekly earnings paid, and rate of equity acquisition. It is also proposed that homes may be subject to repossession and sale even though there is no default on the part of the rental purchaser. For these reasons, we believe that an informed purchaser would not enter into a Ramsay Trust agreement.

That is the advice of the South Australian Development Corporation. The House will note from this information that the former Government looked at this proposal from the points of view of the investor and the purchaser. The former Government decided to implement other action to help home buyers and those having difficulty meeting interest and rental commitments. Those actions included stamp duty concessions, abolition of land tax, an increased maximum loan from the State Bank, a new low deposit rental-purchase scheme, a mortgage and rent relief scheme, and record levels of funding for the Housing Trust. Incidentally, there was an allocation of \$126 500 000 this financial year, an 84 per cent increase on the State's allocation three years ago, allowing the commencement of 2 180 dwellings. That is an excellent record.

Compare that record with the farcical situation promoted by this Government. They are real achievements in very difficult economic circumstances, yet they did not stop the present Premier attacking our policies and promising to do much better. The expectations the Premier raised on the Ramsay Trust simply have not been fulfilled. The public and investors have been misled. The Labor Party's housing policy paper said that the proposal had been fully developed. It was not fully developed, and I understand that refinements and variations were still being made while the application

for a guarantee was still before the I.D.C. Labor's policy paper also said:

Considerable success in raising funds has been achieved in the United Kingdom and New Zealand through the sale of bonds of a similar type.

In fact, in both countries income accruing on the bonds is tax free and the bonds have a small interest bearing coupon attached, whereas tax is payable in full on income from Ramsay Trust debentures and the trust offers no interest. The Premier continued to mislead yesterday. He said that not one word of criticism was uttered about the trust or the Government's provision of a Treasury guarantee. I therefore challenge the Premier to tell the House in his reply whether or not the recommendation he received from the Industries Development Committee was a unanimous one. A truthful answer to that challenge will expose the complete lack of credibility in the Premier's statement yesterday. What is more, the Premier should have been aware from information available in Government dockets that what he said yesterday was misleading.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: There has been a leak on this, though.

Mr OLSEN: I am merely asking for the truth from the Government. You do not like the truth coming out in Parliament. You do not like the truth coming out to the people of South Australia about your background and actions. The Premier was also aware that the former Government had rejected the proposal on Treasury and Development Corporation advice, as indicated in a statement by the former Housing Minister reported in the *Advertiser* on 25 October last year, the very day the Premier promised the trust in his election policy speech. Because the Premier has now discovered that the warnings he was given on this proposal and the former Government's decision were correct, he has become most careless with the truth.

In fact, while we made plain our view before the election, we deliberately avoided making any further public comment once the Government had decided to proceed with the prospectus to allow the investing public to make its own judgment. We have made further comment only after the closure of the prospectus and the judgment of the investing public has confirmed the advice and decisions taken while we were in Government.

I believe that it is important that people who have invested in the trust, and South Australian taxpayers whose funds have been used to establish the trust, should be fully informed about the reasons for its failure. I call on the Premier to make public all advice he has received on this proposal and the amount it has cost the Government to develop the trust to its present stage. In return, I give the Premier this commitment on behalf of the Opposition: we are prepared to support, in a bipartisan manner, any practical and positive proposal to increase welfare housing funding. Our record in Government shows that. If the Premier is prepared to advocate an extension of the wage pause, we will support him in that to make available more Commonwealth funds for welfare housing in addition to the \$8 500 000 that has already been made available by the then Fraser Government.

However, we will not support schemes which are impractical, ill advised, and out of touch with the realities of the investing world, and which waste and risk taxpayers' money. For the same reason, I give notice to the Premier that the Opposition will be giving very close scrutiny to his proposal for a State enterprise fund.

During the election campaign, the Premier was less than frank about how this fund would operate, but he has indicated that the Government contemplated raising the funds from private investors. The experience with the Ramsay Trust now raises serious doubts about the enterprise fund. Who will invest with a Government so obviously devoid

of financial expertise, a Government prepared to ignore advice from senior and experienced public servants? The Government's performance in its first four months in office does not inspire any confidence that it has the experience or the expertise to manage the State's finances and implement realistic and responsible policies. In saying this, I offer no criticism of the—

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): This is yet a further round of the extraordinary performance of the Opposition over the past few days, in particular, in relation to this matter. I would have thought that a lesson that came through more clearly than any other from the verdict of the Australian public in the recent Federal election was that they were sick and tired of the porno-politics approach, the carping and attacks, and the sort of language we have heard in a series of press releases today. It is about time that the Opposition recognised the gravity of the economic position facing us, the toughness of the decisions needed at all levels of Government, and began getting in behind what must be done instead of indulging in the carping criticism which we have had to put up with over the past few weeks.

In regard to the motion we have before us, might I say that it concerns not the failure of the Ramsay Trust but the failure of the debenture issue of the Ramsay Trust which occurred for a number of reasons that I will go into in a moment. It was an attempt to provide funds, not at cost to the Government, but from the private sector, for welfare housing and to provide a considerable number of houses. If it had been successful on this occasion it would have led to numerous other issues, and indeed, to the success of the total project. The debenture issue closed on Friday and within a matter of some hours came the Opposition's statement saying what an outrageous failure the whole thing was, a statement full of the most outrageous language. There was no statement about it being a pity that such a bold initiative had failed due to the Government not being able to find the money for welfare housing—not a bit of it. The Opposition took pleasure in gloating about the fact that it had been right in saying that it could not be done. If that sort of petty attitude persists, South Australia has no hope whatsoever. I suggest that the Opposition had better lift its game.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: If one thing stands out in the experience of the past three terrible years that we had to put up with under the absent former Premier of this State, it is that the former Government was not prepared to show a bit of entrepreneurial flair, was not prepared to innovate, take risks, or put in investment money. It should be remembered that we are talking about a sum of \$100 000—about the cost of three houses. If the proposal had succeeded, 300 houses would have been built as a result. Contrast that with the \$120 000-odd spent by the former Premier on a great pile of useless books, still mouldering away somewhere, as an election gimmick to hand out to school children.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will resume his seat. There are far too many interjections on both sides of the House. I have been putting up with this for quite some minutes, but if it continues I will take the appropriate action.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Contrast this with the hundreds of thousands of dollars spent on fairly ill-phased promotion. Contrast this with the pay-out of some \$130 000-odd of severance pay to former staff members of the Government, and so on. Let us set this in perspective. This was an amount

that the Government did not put into the market itself. The Government did not pay it in expenses.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Government provided it as a guarantee to allow this kind of sector investment to take place. If the Government is not prepared to do this in this current economic climate, we all may as well pack up. I would have thought that the Opposition had learnt from its years in Government that the sort of attitude that they have is not going to lead to development and stimulation in this economy.

The fact is that the debenture issue did not succeed. Why did it not succeed? I would suggest that it is not because there was a fundamental flaw in the Ramsay Trust concept. In saying that, I freely acknowledge that there were many people who did not accept that it could succeed. I freely accept that on the Industries Development Committee itself there were some who did not accept that it could succeed. I do not think there should be anything hidden from that. A series of investment advisers of all sorts have commented on this proposal over a period of time. Some have said that it would succeed and some have said that it would not. However, the balancing of odds in its favour was very great at the time at which it was proposed to be launched and that was made quite clear.

Incidentally, we do not want a holier-than-thou attitude coming from the Opposition. In the dying days of the Liberal Government, in the last few weeks before it went out of office, having rejected this concept in 1980 with such precipitance as the Leader would have us believe, the proposal came up yet again with a recommendation from the then Minister of Housing that we should look at the possibilities again. We should look at it! The then Premier said, 'Please do so. Please let us have a look at it too.' So let us not have any 'holier-than-thou, we knew all and we projected it' nonsense coming from the Opposition benches. They knew in response to the sort of argument that impressed us in Opposition that there was value in this concept and it was worth trying and, indeed, we had the guts to stand up and do it.

The fact is that the launch of the trust was committed at a time which was probably the worst possible time to be in the market seeking investment funds, particularly long-term institutional investment funds. That is a fact of life and every member who has any experience in the financial or investment market would know that to be so. There could not have been a worse time, and I think, indeed, it was somewhat ironically appropriate that the very person, the former Prime Minister of Australia, who was the one who presided over this crisis of housing and who has caused such a shortage of welfare housing in this country, would make all of these necessary measures, the Ramsay Trust being just one of them. Calling the election out of the blue meant that this had already been committed to the launch; the prospectuses had been printed, and we were in a market during the time of the Federal election which almost doomed the whole issue to failure. There could not have been a worse time to be in the market. Much of this \$100 000 was spent in advertising the launch of the Ramsay Trust by a series of newspaper advertisements and these were buried under the political propaganda advertising that was rampant throughout the press at that time.

What happened during the election period? No-one was prepared to invest, particularly in the long term. Millions and millions of dollars left this country and went overseas during the election period over three or four weeks, and millions of dollars have flown back in the week since the devaluation and the new Government being installed. During that period, the Ramsay Trust was in the market. Not only

was it blanketed out by the Federal election campaign and everything else that was going on, but it was trying to raise investment capital in a market that was totally uninterested in investing and, indeed, which was rapidly withdrawing funds from those larger institutional areas to send out of the country.

That is the position we found ourselves in. We had no forenotice of the Federal election being called and, neither did very many other people. However, we were committed to the launch and the Ramsay Trust had to try to battle it out in that context, which could not have been worse. Was it basically a failure or a wrong concept? A number of financial writers and investment experts over the period the trust was in the field expressed their views that it was a worthwhile investment with long-term value.

Were their words heard? Did the message get through to investors? Of course not, because they were preoccupied; they were not in the mood to invest, and there was no chance, because of the closing date of the prospectus, to go back to them after the dust had settled. It is a tragedy for this concept that this happened. Instead of Opposition members acknowledging that, they are gloating, they are very pleased that we are going to miss out on these funds and they are saying, 'We told you so.' That is just intolerable.

In an analysis of the long-term value of the Ramsay Trust which appeared in the *Age* last Thursday it was pointed out that as an investment it does have appeal as a component in an investment portfolio which always needs to match current income and future income closely with present and future tax positions of the investor. The article stated:

Further, the repayment on the debentures is guaranteed by the South Australian Government. The Ramsay Trust, incidentally, being a non-profit independent organisation intended to provide low-income housing. However, subscription lists to the trust close tomorrow.

The long *Age* report spelt out the benefits for investors of the Ramsay Trust concept. That was buried in the paper, as so much of it was. We all know who created that climate for investment. We all know who created the scare that frightened investors off getting into anything in the market place and sent millions of dollars overseas. It was the irresponsible attitudes of the Prime Minister of the day, Mr Fraser, and his 'Put your dollars under the bed and take them out of the banks'. If people were taking it out of the banks, one would expect that they were not going to be encouraged in putting it into some new and innovative trust, such as the Ramsay Trust.

Let me stress that the trust was backed by the Government; we do not renege from that. Indeed, I made that clear in my speech at the opening, when I said:

There is of course some financial risk in the Government's backing the trust, but it is a risk the Government is glad to take and I am glad to take.

I am not backing away from that responsibility, and I never have, but I would point out that the trust was a private sector operation, that its Chairman is one of Adelaide's leading business men, a man who has had enormous business success in his own right in a range of fields, an expert in investment—

Mr Becker: Limited.

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: The honourable member can cast aspersions on the trustees if he likes. With the Chairman was another man, well respected in the business community, and also very skilled in the fund-raising area. There was the Deputy Chairman of the Housing Trust, Mr Stretton, who is well respected as a planner and developer of ideas in this country, as well as David Scott, of the Brotherhood of St. Laurence, which was providing important backing to this concept of the trust. There were trustees, in other words, who had that mix of entrepreneurial flair and investment

skills that could give cause for confidence in their assessment that the venture could be successful. They went to the market and attempted to raise these funds. They failed and they failed for reasons, I suggest, which are a cause not for gloating but for great regret that this vital experiment has failed.

We have talked about a lack of interest in terms of the trust. Let us not forget that, despite that environment, more than \$200 000 was subscribed, and a large number of small investors put their faith in it. Unfortunately, for the reasons I have stated, the major institutional investors would not come forward at that time. As to people who wish to use the housing provided by the Housing Trust, we were told by the Leader that the concept was rejected by the previous Government because its advice was that no-one would be interested in taking up a Ramsay Trust type house. That is absolute nonsense. More than 500 persons registered an interest and were keen to take advantage of it. Are we to take the attitude of the Opposition and tell those people that they were mugs and that they were misled? Absolute nonsense! This is not cause for condemnation; it is cause for regret and for an attempt to try and revive this matter at the right time and in the right circumstances.

The attitude of the Opposition was typified by that part of the Leader's speech that referred to the name of Alex Ramsay having been associated with the trust. I thought that that was a particularly scurrilous allusion in the circumstances, and one that I hope the Leader, on reflection, will regret. Mr Alex Ramsay was heavily involved in the establishment of this concept, and worked with the people who are now the trustees. Indeed, it was his encouragement, before his death, and his commitment to the concept that had the matter pursued. Therefore, it was fitting indeed that it should be named after that innovator in housing, that person who was prepared to take risks and establish the finest housing commission in the country. Alex Ramsay would have been proud to have his name linked to the concept, because he was intimately involved in it and told those involved that he would like to see it succeed. Now his name is being dragged into this debate as the Leader has done.

Alex Ramsay's widow has made a direct donation to the trust and has actively and constantly supported it. Again, I suggest that it is scurrilous to say that there is something inappropriate in the name of the late Manager of the Housing Trust being used. On the contrary, the Ramsay Trust and its aspirations are very much what Alex Ramsay was all about. If this debenture issue can be seen as a failure—

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

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): It would appear that the Premier's dictum is that, if you have not got an answer, you try to fudge the issue by drawing red herrings across the trail, sending up smoke screens, and getting away from the facts. I take the first of those facts that the Premier sought to get away from. Page 4 of the Leader's submission to this House states:

Alex Ramsay was a great South Australian who made a signal contribution to the provision of welfare housing in South Australia, and it is appropriate and essential that his work be marked in some meaningful way. I hope that this will happen.

Where is there any disparaging remark about Alex Ramsay? Where is there any disparaging remark about the courage of his widow in putting forward, along with other members of the family, \$2 000 to help launch this project? There is none.

The Opposition has publicly stated, and will continue to say, that Alex Ramsay was a person to be looked up to; we

hope that there will be in future tangible evidence of his existence, and that it will be something directly associated with housing, where his real contribution was made. We have heard the Premier, during the past 24 to 48 hours, state publicly that his Government had nothing to do with this project, and that it was a public venture, not a Government venture. Earlier this afternoon he admitted to its being a Government venture. If the Premier can admit, on the floor of the House, that it was a conscious effort of his Government and was in his policy speech, why, in that ridiculous press release that he gave yesterday afternoon, did he seek to distance himself and the Government from the existence of the Ramsay Trust?

I ask the Premier to look at the telex, which was distributed around South Australia at about 3 p.m. yesterday, in which he distanced himself and his Government from an involvement in this issue. The Premier took the opportunity to suggest that the Opposition 'blew' the story on this matter. The name of the Minister of Housing was on the release published in the newspaper on Friday or Saturday last, relating to the success or otherwise of this venture. Now the Premier wants to disappear; he does not want to hear the truth: the Government, not the Opposition, was associated with the information to the public of the parlous state of the Ramsay Trust.

Soon after the Leader announced his shadow Cabinet, there was a request, in the first instance to the Leader and subsequently from the Leader to me, to meet Mr Hugh Stretton who, with Mr Hugh Hudson, is acknowledged as one of the architects of this project. Discussions were held in the Leader's office in this House between Mr Stretton, the Leader, another member and me, and Mr Stretton gave us the background of the matter and offered further advice and information should it be required. As he rightly said, if this project is to go ahead there is a tremendous advantage in having it on a bipartisan basis. There can be no argument about that. It was an ideal that the directors of the trust wanted to follow through. In fact, an article entitled 'The Socialist Mission', on page 2 of the *National Times* of 6 February 1983, states:

Unless both major political parties are prepared to work together in the public interest, with business and the work force similarly, we will short-change ourselves. We cannot afford to be suspicious of each other.

That statement appeared in the document that went to the Industries Development Committee and was quoted by Mr Stretton to the Leader of the Opposition. There was a clear recognition that there should be a proper look at this issue. From the evidence available to the Leader (and it had been available to the previous Government), it was clear that the matter of whether the trust would get off the ground was dubious. There was a danger that, by breaking new ground in this way, difficulties would be experienced. The previous Government sought the advice of Treasury officials, the Public Actuary, and the I.D.C., and it was told that this was a questionable venture. It was questionable not as to concept but as to its capacity to be implemented.

In the area of welfare housing such is not an uncommon state of affairs. Indeed, in the original Housing Trust legislation under Class B, certain homes were to have been built with the aid of money subscribed by the public. In the whole of its existence under the legislation, however, the Housing Trust has not had the advantage of subscription by the public for welfare housing, and the Party of which the Premier is now Leader in this House in 1973 wrote out that specific aspect of welfare housing.

There is a long history of doubt in this area, but, notwithstanding our doubts and the fact that Mr Stretton acknowledged that there were some imponderables about the project, the Opposition said nothing adverse about it.

It took the attitude that this subject had been contained in the Government's policy speech and that the Government, in that sense, therefore had a mandate to implement that policy. However, we asked the people who were submitting the programme whether it was practicable and we then waited for events.

The promotion of this trust was fairly chequered. The Leader of the Opposition and I were told of no less than three launching dates. Two launchings were put off because problems were being experienced. Indeed, the Opposition, too, had difficulty in solving problems, because Mr Stretton indicated that the first years of tenancy were to be for the trust and the total time over which the occupancy of this form of housing would run was 21 years. However, a few days later another document blew out that period to 22 years, the first two years at 7 per cent of the original capital cost going to the trust. That was a sizable increase of the amount going to the trust. The project was promoted on Friday 4 February, more than 24 hours after the announcement of the Federal election.

If the entrepreneurial people of whom the Premier spoke, as well as the Premier himself, could not foresee the climate in which the promotion was to proceed, so that the project could have been withdrawn or some other positive action taken, he should not come into the House now and say that the project was launched at an inopportune time. The Premier cannot have it both ways. He was committed to make an announcement and there was a commitment for the promotion to go ahead. Does the Premier now suggest that he is the wise one, that his advisers are wise, and that all those who sit on this side are not wise? Why, if he foresaw the complications that would arise in promoting this issue in the middle of the Federal election, did he let it go ahead? The Premier has raised this matter, not us. He sought to fudge the issue by suggesting that it was hidden beneath the Federal election.

The last person I can remember who stood in this House and sought to walk away from a direct Government involvement in what proved to be a fiasco was the Hon. G.T. Virgo, in the matter of dial-a-bus. Members opposite may smile and chortle, but the situation on that matter was clear. The Government was committed to a specific line of action: it promoted dial-a-bus to the public, sold the project to the public, and then, having re-thought the matter, sought to distance itself from the promotion, and never from that time onwards was Mr Virgo or his Government able to walk away from responsibility for that failed project. Because of the way in which the Premier has dodged around and refused to face the facts about the Ramsay Trust over the past 48 hours, he has placed this project as an albatross around the neck of his Government for all time.

The Premier said that there are calls for help regarding welfare housing. There is no denial of that fact. The Minister of Education, the Hon. Mr Gilfillan in another place and I met in a public forum as recently as last Thursday evening to discuss the problems of housing. More specifically, the reason for calling the meeting was high interest rates, but we canvassed a range of difficulties. Not one of us was able to admit to having the complete answer to the problem. A number of us had views on where there may be an area for manoeuvre. Let us hope that those areas of manoeuvre will come to some form of fruition.

Finally, there will be no benefit to the public of this State in welfare housing whilst the Premier seeks to besmirch the previous Federal Government (and more particularly its Prime Minister) by saying that it did nothing for welfare housing. He knows full well that, as a result of the wage pause, \$8 790 000 was provided for the State for the purpose of welfare housing.

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

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Minister of Housing): First, I make no apology to the House for supporting the Ramsay Trust. I was very proud to take part in formulating the housing policy during the election campaign, when I emphasised what the Ramsay Trust could achieve for low-income earners in this State. So, my record is clear. The Leader has shown his abysmal ignorance of what the Ramsay Trust is all about and what it means to low-income earners. When I saw his press conference he seemed to me to be the ghoul at the graveside, rubbing his hands and saying, 'I told you so. We said it would never happen, it could not happen, and you were the suckers who followed it along.' The Premier has demonstrated to the House that, because of our policy commitment to the Ramsay Trust, the previous Government, as late as August 1982, was attempting to resurrect it. The previous Minister of Housing was all for it, as was the then Premier.

The Leader shows no concern for low-income earners. He does not know what it means for those people who cannot meet the deposit gap and are forced to go on a Housing Trust waiting list for public sector housing. It is quite significant that the Leader and members of the Opposition all use the term 'welfare housing' as though it were a hand-out from the wealthy to those people in need. I prefer to call it 'public sector housing'. The Leader would not know about this, because the circle in which he moves comprises affluent people who can afford to pay the high interest rates.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: What cannot be doubted is the need for low-cost housing to meet the home ownership aspirations of many people in our community. Inquiries through the Housing Trust, through my office, and through the offices of members on this side have indicated that 500 people wish to take advantage of the Ramsay Trust scheme.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Of course, we haven't!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Members opposite may have had inquiries. If so, that would put the figure at around 600 people. Those people cannot meet the deposit gap. They cannot meet the requirements of the State Bank low-interest loans. Therefore, the Ramsay Trust was the light on the horizon for them to get into home ownership. That is what it is all about: promoting home ownership.

The current shadow Minister of Housing said that the Premier should not place too much blame on the previous Federal Government. However, it was because of continual cutbacks in funding to the States for low-cost housing that people such as directors and trustees were forced to promote the idea of the Ramsay Trust. I never heard, when in Opposition, one member of the previous Government condemn the Fraser Government for continually cutting back on funding; in fact, we had weak excuses that it was necessary. One can recall, when we debated the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, the weak apologist attitude by the then Government that if we did not sign the agreement we would not get the money.

It was because of the paranoia exhibited by the previous Liberal Government that the Housing Trust was stopped from continuing its entrepreneurial activities in providing rental-purchase housing. That Government replaced the existing rental-purchase scheme with one which was admitted by the State Bank and the South Australian Housing Trust to be unworkable. Members opposite then have the gall to say that the previous Federal Government did so much for public sector housing. Even the \$8 790 000 resulting from the con trick of the wage pause will not achieve anywhere

near the number of commencements that would stem the tide of people waiting on the Housing Trust list. There are 24 000 people awaiting accommodation. That list is growing rapidly annually because people are being denied the chance of home ownership. The Ramsay Trust, as the Premier stated, could have provided 300 homes per year for the cost of three homes, yet Opposition members sit there rubbing their hands and saying, 'We told you so.'

I commend Bill Hayes, as an Adelaide business man. The member for Hanson indicated the opposite by way of interjection and said that Mr Hayes had limited business sense. I would back Bill Hayes before the member for Hanson. Mr Hayes is a member of the Liberal Party but it was his concern to provide low-income people with homes of their own that prompted him to join the trustees. The previous Minister and Premier were quite prepared to look at the Ramsay Trust again, because the money being raised by the previous Government which was tax-indexed funding from S.G.I.C. and the Superannuation Fund fell exactly into the same category as the Ramsay Trust.

The previous Minister said, 'What's good enough for S.G.I.C. and the Superannuation Fund should surely be good enough for the Ramsay Trust.' Obviously, the Leader (the then Chief Secretary) was so new to his job that he did not understand what was going on in Cabinet. Perhaps he was planning the future coup and was spending more time on that. The Government believes that if the trust were successful it would open up home ownership to many low-income families, and that is an objective which is beyond reproach. Obviously, the whole attitude of the Opposition is that it could not care one iota about housing people. All members opposite want to do is embark on a situation to get headlines and not care a damn about what has been done. If anyone has killed the Ramsay Trust, the Leader has done so. Even if the Ramsay Trust does continue (and I sincerely hope it does), through his scaremongering headlines the Leader has made the people in question rather hesitant.

I sincerely hope that members of the media (who as yet do not understand exactly what the Ramsay Trust means) will, when they have been educated, tell people that what the Leader said to them in his press conference was a load of twaddle.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Compared to the two speakers on the other side, I think that I am scoring points rather heavily. Let us get back to rising interest rates. The member for Light made one of his usual pompous speeches about high interest rates. He did not attempt at that public meeting to lay the blame on the Fraser Government for high interest rates. He did not attempt to lay the blame on the Fraser Government's philosophy of letting the free money market decide exactly what the high interest rates should be. He merely said that we have a problem. However, we all know that the problem was with the previous Fraser Government and that the Ramsay Trust was an honest attempt to make sure that at least some low-income people could achieve home ownership without the weight of high interest rates hanging around their necks. Not one member on the Opposition benches would deny that that was the intention of the Ramsay Trust.

We considered the Ramsay Trust and, for the sake of low-income families, we were prepared to give it a go, and I am proud to be a part of that team that was prepared to give it a go. The debenture aspect failed, but the Ramsay Trust has not failed, because the philosophy promoted with the Ramsay Trust will continue. I would like to see the Leader's attitude when, in a different economic climate, the Ramsay Trust attempts to raise money. If the Ramsay Trust was a success he would still find something wrong to say

about it. Already the Housing Trust has projected that it will be commencing 2 300 homes this year. If we could have added another 300 homes that would have provided, with the multiplying factor, thousands of other jobs in this State.

Mr Olsen: You acknowledge our record?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: No, I am talking about the commencements under this Government. The Leader treats it all as a joke. In his press release we read, 'Mr Olsen announces collapse of Ramsay Trust'; that had been announced on Friday night. I acknowledged on the Monday that the Ramsay Trust was in trouble but, no, then we had the Leader looking after his third headline, announcing to the media the collapse of the Ramsay Trust.

Let us put the Ramsay Trust in perspective. It is not the be all and end all of this Government's policies. The Leader mentioned that we have been in Government for 125 days: already we have announced measures that make it easier for people to obtain housing. I fully expect that after today's performance the Leader will be getting his rejuvenated Mr Story back into business and saying, 'Let's have a look at their other policies. Perhaps we can find something wrong with them.'

The SPEAKER: Order! The time allowed for this motion has expired. Call on the business of the day.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 15 December 1982. Page 233.)

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): When I sought leave to continue my remarks on 15 December last year, I was in the process of highlighting the action taken by the then Dunstan Labor Government concerning the Riverland Cannery and the effects that that had on the future of the cannery and its likely chances of surviving in the longer term. I have indicated to the House that, as a result of the conversion of a loan to a grant, the Government at that time had effectively taken control of the Riverland Cannery for a matter of only some \$417 500, and having gained control of the cannery the Government, through the S.A.D.C., then embarked on a programme of expansion of the cannery entering into the general products line, as well as the normal fruit processing canning production of that plant.

It decided to purchase the general products processing plant from the Henry Jones operation at Port Melbourne, and that eventually cost the Riverland Cannery something in excess of \$8 000 000. That was to purchase plant and install it in the Riverland Cannery, and then not only did the cannery have that additional debt of \$8 000 000 as a result of that acquisition by the S.A.D.C. on behalf of the State Government: it also had a maintenance bill for that very poor, outdated and inefficient equipment which, to all intents and purposes, could really only be classified as scrap. If it had not been for the State Government purchasing that equipment, undoubtedly that equipment in the Henry Jones factory at Port Melbourne would have gone to scrap. So, we have a situation where it cost about \$8 000 000 to install; it cost a further \$1 300 000 in maintenance in the first year of operation, and a further \$1 000 000 in the following year. As a result, the cost burden placed on the cannery was absolutely enormous.

Not only did the cannery have the burden of the financial commitment of the purchase of that equipment from Henry Jones but at the same time the Government entered into negotiations through the South Australian Development Corporation and Henry Jones on a marketing arrangement. The extent of that marketing arrangement was to place

Henry Jones in an extremely favourable position and the Riverland Cannery in what was virtually an impossible position. In fact, the agreement provided that Henry Jones would have an exclusive agency of Riverland products for 18 years, notwithstanding that Henry Jones's own products competed directly with those of Riverland Fruit Products.

The arrangement under the agreement required Riverland Fruit Products to carry stock which, at the date of the appointment of the receivers, was approximately \$5 000 000, but Henry Jones was able to set the price at which Riverland fruit products were to be sold. Commission, trade expenses, freight, advertising and allowances payable to Henry Jones by Riverland Fruit Products under the arrangement amounted to over 20 per cent, and it was probably nearer 24 per cent of the selling price. Payments to Riverland Fruit Products for products sold under the agreement were to be made some 45 days after the end of the month of the sale. The arrangements were, to say the least, extremely favourable for Henry Jones.

That highlights once again that for a Government to get involved in an industry that it knows absolutely nothing about can lead to nothing else but a complete and utter disaster. I hope that the present Labor Government in South Australia has learnt from that very expensive mistake of the former Dunstan Government and that it certainly will not be involved in further attempts to take over industries, particularly in the Riverland. South Australia cannot afford to have another disaster of that magnitude. In my mind there is no doubt that the cannery, now under the efficient management and operation of the receivers appointed by the State Bank, in the long term can trade itself out of its difficulties and that we can retain this important industry, not only for the Riverland but also for South Australia.

I urge the present Government to continue the support given to the cannery by the Tonkin Government during the past three years, because the situation that currently exists with that operation is very much more favourable and, with the involvement and the commitment that I believe would have come from the former Federal Government, if a similar commitment comes from the present Hawke Government in Canberra, the future of the South Australian cannery in the Riverland will be assured.

At this stage I have had no indication of what the attitude of the Hawke Government in Canberra will be, but I believe that the report of the I.A.C. is due to be handed down at some time this month. Once that is available, it should shed further light on the matter. I trust that the Labor Government in Canberra will support this industry. Otherwise it will be another industry in Australia that will go to the wall. We just cannot afford to lose any more industries of this nature. As I pointed out towards the end of last year, it is a labour-intensive industry. In the Riverland some 500 employees are directly and indirectly employed within that cannery. I do not think I have to spell out to this House the effect on the community of the size of that in the Riverland the loss of some 500 jobs. It is quite obvious that the effect on a community of that size would be absolutely devastating. I trust that the present South Australian Government will continue in the direction in which the Tonkin Government was headed and that it will continue to support that cannery, because I believe it does have a viable long-term future.

Since the House adjourned in December last year, a number of statements and commitments have been made by the Federal Government in relation to a water resources development programme. I would like the Minister of Water Resources to indicate whether or not the commitment given by the former Liberal Federal Government in Canberra concerning the \$600 000 000 water resources development programme will be continued and honoured by the Hawke Federal Government. At the time when the announcement

was made by the then Minister for National Development (Sir John Carrick) it received a very favourable response from the Labor Government in South Australia. In fact, the Government in this State indicated that allocations provided under that programme by the Federal Government would enable the water resources programme that the former Tonkin Government was involved in to continue and, in fact, be speeded up to the benefit of South Australia.

I can go only on the comments that were made by members of the Labor Party in the Federal Parliament at that time, but it is interesting to note that, while the Government in South Australia was supportive and appreciative of the allocation that had been made to this State for the water resources development programme, the spokesman for resources and energy at that time (Senator Peter Walsh) was reported to have said:

This package has the stamp of one put together to meet the perceived political needs of the Fraser Government, not the economic needs of the nation.

That certainly does not lead us to have very great confidence in the present Labor Government in Canberra continuing with the programme announced by the former Federal Government. The Minister of Water Resources should let the people of South Australia know as quickly as possible whether or not the incoming Labor Government in Canberra is going to honour the undertaking and whether the funds allocated to South Australia will be available to enable the vital projects of water filtration and Murray River salinity control measures to proceed as planned. If that is not to be the case, the sooner the people of South Australia know, the better. If the water resources programme which has been announced and which is in the process of being implemented is to be drastically cut, that will be a further disaster for this State. That situation needs to be clarified at the earliest opportunity by the Minister of Water Resources.

Also, prior to the last State election it was clearly indicated by the Minister of Transport (Hon. Michael Wilson) that, with the agreement of the former Federal Government, funds would be made available for the construction of the proposed new bridge at Berri and that the funds would be made available principally by the Federal Government under the Bi-centennial Roads Programme. Certainly, the councils and the towns of Berri and Loxton in the Riverland would like to know precisely where the present Government stands on this matter. We have been trying to find out what the attitude of the present Government in South Australia is to this project, as it has been rumoured that the project may be either delayed or scrubbed altogether. However, a clear undertaking and an unequivocal guarantee was given by the present Chief Secretary to the Mayor of Loxton some two days before the last State election that the project would proceed in the event of a Labor Government being elected in South Australia, that an incoming Labor Government would honour the commitment. The Opposition holds the present Government to that commitment, because funds for this project were assured by the Federal Government under the Bi-centennial Roads Programme.

If the Government in South Australia now decides to allocate the funds for that project to some other project in this State, it will be a further denial not only of the commitment that was given by the Tonkin Liberal Government in South Australia as far as that project is concerned, but also of a clear undertaking to honour that commitment that was given by the Chief Secretary only some two days before the last State election.

One could continue on with the performance of the present Government in South Australia and read through a number of statements which have been made by the Premier and which are quite contrary to the statements that he made before and after the State election. However, I think that,

in the last two minutes that I have, I should refer to a point that probably was foremost in the minds of South Australians at the time of the last State election, and that is unemployment. On this occasion, the now Premier said quite clearly in his election policy speech on 25 October 1982:

We have always said that we are prepared to accept the responsibility of direct job creation.

He did not back away from that for one moment, but it is interesting to note what his deputy said on 25 February 1983 and which was reported in the *Southern Cross* newspaper:

There is no answer to the problem of unemployment. If we knew the answer to unemployment, we would try to solve it right now.

Where is the credibility of any Premier or Deputy Premier in making a statement like that, accepting clear responsibility for it two or three months earlier, and then two or three months later coming out with a statement that they have absolutely no idea how to solve the problem whatsoever.

I ask all South Australians: how can any Government have credibility as the Government if, in a matter of only 125 days, it continues to back down on election undertakings and election promises which were clearly and unequivocally made, and then back off in such a fashion a few days later by saying that it has no answer to the complete commitment it gave a short time earlier?

The Hon. B. C. EASTICK (Light): I support the motion. I would like to make a very brief comment relative to the passing of the Hon. Cyril Douglas Hutchens, C.B.E., and the Hon. Gordon James Gilfillan, because they were two persons whose names were specifically mentioned in the Governor's Address. Regrettably, we have now to add to that list of former members of this Parliament who have passed on the name of the late John Coumbe.

I was fortunate enough to know all three persons and to appreciate, regardless of the fact that one was not in this House and one was not of the same political Party as I am, the tremendous contribution that those people made. It is rather ironic that two of the people whose names I have just mentioned were former Ministers of Works and, in their time, both did a tremendous job for the State of South Australia. To their relatives and friends, I certainly add my condolences to those which were expressed by the House on an earlier occasion and which was expressed in the Opening Speech presented by His Excellency the Governor.

To you, Mr Speaker, I pay a tribute on your election to the highest office that this House can bestow. It is one which I know something about and one which I hold in very high regard, not only because of its traditional role but also because of the very important part which it plays in our democratic system. If there was to be any watering down or any deterioration in the control which the House places in the hands of its Speaker, it would be against the better government of this State. I know that I speak with some conviction, having entered this place on the same occasion as you did in May 1970 and having had parallel courses in some respects, that you will apply yourself and are applying yourself to the highest ideals of that office which is the nub around which the workings of the House proceed.

Quite unashamedly, I am going to do a little bit of local promotion. More particularly, I want to speak for a short time on the event of 1983 which is the centenary of Roseworthy Agricultural College. I say 'the event of 1983' because Roseworthy Agricultural College, which is the oldest of the agricultural colleges in Australia, is into the process of its centenary activities. It has returned to this Parliament a number of graduate students. My colleague who so recently echoed my views, the member for Mallee, is a graduate; the

Hon. David Brookman, who was a Minister in this House on an earlier occasion, was a member of the Roseworthy Agricultural College; the Hon. Boyd Dawkins, who has vacated his office in another place, was not a graduate but a student at the Roseworthy Agricultural College; and the Hon. William Field Nankivell, who played a significant role as the former member for Mallee, also was involved. Indeed, there have been a number of members of this House who have given singular service to the council of the college. I refer to the honourable member for Hartley (Mr Groom), the Speaker (Mr Terry McRae), who is the member for Playford, and the Hon. Brian Chatterton, a member of another place. They have all played a part as councillors of Roseworthy Agricultural College and have been involved in the very significant changes which have taken place in regard to the role of Roseworthy in a changing society.

It is a fact that Roseworthy Agricultural College has made a contribution to agriculture in this State and far beyond, not only because it was the first, but because of some of the very major developments which have arisen from the research undertaken at Roseworthy and the pre-eminence of a number of the people who have been members of its staff. Indeed, a number of them have been directors of the college, and I will refer to some of them.

The college was first established in 1883 as an experimental farm to which farmers could be invited to observe results. This was one of the very early facets of the extension service which has been developed very effectively by the Department of Agriculture over the years and which gives people an opportunity (and, indeed, it is a form of approach which is applied in many other areas in agriculture today) to actually see in the making, or in the doing, the various activities which are being talked about or which are being promoted as an advance to the benefit of the particular area of involvement.

The first of the directors was Professor Custance, whose photograph appears on the cover of all the country telephone directories for 1983. He was quite actively involved in combining both agricultural education and research. He believed that they should be combined for the best benefit of the industry. The first students graduated from the college in October 1885. The establishment of Roseworthy preceded the formation of the Department of Agriculture in this State. In fact, Professor Custance was known as the Director of Agriculture for this State, a position which embraced both his Roseworthy commitment and as a forerunner to agriculture service in this State.

He held that position until the early 1900s, when the faculty of agricultural science was established at Adelaide University, along with the Waite Agricultural Research Institute, which was established in 1925, and until then the top Roseworthy students were able to proceed to the university to complete a Bachelor of Science (Agriculture) degree. The first Director of the Waite Institute and many of the original staff members were past graduates of Roseworthy and today many of the past graduates who have taken higher degrees in other disciplines play a vital role in many of the university and tertiary establishments in South Australia and most certainly in the Department of Agriculture.

What Roseworthy has been able to achieve for South Australia and beyond its borders can best be categorised as follows: wheat varieties, viticulture and wine, use of super-phosphate, the dryland farming system of medic wheat cereal cropping, in teaching developments, and in a number of other areas more particularly associated with agricultural business management, which is a more recent involvement of the college. The wheat varieties are widely known across Australia. The more recent adaptations can be simply identified, because they are all named after a type of sword or similar weapon. For example, there are sabre, rapier, dirk,

halberd, scimitar, claymore, and many other similarly named wheat varieties. The original wheat variety 'sword' which is one of the oldest semi-modern varieties was not developed at Roseworthy but probably because 'sword' figured most dramatically in the development of these other varieties it was the genesis of naming more recent developments after other types of sword.

Since the establishment of Roseworthy up to 75 per cent of the wheat varieties grown in southern Australia (including South Australia, Victoria and Western Australia) have been developed at Roseworthy, although I admit that the future of the role played by Roseworthy in the development of wheat varieties is in doubt because of a lack of or possible reduction in funds. Quite obviously people will not grow those varieties of wheat unless they will return better than is presently available or they have been shown to be adaptable to the particular climatic and soil conditions prevailing.

The second of the two areas of involvement is in the area of viticulture and wine. This is of tremendous importance to the Roseworthy College and is probably the area for which the college is currently best known. It is a major involvement not only because South Australia is the centre of the wine industry in Australia but also because it has provided the expertise required in wineries around Australia, as well as in New Zealand and South Africa, and wherever there is a discussion of the scientific aspects of wine making or scientific aspects of maturation or bouquet or any worthwhile development, Roseworthy is certainly well to the fore.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: You sound as if you like them.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The honourable member interjects that I like them. He knows that I tread them but I do not drink them. My story is that on one occasion I got into a vat along with my colleague, the member for Kavel, to tread the grapes. In another vat across the way were the Hon. Don Dunstan and the Hon. Des Corcoran. It is a fact of life that the Hon. Roger Goldsworthy and I outdistanced the other two members by two to one. They were white grapes.

At the next Vintage Festival the Hon. Roger Goldsworthy and I got back into a vat and on that occasion we were pitted against the Hon. Don Dunstan and the Hon. Tom Casey. What we did not know at the commencement was that they had spent most afternoons of the previous week at the Barossa Valley getting tuition in how to tread grapes to get the most juice out of them. On that occasion the Liberal Party (if I might use the term in the sense that it was promoted) was soundly beaten by the Labor Party—one of the few occasions that that has happened in the past and certainly will not happen in the future. On the second occasion they were black grapes. Because the first time they were white grapes and the second time they were black grapes, I have never touched a drop since because I am fearful of getting some of my own back.

The first senior lecturer in agriculture at Roseworthy Agricultural College was Mr Arthur Perkins, who later became Professor Perkins and who was a graduate from the School of Viticulture and Oenology at Montpellier, in France. He was appointed in 1892 and his appointment coincided with the rapid expansion of viticulture in South Australia. He was appointed Government viticulturist and he masterminded the phylloxera legislation, which has protected South Australia from this dreaded pest ever since and has probably been responsible in a large part for South Australia's pre-eminence as the viticultural State of Australia. I suggest that his work in relation to phylloxera and the prevention of phylloxera coming into South Australia is parallel with the actions taken by a succession of Governments in more recent years in seeking to keep fruit fly out of the State.

We have not had quite the success with that as we had with phylloxera but certainly the rationale for preventing

phylloxera is the same as the rationale of committing large sums of Government money to prevent the introduction of fruit fly in our fruit industry. Professor Perkins established a winery at the college and introduced the teaching of viticulture and oenology in 1895, just three years after his arrival. Since then Roseworthy has been recognised as being the national centre for the training of wine-makers and technologists for the wine industry. It is not unreal to accept or expect that the natural follow-on from that point has been the development of wine marketing and other associated promotional activities.

Some diplomas now available from Roseworthy Agricultural College are not directly associated with winemaking but rather with the general wine industry, and many students who have graduated from these areas of activity are providing a real service throughout Australia.

Professor Custance experimented with superphosphate and with some new crops. As a result, he found that legumes improve soil fertility, that superphosphate improves legumes, and that there was a worthwhile balance. That experimentation with superphosphate at Roseworthy was the first indication of the need of Australian agriculture for this fertiliser. Without phosphate, agriculture in the cereal-growing areas of the southern part of Australia would be well nigh impossible.

Because of the nature of our environment, South Australia being the driest State in the driest country, dry-land farming with medic and cereal cropping is important. Work on this project was initiated by Dr (later Sir) Allan Callaghan, who is hale and hearty in his retirement, and who is to give the oration at the Centenary Convocation in May this year. His work in the 1930s established the real value of annual medic pasture in cereal rotation and its benefit on soil fertility.

The development of this form of dry farming has been extended and is the basis of much of the consultancy work undertaken by the South Australian Government, in association with certain sections of the Australian Government, in Middle East countries. Many Roseworthy graduates have helped take that technique from this area and put it into effect in many countries around the Mediterranean. In fact, so important was it considered by the countries into which dry-land farming was introduced that for a long time there was a very successful international course to which people from Libya, Tunisia, Sudan, Syria, Pakistan, India, and other such countries were introduced when they came to South Australia, resided at Roseworthy, and saw the development of the scheme that was being promoted in their own countries. They then went back as advisers to the agricultural authorities in those countries.

Teaching has been a major development at Roseworthy Agricultural College, and many of the agricultural teachers in the State education system have graduated from Roseworthy. Some have undertaken courses at Roseworthy and subsequently studied for a Diploma in Education, and they are all playing a practical role in the extended agricultural course now available in many high schools and area schools throughout the State. The situation today is a far cry from the early 1940s when I was involved as a student at Urrbrae. Agriculture, as a high school subject, was limited to Urrbrae Agricultural High School, and at that time country students had to move to the city to undertake basic agricultural training.

I support the scheme of agricultural education being undertaken by the Education Department, and I laud the extension by Governments of both persuasions of the on-farm training scheme, which is a more recent development. South Australia does not have access to a Glenormiston undertaking, as have Victorians. That is an agricultural education centre whose academic achievements are pitched lower than are those at Roseworthy, but its curriculum is

based on a deep involvement in practical agricultural work, a role that Roseworthy played in a major way two decades ago. Many Roseworthy graduates are playing a part in the beneficial on-farm training scheme.

As a graduate, I have a genuine sense of responsibility to Roseworthy Agricultural College. Further, it is in my electoral district. Not only have I had the good fortune to be a student there, but for a time I lectured at the college on a part-time basis. Later, I provided professional veterinary services, and for the past 14 months I have been a member of the council of the college. I place my involvement on record, but such involvement does not detract from anything that I have said about the college, which will celebrate its centenary in May.

As part of the centenary celebrations, there will be a convocation. Agricultural college principals and directors will gather from all over Australia to exchange views on agricultural education. The three major departments at Roseworthy (the oenology, agriculture, and natural resources departments) will each undertake a seminar during the centenary year. The first of these will be conducted on Friday and Saturday of this week by the natural resources department and will involve a study of trees and the future of trees in the agricultural situation.

A little later, the oenology department will conduct a seminar on wine appreciation and wine development, and the agriculture department will later deal with the future of agriculture and pose the question of whether we are doing the right thing in the way we are trying to meet our agricultural commitments in South Australia.

One highlight of the centenary will be an 'olde worlde fayre', to be held on Sunday 20 March. As many as 20 000 people could attend that function to see a number of demonstrations of the early agricultural activities of the farrier, and haymaking with old equipment. There will also be a major involvement by the horse course personnel, which is a more recent development at Roseworthy, whereby young people enrol for two years and are given the chance, under professional staff, to appreciate to the full the role of the horse handler. Students graduating from that course are being sought all around Australia and some graduates are employed in the United Kingdom, where the lessons they learnt from Peter Jones, originally of Lindsay Park stud fame, and other practical people have provided them with a basic knowledge of horse handling and its importance to the horse industry. The course was based around trotting, galloping and, more recently, a very extended leisure horse industry of horse riding, horse jumping, endurance tests, and so on.

I make no apologies for having concentrated to some degree on Roseworthy Agricultural College and its involvement at this time, because it is a major source of expertise to the State of South Australia and elsewhere in vital areas. Graduates have played a major part for many years in the past and I have no doubt that they will continue to play a major part in the future.

I now switch completely to a subject highlighted in an address circulated by the Institute of Public Affairs, New South Wales. The subject of the address was 'Freedom and Wealth Creation', and it was given by Mr Paul Johnson in Sydney on Thursday, 25 November 1982. First, we have the following thumb-nail sketch of Mr Paul Johnson:

Paul Johnson is a world renowned British historian, journalist and broadcaster, and was editor of the left-wing *New Statesman* weekly magazine in the United Kingdom until 1970, when he resigned to 're-assess his political position'. He explained his break from what he called 'the Fascist Left in Britain' in one of his many books *Enemies of Society*.

Mr Johnson toured Australia in late November/early December, and his lecture *Freedom and Wealth Creation* was delivered to an audience of 450 people in Sydney on 25 November 1982.

Many transcripts and tapes of the address, and his response to questions put by members of the audience, have already been distributed. I.P.A. (N.S.W.) is now distributing the text to its members and supporters, and recommends that it be closely studied and given the maximum possible circulation.

That was a footnote applied by Alec Simpson, who was the executive director of the organisation in January 1983. I wish to pick up several points in the document, although I do not intend to read it all. I want to read the information against a background of recent events, but not in a political sense, as I believe that it contains a message which I have not seen pronounced on a public basis and which I believe should have had far greater public involvement. The article states at page 3:

One can look at the last three decades of recent history in a slightly different way, taking in non-economic factors, and my analysis is as follows: The 1960s I call 'the decade of illusion', the illusion that the world economy would continue to expand rapidly, smoothly and indefinitely, that rising expectations could be systematically matched by an ever-growing gross national product in the form of higher real wages and expanded social services, and not least, that the cultural quality of life could be radically improved by public intervention. Hence, the spectacular and world-wide expansion of higher education which was an even more characteristic feature of these years.

He then goes on to talk of the next decade, the 1970s, and states:

The 1970s were almost inevitably 'the decade of disillusionment', a return to the real world of economic cycles. We lost confidence in fast, indefinite growth, in the notion of cheap, limitless energy, in the idea of the world as an inexhaustible mine of resources, we lost confidence in cheap credit, deficit financing, printing currency, in throwing money at social problems and in throwing money at poor countries, hoping they'd go away. We lost confidence in education as a cure-all and in the social democratic state as the repository of benevolent omniscience.

In the process of discarding these illusions, some rather old-fashioned truths were rediscovered. The paramountcy of hard, honest money, the advantages of balanced budgets, the need for discipline of competition, the virtues of a free market, the evils of excessive government size and hyperactivity. We learnt to fear inflation as our ancestors feared the plague, and to prize price stability as the only reliable basis on which to plan investment and restore full employment.

He then goes on with the third decade, and states:

These painfully acquired lessons, let us hope, are making the 1980s 'the decade of realism', the new realism we might call it, though it's really only the old-fashioned economic fundamentalism of Adam Smith, newly engraved upon our hearts. The fundamental prosperity will, I think, continue, but only provided we retain our confidence in economic freedom, and that is what it's all about. Freedom is individual, is indivisible. All freedoms are encompassed in the freedom to choose for ourselves, the notion that we are endowed with free will, and that the right to choose lies with the individual and not with society, though, of course, the individual can delegate his power to parliaments and assemblies and congresses.

I found those three periods—the decades of illusion, of disillusionment, and of realism—three suggestions which I could apply clearly to the period of time most recent in our memory. Johnson states:

It has become clear to me that the destruction of economic freedom leads almost inevitably to the destruction of political freedom. For the truth is, without sufficient economic freedom you cannot create wealth, and when men and women become angry at this failure to create wealth, you are driven to restrict their political freedom too. And I think the opposite is also valid, where political freedom no longer exists it is hard to maintain economic freedom for long.

I have raised this article because it is important and was important when I first read it, when the Fraser Liberal Party and Country Party coalition Government was in Canberra. I believe that it is equally (but no more) important now that we have a Hawke Labor Government in Canberra. I believe that a number of statements made in this document bear great significance to the proposed economic summit meeting being developed for Canberra around 13 April. It is a great pity (and a number of my colleagues opposite

have agreed with me publicly) that, when talking of over-coming confrontation, getting back to basics and finding a realistic approach to a large number of subject difficulties that exist today, there is not the broadest involvement of people. We should have members of Oppositions, Federal and State, attending along with members of Governments, Federal and State.

I trust that it is not yet too late for the new Federal Government to accept responsibility for saying, 'We have had another look at this matter. We appreciate that not all wisdom resides on our side of the political fence and that there is a distinct benefit in eventually seeking a bipartisan approach to subjects which do not have an answer in a partisan commitment.' The only answer will be by a total bipartisan approach, and this matter was recorded earlier this afternoon in another debate to which I do not refer, other than saying that there was a clear indication by the Opposition, on the subject of the Ramsay Trust, that bipartisanship was necessary in looking at the thing in a total sense. That bipartisanship was given in the discussions held between the elevation to office of the present Labor Government and the promotion of the now ill-fated project earlier this year.

During the discussion following this presentation by Paul Johnson, questions were asked against a background of his knowledge of the English scene and the manner in which Great Britain was coming to grips with a number of problems, such as inflation, economic depression, and unemployment. In relation to unemployment, Mr Johnson said:

It's true we have very heavy unemployment. My belief is that that would have occurred anyway because most of those lost jobs, 3 300 000 lost jobs, were not genuine jobs at all, they were phoney jobs—jobs which had been created or sustained by an entire generation of overmanning and restrictive practices. They were not true jobs. They've gone. They had to go and they would have gone anyway.

This, granted, relates to the English scene. I believe that it is totally pertinent to the Australian scene; it is certainly pertinent to the South Australian scene and the reviews undertaken by the previous Government identified a number of those extravagances and excesses which had allowed a series of positions to continue in perpetuity, whether or not they were producing a worthwhile benefit. Mr Johnson goes on to say:

And by pushing through her programme—

he is now talking of Mrs Thatcher and her programme in relation to this matter—

fairly toughly and fairly quickly we have got a tremendous recompense in that because in 1981 productivity in Britain went up between 10 per cent and 15 per cent. That is the highest rise in a single year in the whole of our industrial history and that is a very important feature. People say to me here, since I've arrived in Australia, what are we going to do with our heavy unemployment, and my answer to them is that that unemployment was probably inevitable because of overmanning and it won't matter in the long run provided your productivity also rises. That is the figure to watch. If your productivity is rising while unemployment is going up, then you know that that unemployment is only going to be a medium term or short term unemployment but in the long run you're going to get it right. So that is the figure to watch for. The figure in Britain is very encouraging, as I say, so although there are many many difficulties that Britain faces at the moment, and in some ways it is a very unhappy country because unemployment does make people very unhappy—both to experience it and to observe it, nevertheless despite that the underlying factors I think are quite healthy and quite hopeful and I for one am very optimistic about the future.

As I said earlier, those words could have been written in the first instance about the situation in Australia; the place is different, but the times are the same. The identifiable difficulties are the same, and they surely must be some of the very vital issues which will be highlighted by the economic summit meeting in three weeks time. I reaffirm that I believe that it is most unfortunate, but not yet too late,

for the present Federal Government to move away from the action taken thus far of inviting only those who are in government, because you, Sir, and I know from a long association with the Commonwealth Constitution Convention, even though it has not yet come up with all the answers, that opportunity will arise late in April for that to go one step further because the convention will meet in Adelaide.

Getting around the table people from a wide variety of areas eventually finds a solution and never has this been more so than in an area in which you, Mr Speaker, have had involvement, that of the judicature, where significant suggestions have been aired. Significant motions, I suspect, will be put to the convention and, with the accord already reached over the Parliaments of Australia, there is every chance that some of those decisions will go forward as referenda items in the future. Certainly, they will be the basis of effective Government promotion, and I speak of the individual Government promotions in planning their way or their programmes from here on.

I now turn to an area of recent concern, and that is in relation to the calamities that have affected South Australia. I will not speak about the drought; that was a calamity. Its effects will be felt for a long time. They are probably the major contributing factor to unemployment and the economic down-turn in South Australia. In the years I was in practice, I kept a ledger in relation to a clinical practice at Elizabeth. I can tell almost to the day when the agricultural industry was in difficulties, because when the agricultural industry got into difficulties (in the sense that there was no income or a markedly reduced income) that is reflected in the bad debts of that clinic based at Elizabeth, where a large proportion of the workforce was directly associated with General Motors-Holden's.

General Motors-Holden's was one of the barometers of economics, shown by a down-turn in demand for product, the laying off of a large number of people, and, therefore, the ability of those people to meet financial commitments entered into in anticipation of continuing employment. The period of delay between the farming difficulty and the urban Elizabeth difficulty was invariably between five and nine months. One can pick up this problem very clearly; that has certainly been with us in recent times.

I want to speak about the fires and the floods, not necessarily specifically or in relation to specific events, but in a fairly general way. First, in respect of the fires, I would like to pay a tribute to the volunteers who put their own lives at risk and who sought to help their fellow men by making their services available to combat the fires.

There were a number of areas of difficulty, and I have no doubt that a proper post-mortem (in the sense of consulting all the agencies and assessing the course of events and the problems that arose) would identify problems in the future. By way of illustration, a large number of people from the Mid-North answered the call for assistance in the Clare area where the town was threatened and where a very dangerous situation existed.

During the period when some of the northern fire units, particularly those from the vicinity of Spalding, were attending the Clare fire they heard on the radio or were told by other people in the vicinity that the town of Spalding, their home base, was threatened. This announcement was being made by radio broadcasters.

The people in the Spalding area, having heard the announcement and disbelieving it, made a double check and learnt that there was no problem and, through the Country Fire Service and through the particular radio station involved, they sought to have the statement retracted. However, they met a blanket of indifference, and the announcements that Spalding was going up in smoke continued to

be made causing tremendous disruption and divided loyalty among the people who were doing their best in the Clare area. In fact, not unexpectedly, some of the units from the Spalding area sped back to Spalding to fight the fire.

On the evidence provided to me, the information was given to the headquarters of the organisation but the response to the request for a retraction was denied. I said earlier that I do not want to be critical, but I simply point out that this is one of the things that ought to be sorted out during the post-mortem in relation to the whole exercise. In fact, the Country Fire Service has subsequently indicated in relation to the broadcast made for people in Adelaide to head for their hills homes that it would have been better if that broadcast had not been made.

These are matters that can create a lot of problems. They certainly occurred in relation to the Clare area. Whilst I am not so naive as to believe that there will not be breakdowns in communication or problems on future occasions, I think that the incident I have highlighted is one so patently unfortunate as to require a fail-safe system to be developed in order to overcome such a difficulty.

Volunteers provide a very worthwhile service to the community, not only firefighting and ambulance services, etc., but also those provided in connection with a disaster situation. I would like to believe that they will continue to have the support of Governments regardless of their political persuasion. However, it is extremely important not to allow the emotions that arise during a catastrophe and surrounding circumstances to get the better of our judgment. Claims I have heard made that funds for the Country Fire Service should be doubled, trebled or even quadrupled are not realistic. Certainly there ought to be funds available, but we should not fall into the trap of making decisions to open the purse-strings too widely without having a proper and balanced appreciation of all the circumstances.

I refer to the other catastrophe, and that involves the flooding that recently occurred. It was quite amazing that within the space of two weeks one area was involved in events of such a divergent nature. In regard to the flooding, there was a wealth of knowledge about the volume of water that would inevitably flow downstream from where it had fallen. Even though that information was known to the authorities, the passage of information to some people in authority in downstream areas was pooh-poohed by those authorities. I am advised that in the early stages the police were unable effectively to get the message across that people should move from danger areas. For example, it was known that part of the Gawler caravan park would be inundated. However, some people in authority said that they had never seen water reach that area, that it would not do so and that therefore they were not going to disturb the people and get them to move. As a consequence of not taking action some two or three hours before the event, 16 families lost what was to many of them their total family financial holdings. It would have been simple enough, with the help available or with their own resources, to move all of those caravans well in advance of the flooding.

A further problem concerns insurance. It is a fact that a large number of people were not insured for flooding. This was mainly because a number of insurance schemes currently available are shopfront presentations where one does not have access to an agent who knows the circumstances and who is able to counsel people on what is available and what insurance is best to suit their locality or circumstances. Therefore, there is a situation of people having to opt in rather than having to opt out. I suggest most strenuously that the insurance industry should be restructured on the basis that people opt out of those protections they do not want but that all the protections be available in the basic package offered to them in the first instance. If a person

opts out and subsequently suffers a loss, then that is his or her responsibility. However, on the present basis, where people have to opt in (and there is the question whether they are told that there is an optional extra), they are at a considerable disadvantage.

We then have the bureaucracy of some of the insurance systems which cause me a great deal of concern. For example, one of the people who was affected by the floods at Gawler had some relatively minor damage to a caravan and the tow bar. The caravan was pulled away in a hurry so as to save it, causing damage in the order of \$190. When that person submitted a claim for that damage he was told that he could not get it because he had insured for an on-site van and the very fact that somebody had pulled that van away caused it to cease to be an on-site van.

The futility of that situation is apparent to every member. If the caravan had not been shifted, it would have gone down the river and the people would have lost the lot. If a commonsense approach was adopted to get it out of the way, involving \$190 in damages, with a \$50 first payment by the insured, surely the insurance company should be responsible for the other \$140 damage sustained and not hide behind a ridiculous technicality that because it is no longer on site it is not insured.

As I indicated, there is a series of events of that nature which I trust will be taken into consideration following these events. I can assure the Premier and any of his Ministers or their officers who are involved in discussions held in an effort to highlight some of these deficiencies that I am quite prepared to make myself and my records available for their benefit.

The South Australian Government thus far has not given members of Parliament, no matter where they sit in this place, the opportunity to address themselves to the problems affecting the State. I would hope that in the balance of this Parliament we will see a very positive endeavour to have sufficient Parliamentary sessions so that the Ministry can be questioned and so that matters can be debated. There is no way that the South Australian public wants a Government by regulation or by executive undertaking. The only way that this Government can ensure against that is to make sure that there are adequate Parliamentary sittings. I support the motion.

Mr PLUNKETT (Peake): I would like to take the opportunity in this Address in Reply debate to relate some information on the recent study tour which I commenced on 20 December last concerning the farming and grazing industry in New Zealand. We arrived in Auckland on 20 December and collected a motor van on 21 December, drove north on Highway 1 to Warkworth, left Highway 1 and drove to Leigh. The main industry in this town is commercial fishing, fish processing, farming and saw-milling. We also called in at Matakana, which is a mixed farming, fruit-growing and wine-making district.

We then went back on to Highway 1 to Welsford and on to Whangarei. Most of the farming in this area is cattle, sheep and pig breeding. I spoke with some of the farmers and commented on the pine forests in this area. The majority of the pine forests are part of the State forests industry. Private land owners are given Government incentives to plant pine plantations, but graziers are unhappy about the amount of good grazing land being used for pine forests.

Whangarei is a busy country city, and one of its major industries is the oil refinery at Marsden Point and the current expansions being undertaken there. We continued north along Highway 1 to Kawakawa and Waitangi where the Bay of Islands is situated. This is the Surfers Paradise of the North Island of New Zealand. I stayed there one day and went on boat tours of all the islands, and I also visited

many historical places, including Waitangi Treaty House, the Kerikeri Mission Station and Harura Falls, and I also enjoyed bathing at the lovely beaches there.

The next place visited was Ohaeawai, where there are many thermal springs which are a major tourist attraction. We then travelled along Highway 12, going through Kaikohe on to Omanaia. While still on Highway 12 we went through Waipoua Forest where there are some tall kauri timbers. We spent a night at Dargaville. The following morning, which was Christmas Day, we drove back to Waiwera, where we visited the thermal pools and spent a very enjoyable day. There are six pools all of different temperatures ranging from warm to very hot. This complex also contains water slides which are similar to the Magic Mountain at Glenelg. It is an extremely popular attraction for not only tourists but also local people.

Continuing our journey, we travelled to Auckland and on to Hamilton, where I was very impressed with the district. I was told that the grass grows 11 months of the year, and it is possible to run eight or nine sheep to the acre. Mixed farming is also popular in this area. Many sheep in this area would be shorn straight after the Christmas period, and many are shorn three times in two years. Many race horse and trotting studs are located near Hamilton. From Hamilton we drove out through Cambridge along Highway 1 until we got to Tirau. We then travelled along Highway 5 to Rotorua which is known as one of the world's finest sightseeing areas. It offers attractions including launch trips, fishing and swimming and over a dozen wonderful lakes. It is a thermal wonderland with geysers and bubbling mud, and it is a real cultural centre for the Maori people, with dancers, songs and hakas being performed regularly for visitors. Trout-fishing rates highly as a sightseeing attraction, featuring hand-fed trout, bush walks and animal parks, and at the end of every day it is possible to relax in hot thermal pools. Every caravan park and motel has its own private thermal pool. A few miles out of Rotorua at Ngongotaha is the Agrodome, which is run by Godfrey Bowen and is an agricultural and pastoral exhibition which is certainly well worth seeing.

Deer farming is becoming very popular in New Zealand. I am sure members will be interested in the comments of Peter Fraser, a farmer in Matamata; he said that deer farming in New Zealand is probably the most important development in New Zealand's agriculture over the past few years. The only thing that is holding the industry back a bit is the lack of breeding hinds.

In spite of this, they confidently expect to earn more export dollars from deer than from beef within the next 10 or 15 years. Deer are a splendid animal to farm and are easily managed by anyone with an element of stock sense. They can be farmed under most conditions and mob sizes are not important. They can be farmed successfully in small mobs or big mobs of many hundreds, and they do well on ordinary pasture. However, when pasture is in short supply they take readily to a supplement such as hay, silage or meal. Surplus potatoes and fruit have also been fed to them. They do well on straight oats or barley and are particularly fond of maize.

The harvesting of velvet is a simple operation performed under veterinary supervision. For the operation the stags are restrained in a crush and a tranquiliser is administered. They are then given a local anaesthetic and the antlers are removed with a sharp meat saw. The tails, pissles and testicles are greatly prized by the Asians for medicines that they make. The velvet is the most valuable by-product, being an ingredient in most oriental medicines. Even the eye teeth of the stags are not wasted, as I believe they are used in making trinkets and cheap jewellery, and the skins are made into the best suede. It has been scientifically

proved that deer will produce double the meat per acreage compared to sheep or cattle, therefore the farming of these animals is becoming more and more popular. The most popular breed of deer in New Zealand is the red deer. Many farmers are starting to show an interest in a larger elk known in New Zealand as the wapiti. When crossed with the red deer, these produce a much larger carcass at an earlier age. I thank Peter Fraser for this useful information. I saw many deer farms both in the North Island and in the South Island.

We reluctantly left Rotorua and headed down Highway 30. During the week we were in the North Island the weather was beautiful and the highest temperature was 25°F, the usual temperature being 22°F. We were informed while in the North Island that in the South Island it was raining and snowing heavily, so we were pleased to get such congenial weather in the North Island. The scenery on Highway 30 was good. We saw many pine forests, this being a major industry in this part of the North Island. We also saw swiftly running rivers, which would be a tremendous asset if we had one or two of them in this State.

On Highway 30, I called into Allan Marsh's shearing shed, which is 15 miles out of Te Kuiti. Shearing had not started, although on the day we were there they were shedding the sheep preparatory to shearing them on the following day. Allan Marsh runs 4 000 sheep and he shears them twice a year. He employs three shearers and the sheep are Romney Marsh and Leicester Cross. The shearers shear for nine hours a day and average 280 to 300 sheep a day. They use what is known in Australia as the 'Merry Widow' comb, the four-prong cutter, and the New Zealand hand piece. In New Zealand that is standard gear, because all the open-cutting sheep are shorn with this type of comb and cutter. Merinos are the exception and the Australian comb is normally used on them, although I am told that they bend the teeth, and it is then known as a pulled comb.

I drove on to Waitomo and stayed the night. That evening I visited the local hotel and introduced myself to the publican who, in turn, introduced me to two shearers. They were quite young, in their early twenties. I asked them how much shearing they do in a year and they replied that they shear for most of the year. They both own small properties and are both farmers' sons. They run about 2 000 Perendale sheep on their properties. They mainly shear in the districts between Waitomo and Hamilton. They leave that area only to work two sheds in the South Island. I asked them how many hours they work each day and they replied as many as they could, but at least nine hours. They work up to seven days a week, if need be.

They also told me that the longest they had worked without a spell was 24 days. They shear between 350 and 400 sheep per day. They use the big New Zealand comb and four-pronged cutter with the New Zealand hand piece. They have never shorn merino sheep and mostly work with Perendale sheep, a new breed developed for New Zealand hill country. Some members may wonder why they are known as a new breed when they have been in existence for 30 years. Well, the Border Leicester, for instance, was developed in 1770, so that is why the Perendale is called a new breed.

Thirty years ago some hill-country farmers considered the Romney Marsh was a little short in the leg and woolly in the points for hills use. However, the Romney is a good-sized, good-boned, dual-purpose sheep. Farmers did not wish to go all the way to a Cheviot, which is a smaller sheep with less bone and wool than the Romney.

The Massey University took up the challenge to produce a dual purpose hill-country sheep. Working with selected breeders on a tight breeding programme top Cheviot stud rams were crossed with specially selected Romney stud ewes. The progeny was rigorously culled and better progeny

bred from them. Within a short time a type was fixed and the breed given the name of Perendale. The breed has rapidly increased and gone from strength to strength. Today it stands as a very popular breed of sheep for the grassland hill country. The Perendale is a clean-faced sheep with clean legs. It maintains a good covering of wool on the body, inheriting from the Romney the deep well-set body and dense quality wool and from the Cheviot the ability to shepherd itself. Death rates are low and the ewes seldom have any lambing problems. It is an outstanding new breed. The wool is 50 to 54 count and, provided it is of good quality and free of kemp, commands a good price in comparison with other wools.

The two shearers in the hotel informed me that they pay no tax, explaining that all their earnings go into their properties and are therefore not taxed. They added that they are not members of an appropriate union. The following morning after visiting the glowworm caves, we drove back through Te Kuiti to Eight Mile Junction on Highway 3, then down Highway 4 to Tangitu.

We called in to another shearing shed, which was owned by Mr Ronald Grant. I spoke to the owner, introduced myself, and asked him if he would mind if I spoke to the shearers who were having their lunch. There were three shearers and two shed hands present. They were only too pleased to answer any questions that I wanted to ask. Allan Daly, one of the shearers, introduced the other shearers and shed hands to me. One was his son, the other shearer was his nephew, and they were both aged about 19 or 20. The lass on the board was his daughter. His wife was also working in the shed. Her duties were to sweep the floors and prepare meals for the team at smoko and lunchtime. Also in the shed were the owner and his two sons who did the pressing, penning up, mustering and counting out of sheep.

The shearers started work at 7.30 a.m. and knocked off at 5.30 p.m., which is 12 minutes longer than is worked in Australian shearing sheds. For the information of those who do not know about the Australian shearing industry, there is what is called the three-minute bell, which indicates to the shearer and the shed hand that they have three minutes to clean up after a two-hour run. There are four such periods, resulting in twelve minutes less being worked each day in Australian shearing sheds.

These men work five days per week, shearing between 180 and 200 sheep per day. The shearing rate they receive is \$65.00 per 100. They told me that they shored and sometimes crutched for most of the year doing very little other work than in shearing sheds. I told them of the two shearers I had spoken to the previous night and how they had worked up to 24 days straight and shored 350 to 400 sheep per day. The older of the shearers said that there were a few around like that, but that at the age of 28 to 30 years they are burnt out and drop right out of the industry. They told me that their tax was about 15c in the \$1. I took photos of the shearers, the sheep and the owner and his son. They were all very friendly to me and my wife and the owner invited us over to the house to meet his wife and daughter. We had a meal with them and stayed talking for a couple of hours. We thoroughly enjoyed meeting those people. The owner explained that the property he has runs about five sheep to the acre, but that it was a fairly expensive property to drain. Parts of the land had to be drained using clay pipes similar to those used to drain fruit blocks at Renmark, Waikerie or Loxton.

After we left that property I noticed that all the sheep we saw on surrounding properties were bred for their meat value and fat lamb production, not so much for their wool value. One property bred Drysdale. This breed of sheep

has been developed over recent years for the production of quality carpet wool. Carpet wool specialists became interested in the Drysdale wool in about 1946. The breed was developed solely for this purpose. Carpet yarn is made from a blend of different types of wool. Drysdale wool has a high resilience so that the finished carpet will stand wear and recover quickly from flattening.

The breeding of Drysdales is strictly controlled and kept to supervised closed flocks. The Drysdales, because of the very long staple, are often shorn twice a year. We continued on to New Plymouth, a large city, and had about three hours to look around. We then drove on to Wanganui, and stayed overnight. The following day we drove to the capital, Wellington, where we were to board the rail ferry to the South Island. We had four hours looking around Wellington, which also is quite a large city. We found Wellington very windy; I am told it is known as Windy Wellington.

At 6 p.m. we caught the Wellington to Picton ferry, where all the equipment is transferred from one island to the other. It is an extremely busy service. There would have been 250 to 270 people on the boat, as well as four railway trucks (the rail link runs on to the boat), and the cars and equipment that people were transferring from the North to the South Island. Semi-trailers, too, were being transferred from one island to the other.

Cook Strait is recognised as being dangerous and rough and on this crossing many of the passengers became ill. Some of the crew said that it was one of the roughest crossings they could recall. Everyone was pleased to disembark at Picton and I was pleased we did not have to make the return trip—I have never professed to being a great sailor. We stayed at Picton for the night and on the following day drove down Highway 6 to Nelson. For most of the way, we drove through the pine forests of the Mount Richmond State Forest, arriving at the large town of Nelson, which is a very popular holiday resort. It has a big influx of holiday makers and the celebrations were in full swing when we arrived there on 30 December.

We continued down Highway 6 to Westport. The highway runs along the bank of the Buller River, a very large swift running river, where the scenery is quite good. Westport is an industrial town and we had a quick look over Westport and over the old gold mine workings not very far out of Westport. We then continued down the west coast on Highway 6. There is some beautiful scenery to be seen in very hilly country, and one can look down from the highway to the coast, which is not unlike the Great Ocean Road, in Victoria, before the recent bush fires. We travelled through Greymouth to Hokitika, where there is a glass blowing factory which we found quite interesting. We then went on to Franz Joseph. There are many attractions in that area, and we viewed the Franz Joseph and Fox glaciers.

Travelling further down the west coast we stayed the night at Haast. On the following morning we started our journey through the Haast Pass, where the scenery is comparable with anything in the world. The road follows the Haast River, an enormous river, and the road is very narrow. The Southern Alps are on both sides of the river. There was still plenty of snow on the ranges, and all the waterfalls were running. We lost count of the number of waterfalls through this area, but it is a tremendous sight to see the water streaming down the mountains into the river. I give a word of warning to anyone who decides to take this road: I would advise them to obey the speed signs, as the road is not only narrow and rough, but also there are some one-way bridges. This means that the first person on such a bridge has the right of way—it is a hell of a long way down into the river if you go off the road!

We were told that at many times of the year Haast Pass is closed due to bad road slides. Highway 6 further down

goes along the edge of Lake Wanaka and Lake Hawea, two enormous lakes, and there is a hydro-electric scheme on Lake Hawea. We drove to the township of Wanaka, another popular tourist resort, I was told that over the Christmas period the population can be increased by 10 000 people.

We took Highway 89 to Arrowtown, an old mining town that has been restored to look as it did at the turn of the century. It is a major tourist attraction. The museum is well worth looking through and has the history and records of the people who opened up the country 100 years ago. Again, I have another word of warning concerning Highway 89. This is what the New Zealanders call a difficult road, and I agree wholeheartedly with them. It is tremendously narrow, has extremely bad corners, and is a rough gravel road. I suggest that anyone would be well advised to take Highway 6 to Arrowtown as it is a good bitumen road.

From Arrowtown it is only a short distance to Queenstown, the holiday resort of the South Island. People come from all over the world to see it. It is on the banks of Lake Wakatipu, the largest lake in the South Island, fed by rivers running from the surrounding 10 mountains. In summer, one can travel on the historic lake steamers, speed boats, Hamilton jet boats, yachts, or wind-surf or even ride the rapids. Many people like to take guided bush walks through the mountainous terrain. In winter, it is an extremely popular ski resort attracting international tourists. There are many different tourist attractions and it is hard to name them all. The mountains are a great attraction, as are the rivers and the water-falls.

Our time was running out, as we had only three weeks in New Zealand, so we decided that we could not go to Invercargill and Dunedin. At the caravan park, I was lucky to meet five farmers from Invercargill, and they told me that the land around Invercargill was the best country in the South Island, because of guaranteed rainfalls and careful top-dressing. The country in the Invercargill district would run up to 10 sheep to the acre, which is much higher than anywhere else in New Zealand. Perhaps at some other time I will have an opportunity to visit these areas.

After leaving Queenstown, we travelled to Cromwell, which is an orcharding district, and I spoke to some people who own orchards in that area. They are not pleased that the Government is erecting the Clyde power project dam, as it will flood all the orchards. This is a very large scheme, and the reaction seems similar to that of the Tasmanians *versus* a large number of Australians over the Franklin River dam.

People in Dunedin maintain that this will provide employment, mostly in relation to an aluminium smelter to be built which will use power from the Clyde project at a reduced rate. A significant number of New Zealanders are opposed to the dam on environmental grounds as well as having a dislike for multi-national companies being given preferential treatment, especially in regard to power charges, as instanced by the support that Comalco already receives.

We continued up Highway 8. Many valleys are located between the hills and the ranges, and it is in this area that substantial numbers of bigger properties are owned in New Zealand. This is merino sheep country, and most merinos are run in the South Island. It was also in this area that we first saw irrigation. Bendigo Station was located on this road with its six-stand shearing shed, and there was a most healthy looking barley crop growing alongside much grass hay which was still to be cut. The irrigation water was drawn from the Lindus River.

Morven Hills Station was located in this area, also running merinos and having an eight-stand shearing shed. Also on this property there is a goat stud and a deer-breeding stud. I must indicate to the House that the wildflowers, known as lupins, grow along the river and are a magnificent sight

at this time of year. I am told that these flowers are of great benefit to farmers, as they provide nitrogen to the soil.

We then went through what is known as 'MacKenzie Country', up to Lake Pukaki. Just before getting to Lake Pukaki we passed through the town of Twizel. This town is similar to Leigh Creek, although much larger, and most of the people are employed by the New Zealand Hydro-electricity Trust. We then drove along Highway 80 to Mount Cook, which is on the edge of Lake Pukaki. We were fortunate that at Mount Cook there was still plenty of snow. We visited the Tasman glacier. These are great tourist and mountaineering attractions. We then went on to the Hermitage, a popular snow-skiing chalet on Lake Tekapo.

Going back to Highway 8, we travelled into Fairlie, a small farming area producing lighter wool and meat breeding fat lambs. From Fairlie we drove on Highway 79 through to Highway 1 at Rangitata, and on through Ashburton. Between Fairlie and Christchurch the country is similar to that in the South-East of South Australia. It was very dry, but nevertheless we saw some excellent crops. Arriving in Christchurch on 8 January, we had two days before our return to Australia. Certainly, it is hard to compare farming in New Zealand with farming in Australia. Generally, temperatures of extreme heat and cold are rare. Rainfall is generally evenly spread throughout the year and is adequate for pastoral and arable farming. The hours of sunshine range from 1 500 to more than 2 000 a year. Such conditions especially favour pastoral farming. Indeed, New Zealand leads the world in grassland farming and, with correct grazing techniques, pastures and top dressing, grass grows for 11 months of the year in most of New Zealand.

Types of New Zealand farms are disposed as 31 per cent mainly dairy farming, 32 per cent mainly sheep farming, 12 per cent mainly beef farming, 10 per cent mixed livestock, 9 per cent general mixed farming and cropping, and 6 per cent other. Sheep total approximately 62 200 000, of which 45 000 000 are breeding ewes. The approximate beef total is 5 500 000, and there are 2 900 000 dairy cattle. The annual wool production is approximately 320 000 000 kilograms.

The annual meat production total killings is 25 400 000 lambs, 6 700 000 sheep, 2 300 000 cattle, and 1 300 000 calves. The annual total of sheep meats is approximately 500 000 tonnes and beef meats approximately 550 000 tonnes. The annual dairy production in tonnes is: butter 221 800, cheese 81 000, whole milk dried 77 900, whole skim milk powder 205 700, buttermilk powder 23 500, and casein 58 000. the agricultural exports total \$2 952 000, representing 71 per cent of New Zealand exports.

The total area of New Zealand is 103 000 square miles, or 28 700 000 hectares. In the North Island mountains make up one-tenth of the total area. In the South Island the mountain area is half the total. The population is about 3 100 000, of whom 270 000 are New Zealand Maoris. One-third of the total population is rural, two-thirds urban; 73 per cent of the population is in the North Island and 27 per cent in the South Island and other islands. The four main cities are Auckland (746 000), Wellington (329 000), Christchurch (297 000), and Dunedin (113 000). There are 13 provincial cities with populations exceeding 30 000 ranging up to 75 000: Whangarei, Hamilton, Tauranga, Rotorua, Gisborne, Napier, Hastings, New Plymouth, Wanganui, and Palmerston North in the North Island. In the South Island they are Invercargill, Nelson and Timaru. Sheep breeds in New Zealand are the Corriedale, Merino, Romney Marsh, Cheviot, Perendale, Border Leicester, English Leicester, Lincoln, Drysdale, South Down, Suffolk, South Suffolk, Hampshire, Dorset Downs, Ryland, Dorset Horn, Poll Dorset, South Dorset Downs, and Coopworth.

The Coopworth is a new breed of sheep, which has been developed in New Zealand in the past 10 years from crossing

the Border Leicester and the Romney Marsh, and then interbreeding the progeny of that cross. This interbred Border/Romney sheep is classed as a Coopworth. The leading Coopworth stud flock in New Zealand today is a closed flock and the Border Leicester and the Romney are not used for the production foundation stock.

The Coopworth has a wool count of 46 to 50 and produces three kilograms to five kilograms a year of good, stylish, well crimped, strong wool. It is a highly productive sheep and it is bred for its high fertility. The average lambing percentage for this breed is 130 per cent to 150 per cent, and as the ewes lamb easily little shepherding is required; it is an easier-care sheep.

I travelled, on my tour, by a Newman hire van that had its own accommodation, which is very different from the way in which most people who undertake study tours travel. I travelled 4 200 kilometres through the North and South Islands, and I used a drive-yourself Newman motorvan, because I would have been unable to undertake the study tour by hiring cars and staying at motels. With the van, I was able to drive on to properties and to take roads that are not on the normal beaten track for buses. In a lot of small towns one would not be able to hire a car to continue the trip. I would advise some of the members who have tried to interject, and whose interjections I have not accepted, that it may pay them to take a trip so that they may see things for themselves and be better informed in the future.

In the time I have left I would like to add to what the previous speaker stated. I commend all the firemen who fought the bush fires, whether it was in the Hills area, the Clare area or elsewhere. A bush fire came right up to the back door of my daughter's house at Clare. I am full of praise for the people who assisted in the bush fires. I am a member of the Public Works Committee, which visited Cadell on the day of the fires: on the way back from Cadell we were caught up in smoke and dust from the bush fire at Clare. I must admit that that was very frightening, but it was not as frightening as fighting the fires in the Hills.

I would like to commend all the people from Red Cross, the ambulance services, and anyone else who assisted. Nothing but praise can be directed to those people. I had the terrible experience of seeing my parents' home burnt out in the 1943 fires (Black Friday) in Victoria: that was terrible to go through. I was only young, but my parents and some of the elderly members of my family suffered greatly. Following the recent bush fires, South Australia experienced another tragedy—floods.

It would be very unlikely that one would see that type of thing happening anywhere in the world, but it happened in South Australia within two weeks. I would also like to extend my sympathy to all those people. I would like to add to what the Hon. Bruce Eastick has said: Government in South Australia should take heed of what has happened with insurance companies. I will say this and probably will not be very popular in saying it: the insurance companies border on robbing people. They do not inform people that they are not covered for certain areas. They were very quick to point out straight after the floods that most people were not covered for floods.

The only people who really got coverage by insurance were people who were insured through State insurance. The State insurance has a coverage and it informs everyone that it has that coverage. No wonder that a lot of other companies have the most expensive properties in the city: they love to get people to take insurance, but they hate to have to pay out to people when they are caught. I would like to see the laws on the insurance companies, not only in South Australia but throughout Australia, tightened to the extent that they have to have all coverages or inform people of such when they take out their insurance, because I am certain that a

very big majority of people would not know what is in their agreements when they sign them.

I guarantee that even people sitting in this Chamber would not be sure on this point. I insured my house and had to write six months later to find out what was in the agreement. I did not see the agreement until six months later. If I had not written I could have been burnt out and would not have known whether I was covered for anything. I do not accept what insurance companies do to people. There should be an Act to cover them to make certain that they inform people exactly what they are covered for and what they are not covered for.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I would like to start my remarks by expressing regret at the death of John Coumbe, who was in the House for the latter part of his Parliamentary career while I was here. I take this opportunity of echoing the sentiments expressed earlier today by the Premier, the Leader and other speakers.

I want to deal with the matter to which the honourable member who has just resumed his seat was referring, and that is the question of the bushfires. I happen to live in one of the areas burnt out and lost a lot of property myself. I want to talk about certain areas in which Government has some responsibility. We all know of the enormous pressure there has been on succeeding Governments in relation to the hills face zone, as it is termed. We know the pressure for the declaration of conservation parks, reserves, and the like. Over the years, much of the hills face zone has been either declared reserves and national parks or, in our case, in the vicinity of Anstey Hill, a reserve. This is all fine in terms of the public looking out at a nice rural setting from their backyards in Adelaide, but it poses some continuing problems for Government, and certainly some continuing problems for people who happen to live adjacent to or above those areas in the Hills. These areas now constitute a very major hazard in terms of the lives of people who live above these areas in the Adelaide Hills. Let me speak from my own first-hand knowledge of what has happened over the years in the area where I have lived now for about 30 years.

Part of the hills face zone, which I believe is now called Tea Tree Gully or Anstey Hill Reserve, was initially in private ownership and was grazed, which meant that the grass in that area was eaten down before summer. That area has now been declared a reserve. It is no longer grazed and natural scrub is allowed to grow. I understand that the area is under the care of the State Planning Office. The reserve keeper, a Government employee, lives in a house at the top of the reserve area. That was compulsorily acquired from a private owner who was seeking to establish a nursery. As a result of the spread of population to the growing areas of Adelaide, what was once the rural one-horse town of Tea Tree Gully is now a thriving metropolis. One of the penalties paid for this happening is that at least five or six fires start in the vicinity of this reserve each year, either accidentally or deliberately. I understand that this year's fire was deliberately lit.

A continuing hazard exists in regard to fires. In normal circumstances, if fires are detected early, they can be contained. However, the situation in regard to containing fires has deteriorated markedly as a result of the hills face area no longer being grazed. In fact, the danger has increased enormously.

After the fires I drove through the area with the local fire supervisor. I had not previously been extensively through the hilly area. We looked at where the fire had come through. Because of the nature of the terrain and the vegetation, the fire units could not get down to fight the fire. The ungrazed grass in the area was about 3 feet high and thick scrub and saplings grow like hairs on a cat's back to about 20 or 30

feet in height. There are a couple of tracks marked with fancy signs stating, 'Fire track No. 2' and 'Fire track No. 3'. They have padlocked gates and have been provided as access for firemen to get in and fight the fires. It is an absolute farce. They are not fire tracks—they are death traps. To send a fire crew down such a track would be to sentence them to death on days such as the fire day. Under more moderate circumstances it would still be a death trap. To send men down a 10 feet bulldozed track with saplings 20 to 30 feet high nearby and with grass 3 feet high growing underneath them, would be sending those men into an inferno on a fire day.

Numerous fire tracks were provided into the Government reserve and to the top of the range. The units initially went half way down to a clearing but had to retreat before the fire came up to them. I am sure that if they had stayed there we would have lost not one unit but all of the units that were there. The Government has a responsibility, whichever Government department is responsible for the land, to make sure that this land is better protected against bush fires than it is presently.

I talked to the local fire supervisor who believes that a 200-yard wide fire break is needed in this area to give fire-fighters an area from which to operate. Such a fire break would not spoil the view as there are several hills in the area. The reserve keeper in this area learnt his lesson. His house would have been as hot as any because he had saplings right up to it, as did many people in Greenhill, farther to the south. He knows what fires are all about now. I did not know what such fires were like until we were almost burnt out a couple of years after we moved to the hills in 1955.

It was not as hot as this fire, but my property was burnt out, but not the house and sheds on that occasion. The speed with which such fires travel, and their ferocity, has to be seen to be believed. It is hard to imagine a 50 foot wall of fire coming at one at something approaching 100 mph unless one sees it. I think that that man who lives in the house I have mentioned now has a proper appreciation of the fact that the precautions that were taken, that is, to push a 10 foot wide fire track down among saplings with 3 foot high grass growing under them is an absurdity.

Fire supervisors have been saying this for some years, but very little heed has been paid to them. In my electorate, Jim Pellow, of Norton Summit, has had a running battle in relation to the reserves further south from where I live. It is all fine and dandy to talk about having these reserves for the enjoyment of the public, but I do not know how much enjoyment people get from them, particularly at Horsnell Gully and Norton Summit reserves. However, if we are to prevent massive loss of life in the future, and it may only happen once in 30 years, something has to be done. I would be in favour of a slow burn through at least part of these parks at the end of winter before the onset of summer, because unless proper fire breaks are made which give fire fighters a chance of fighting a fire where it starts then we will have a repeat performance of the recent fire. There is nothing surer than as we know the sun rises in the morning and sets at night that if nothing is done there will be another fire of the sort that we have just witnessed, which could be infinitely worse if it got up into some of the heavily wooded areas in Belair and Blackwood. We would then have something approaching the holocaust that occurred in Victoria and Tasmania some years ago. Nobody thought that the suburbs of Hobart could burn (and this sort of thing might only happen once in a generation or once in 50 years) but it happened there and it will happen again in the Adelaide Hills, and will be infinitely more dangerous if something is not done about this problem.

The SPEAKER: Order! We seem to have about 15 different conferences proceeding in the House.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is infinitely more dangerous if land which is under Government control is not properly attended to to ensure that conditions are reasonable and that fire fighters have a chance of putting a fire out somewhere near where it starts. If they have to wait until a fire gets out of the top end of a reserve or a park (and Cleland is another example), on a day like the one recently then that fire will be completely uncontrollable. In such cases, the front is miles wide, which is what happened with the fire near where I live. By the time it got to the top of the range out of this death trap, which is what this reserve is, the front was so wide that fire fighters did not have a hope in hell of containing it. Then it is a question of trying to save individual houses here, there and everywhere. Until conditions change, or it rains, such fires cannot be controlled. In the meantime, there is enormous devastation. Make no mistake about it, these reserves and parks are death traps and they will kill a lot of our population at some time in the future, as sure as the sun rises every day.

Unless Governments, rangers and park keepers take notice of the people who know (and the people who know are the resident fire chiefs, who have lived in these areas all their lives in most cases), we will have a repeat performance of the recent fire except that next time, if the fire is further south than the recent one, it will be a lot bigger and better. This has been said before by the member for Fisher in this place, a man who has lived in the hills for all his life. It has been said by me, and I, too, have lived in the hills for most of my adult life. It is all fine and dandy for park keepers, who may not have been born in this country, to say, 'No, we cannot do that,' but there are many people living in the hills who understand only too well the hazards involved in living there. It is incumbent upon Governments to take a balanced view (and I am not saying that they should desecrate these parks) and to ensure that there be a slow burn through at least part of these parks at the end of each winter so that there is a chance to combat a fire in its early stages because, as I have said, we get fires every year now as a result of the spread of the population. If there is another day like the recent one it cannot be controlled.

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

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Before the dinner adjournment I was talking about the necessity for succeeding Governments to take sensible precautions to safeguard the residents of the Adelaide Hills from the dangers that are now only too apparent in regard to the reserves and parks that are under Government control in the hills face area. This situation has deteriorated markedly during the past few years. I want to pay a tribute to the work of the Country Fire Service. The efforts of those involved were magnificent. Indeed, had it not been for a visiting C.F.S. unit my wife, family and I would not have a roof over our heads at the moment. Unfortunately, none of my family were home at the time of the fire. That was unfortunate in one sense, but, had it had not been for a visiting C.F.S. unit, my own home would have burnt down. The C.F.S. did a magnificent job in most trying circumstances that were quite impossible in regard to some of the Government reserves and parks where the hills fires began.

I would like briefly to refer to some other facets of life during the past 12 months, during which time many of my constituents have been victims of the long drawn-out drought, particularly those on the Murray Plains, which at the best of times can be marginal country. Those involved have suffered grievous loss and hardship during the past season as a result of the drought. On top of that, people in the southern part of the electorate that I represent were

afflicted by bushfires. Greenhill is in the very southernmost part of my electorate. Summertown and Uraidla, also in the area that I represent, were burnt, as was Cudlee Creek, which has never been burnt out before during this century.

In recent times there was a unique and devastating flood through the Barossa Valley, which is at the northern end of my electorate. So, I would think that the electorate of Kavel has not enjoyed a particularly happy season during the past 12 months. The flood had to be seen to be believed, and it took the Government quite a long time to wake up to the fact that something had happened up there. There was some apprehension and people were disconcerted that the Premier had not gone near the area for a couple of weeks, although he eventually went there, possibly because of prompting (I do not know). However, by that time a fair bit of the initial damage had been cleared up because of an enormous voluntary effort on the part of people, some of whom came into the district.

The devastation had to be seen to be believed. Coming hard on the heels of the bushfires, I think the public was saturated with the tragedies that had befallen certain people in the State, and the flood damage did not cause the same amount of concern as it would have done had it been an isolated incident. The fact is that seven or eight inches of rain fell in a most unique fashion in the hills above the Barossa Valley and the water simply came down in a torrent, causing an enormous amount of damage. Areas that had not been flooded for 100 years suffered flood damage.

I was told that the last time something like this happened was in 1913. As members probably know, almost 200 houses were flooded, and it was quite a unique sight to drive around and see the devastation as well as talk to people in the flooded areas. People were wheeling out barrow loads of mud and slush from their lounge rooms or from inside their houses and simply tipping it into the gutters, waiting for somebody to come and cart it away.

The people for whom I felt particularly sorry were the elderly citizens living in the elderly citizens homes. In one case about 4 feet of water came rushing through one of these sets of units, and the elderly people were paddling around in mud up to their ankles looking around the unit at their earthly possessions, wondering which way to turn and what was going to happen to them. It was a pitiful sight. It is nothing short of a miracle that lives were not lost in those floods.

As we know only too well, lives were lost in the bushfires, particularly in the South-East. Lives were also lost in my electorate in the bushfires, and it is nothing short of a miracle that lives were not lost in these floods, because there are stories of people clinging to the railings of bridges with water swirling around them at chest high for up to three hours before they could be rescued. There were stories of people in the trees adjacent to the Nuriootpa Caravan Park hanging on for dear life and of people hanging on to the road signs and the like. So, it is nothing short of a miracle that lives were not lost during this quite unique and devastating flood in my electorate.

As honourable members know, the damage was enormous and the cases of individual hardship were devastating. People who were financially secure and had every reason to believe that they were secure suddenly found that their whole lives and futures had been changed as a result of these fires and floods. So, it has been a very trying time indeed during the past 12 months for a very large number of people in my electorate.

I did want to say something in this Address in Reply debate something about the Government's approach to the development of this State and to make some reference to the areas where I had some responsibility in the Liberal Government. The area of resource development is one area where we could break new ground and, indeed, in which

we made great strides in terms of enlarging this State's economic base.

I do not believe that the Labor Party is yet seized of the basic view and tenet that the only way in which we can make the lot of the average citizen in this State better and improve his lifestyle is to bake a larger cake (to use an example that members have heard before). We will have to bake a bigger economic cake if people are to get bigger shares or slices of that cake. The Government is always pre-occupied with carving up the cake and making sure that the people it represents get a bigger slice of that cake. However, if we do not bake a bigger cake, in the sum total, the public of South Australia will not be any better off. It was the intent of the Liberal Government to bake a bigger cake, and one area in which we were making significant progress related to resource development, part of which was my responsibility.

During the life of the Liberal Government, we managed to attract record levels of exploration in this State in terms of mineral and hydro-carbon activities. In fact, more money was spent in one of those three years of the Liberal Government than was spent during the whole decade of the pace-setting Dunstan years. I believe that the situation has changed and indeed is still changing rapidly. One of the reasons for that, I believe, is the attitude of the Labor Government to resource development, because we know that it is in an ideological bind in relation to one mineral. I refer to the mining of uranium.

How ludicrous it is for the Labor Party, in the heat of an election campaign, when it thinks it is on a loser, to decide to muck about with its Federal policy and make it so obscure that one needs to be a Rhodes scholar to know what it is about. Mr Hawke is a Rhodes scholar and he might understand it. We know that Mr Hawke is in favour of getting on with uranium mining, but he has been choked. What a ludicrous situation it is that, less than eight months ago, the then Leader of the Opposition (now the Premier) was saying that Roxby Downs was a mirage in the desert, that there was nothing there. Yet, when he bothered to look at Roxby Downs after the Labor Party tinkered with its policy and it was to be a goer, he was amazed at the level of activity.

Having modified its policy, the Labor Party says that Roxby Downs is now okay and has the go ahead. The Labor Party has changed it from a uranium mine to a copper mine. These are other metals associated with the uranium metal. It is really now a copper mine or a gold mine, and not a uranium mine.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: Or a silver mine.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, it could be an iron mine if one could get the uranium out. Whatever it is, it is an absurd proposition to suggest that the mining of uranium is any less dangerous at Roxby Downs because, instead of being mixed with dirt, there is copper in fairly modest concentrations. In the fullness of time, Roxby Downs will become the largest uranium mine in the world. Certainly, I hope it does. The former Liberal Government made its best efforts to ensure that we got this world class development under way, despite the stiff opposition of the Labor Party. The Labor Party denigrated the project and changed its policy and prevailed on its Federal colleagues to change their policy only on the eve of the election.

How absurd it is to say that that mine can go ahead when the Labor Party is now on the brink of turning down other significant but earlier developments in the mining area in South Australia. I visited the Honeymoon uranium mine about 18 months or two years ago at the pilot plant stage, and I re-visited the mine about six months ago, when the pilot plant was well under construction.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: I have been there since then.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am glad to hear that. The Minister is at least one up on the Premier. If the Premier visited Honeymoon again he would be amazed. The company at Honeymoon spent about \$6 000 000 in the 12 months prior to the State election, and I think it has spent more than \$10 000 000 in developing that venture. The new pilot plant is ready to operate and to suggest that, because of the Labor Party's anti-uranium policy, the mine should not go ahead but that Roxby Downs will proceed, despite its being immensely larger, is ludicrous. Roxby Downs is trundling out uranium at this moment.

The Premier was amazed at the Whennan shaft, which is a large mining shaft, but now the company is sending out drives and bringing out uranium ore. It even has a stockpile, and that has existed for more than 12 months. It is absurd to suggest that Roxby Downs can go ahead because other minerals are associated with uranium (and uranium does not occur anywhere in the world unassociated with other metals or minerals), and that, because of these other metals and minerals, this enormous uranium mining activity can proceed, but that Honeymoon cannot proceed because there is no copper mixed with the uranium ore. Certainly, it shows the lengths of deception to which the Labor Party is willing to go to accommodate the left wing which is in the ascendancy on the uranium question.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Honourable members may laugh, but who in the Labor Party is anti-uranium? Who leads the push here? It is the member for Elizabeth and others. Although I do not believe in overseas junkets, I implore Government Ministers to go overseas and look at what has been going on in Great Britain over the past 30 years.

Let the Minister of Health, an expatriate from Great Britain, go and talk to his fellow unionists in that country. Let him look at what is happening in the world outside of Australia, because he will realise that if Great Britain, for example, or France, Sweden, Italy, Korea, or a dozen and one other nations do not get their nuclear fuel from Australia, they will get it somewhere else, most likely from somewhere like South Africa.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: How's the market now—all right?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Labor Party and the Minister like to throw up difficulties as they go along. If the market is going to be difficult for Honeymoon, it is going to be difficult for Roxby Downs. The fact is that they are commercial decisions—

The Hon. R.G. Payne: That's not what you were saying six months ago. It was different then.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: If the Minister listens to my point, he might concede that it has some validity. Metal markets have been depressed for some time.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is a fact. It is always encouraging to me when members of the present Government—the former Opposition—behave like buffoons, because I always know that I am making a telling point. Their current buffoonery encourages me to persist. Commercial decisions are made by companies in relation to the market. If companies are prepared to come in here and build and operate, as in this case, a \$6 000 000 pilot plant, for the Government to say that they cannot operate it because it does not think that the market is right is an absurd proposition.

It is the responsibility of the companies to find their markets; it is the responsibility of Government to see that the material is handled safely. To say that it cannot go ahead because in the Government's judgment the markets are not right is absolutely absurd. It is as absurd as the proposition that it is all right to proceed at Roxby Downs,

which is an enormous uranium deposit to be exploited, but not at Honeymoon, because there is no copper associated with it. Further down the track, the \$500 000 000 investment over the life of the Beverley mine is equally in jeopardy. Today, the Minister tabled in the House a report from the Uranium Enrichment Committee, a committee set up—

The Hon. R.G. Payne: Where did you have it? You sat on it.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It was a report to me. The report was prepared and the Minister tabled it. I would be interested to hear what the Minister will do with that committee. From memory, it was set up in 1974 by a former Premier (Hon. D.A. Dunstan), who at that time was quite enthusiastic about this enormous refining industry for South Australia. That was before the Labor Party really got itself into a bind over the uranium question. Mr Dunstan was trotting off around the world, as was his wont, and he was enthusiastic about a uranium enrichment facility. There are not many of them in the world, and he was enthusiastic about that facility for South Australia. Mr Dunstan set up the Uranium Enrichment Committee and included in its membership some of the Government's top brass.

I believe that the Liberal Government upgraded that committee with further expertise, and got on to the job of continuing negotiations with Urenco-Centec, which is a consortium of British, Dutch and German refiners and enrichers, to see whether we could attract that billion dollar industry to South Australia. We were doing extremely well. Unfortunately, the change of government has put that enterprise in jeopardy, because of the change of emphasis within the Australian Labor Party and the view which currently prevails in relation to that commodity.

Since the election, the representatives of that consortium have visited Adelaide. From memory, I think they went to see the Premier on a Monday morning, and then saw the Leader of the Opposition and me in the afternoon, after they had seen the Premier. They told us that they thought they had received a good hearing and that there was nothing to discourage them. During the course of the afternoon we obtained a copy of a press release which the Premier had issued after his back-room boys had got hold of a story. The Leader showed it to the group from Urenco-Centec, and they were amazed. It is an understatement to say that they felt let down: I believe that they felt betrayed.

Mr Olsen: It was a sad document.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: As the Leader says, it was described as a sad document. I firmly believe that South Australia was ahead in its efforts to attract that very valuable, billion dollar industry to South Australia. The Labor Party, before it got itself into a bind, initiated that effort. In my view, South Australia should be seeking desperately to expand its economic base and it will be a tragedy if it turns its back on these real-life developments, things that can happen in the resource area to expand our economic base.

I hear the opponents of this sort of development talking about the millions of dollars per job that is spent, and so on, but I ask, 'What is the alternative?' If anyone has any doubt about the value to this State of major resource developments, I invite him to repeat a trip that I took as Minister to Western Australia. I made it my business to travel around the country to see what was happening at first hand. I took a plane north and looked at the iron mines in the Pilbara and the on-shore gas developments that are taking place in that area as a guest of Western Mining. I then went to the company's nickel mines and gold mines in the south of Western Australia.

If anyone does not believe that an enormous amount of construction activity (in the first instance, earth moving activity and the like) is generated, with permanent employ-

ment, involving the building of new towns and new water supplies, which is good for the economy of any State or country, he is either blind, stupid or just will not listen to facts. After I came back I made a speech to the Adelaide Rotary Club and I stated that we are about 15 years behind Western Australia but that we can get there if we make the most of our opportunities, and I sincerely believe that.

However, those opportunities and the work that we as a Government did over three years are currently being frittered away by the Labor Government because of the philosophical bind in which it has found itself. The Labor Government will allow one mine to go ahead (thank goodness), because it did not think that it could win an election without allowing that mine to go ahead; however, it will bang the door shut on other projects which will create employment now, which will generate royalties from sales, and which will create back-up jobs in terms of the equipment required for those developments.

Not only will such action have an immediate deleterious effect on South Australia's economy but also I believe that this State will become the laughing stock of the mining community around the world. As I said earlier, we do live in the real world. If one goes to any country in the Western democracies, one finds that that is the view, except in odd places, such as one of the western Provinces of Canada in which there is no uranium anyway but which has been through the P.R. exercise of stating that it will not mine uranium. How absurd! There is no uranium to mine. In every other Province in Canada where there is uranium, uranium mining is an important industry.

Mr Mathwin: I believe it was Alberta.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It may be Alberta. We in South Australia are seeing a tailing off of the record levels of expenditure that the Liberal Government encouraged and generated in this State in the resource development area, and we will find that this State will be very much the poorer and it will be put back years because of that action. In my view, in the resource area within 15 years minerals and hydrocarbons would have been discovered that would have put South Australia in the top league in Australia, but we will be put back years. It will be a very difficult job to reattract that capital to the State.

That is one of the penalties which unfortunately the public obviously did not realise that we would be paying for the advent of a Labor Government again in South Australia. Earlier today we had a debate in which, if time had allowed, I would have had something to say. One or two of the things I want to mention now I would have mentioned earlier. That is the proposition by the Premier that we should be risking public funds in an entrepreneurial fashion on a wing and a prayer and a hope that it may be successful. That is the proposition which he put to the House, and I understand that he put it to the public tonight via the television medium. He was seeking to excuse their excursion into this housing fund—the Ramsay Trust—which has just failed. That proposition had its birth back in 1979; it was the brain child of Hugh Stretton and Hugh Hudson. It surfaced two or three times during the life of the Liberal Government. We did not believe that it was economically sound. We do not believe that it is the province of the Government to put public funds at risk. We believe that if we are going to use taxpayers' funds in enterprises there should be very good reason for it—either the private entrepreneurs are not prepared to put their money into that enterprise and there is good reason for it to go ahead, or we ought to keep out of it. The idea of squandering public funds on a wing and a prayer in the hope that something might turn up is absurd.

So the Government got into the housing business recently, and it flopped. We had plenty of examples of this entrepre-

neurial approach during the 10 years of the previous Labor Government. It was going to get into the food business, so it built the Frozen Food Factory; that excursion cost the public millions of dollars. It was going to get into the clothing business, so it got into the Golden Breed act and that finished up going broke—defunct. It got into the clothing business in Whyalla and was belting B.H.P. over the head saying, 'You have to buy your overalls from the Government clothing factory even though they cost you twice as much because we have to see that the thing goes.' That was its excursion into the clothing business. It thought that there was a lot of money in land dealing. It could see that people were making money during the land boom, so 'Let us get into the land business.' That was another brainchild of its brilliant economist, Hugh Hudson, the former member for Brighton. So, it set up the Land Commission; that cost the public probably tens of millions of dollars. It got into the town planning business and said, 'We will build a new town at Monarto.' That cost the public tens of millions of dollars. These are the pipedreams.

An honourable member: The Riverland Cannery.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Labor Party said, 'We will get into the canning business, so we will get into the Riverland Cannery in a big way.' The major problems that the Liberal Government had to grapple with in Government were the leftovers of these excursions into the commercial field of the Labor Government where it set off on a wing and a prayer to use taxpayers' funds—tens of millions of dollars of them—in the hope that something might turn up.

We make no apology for the fact that we would not be in it. We are proud that we would not be in it. The Premier got up this afternoon and nearly blew a gasket when alleging that the Liberal Government lacked these sorts of entrepreneurial skills, saying that we ought to be kicked to death because we did not support their Ramsay Trust when we did not think that it had a feather to fly with. We make no apology. It is all fine and dandy to have those grandiose ideas and schemes, but if one gets the best commercial judgment one can in relation to the enterprise and they say, 'It won't fly' and one then says 'So what; let us give it a go', that is a completely irresponsible approach to Government and the use of hard-won taxpayers' funds.

I, for one, will not be in it, the Liberal Party would not be in it, and we make no apology for it. Another disturbing feature of the way in which the Premier has been behaving in relation to these things is the fact that when the going gets tough he disappears behind a closed door and shoves a public servant out front to take the rap and do the explaining. It is not the sort of personal quality that I admire. When the Government makes a mistake the Premier, as the front man, should front up. He should be explaining what went wrong and why it went wrong. Yesterday he washed his hands of the Ramsay Trust. He said it was private enterprise and had nothing to do with the Government. He said so in a press release. He said that the Opposition should not be screaming as it is criticising private enterprise.

Today somebody was stirring him up a bit: he came in and admitted that in excess of \$100 000 of taxpayers' money had been blown and that the Government had to pay back the money to the public who had subscribed. The Premier had to admit that. Yesterday he was beating a hasty retreat. We have seen the same sort of thing happen with the Premier in a number of instances. If he hopes to be successful in leading the State he will have to do better than that.

The other matters to which I wish to refer briefly involve the Government's approach to the control of the finances of this State. Government largely (although not entirely) revolves around the way in which Government programmes

are going to be funded. If one cannot answer that question one would have no success in Government. The Labor Party came up to the last State election knowingly misleading the public.

Mr Gunn: 'We want South Australia to win'.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Want it to win is right. The Premier talked about credibility quite glibly. In my judgment the Labor Party quite knowingly sought to mislead the public of South Australia, and immediately the new Premier knew he had won he started to backpedal. The very night the election result was announced and he came out to the cheering multitude we got a note of caution, and he started to backpedal. The backpedalling has turned into a downhill race. He misled the public, and I believe he knew that he was misleading the public.

What was the Government's panacea for the ills of the State? The Ramsay Trust was one to fix the housing problem but the other lynch pin of the Government's economic strategy was to set up an enterprise fund. I am looking forward with eager anticipation to the prospectus which will herald the advent of the enterprise fund. It will attract money from the investing public, and that money will be put into commercial and industrial enterprises to create employment. The Labor Government's track record in entrepreneurial ventures over 12 years cost the taxpayers of the State dearly. It is the lynch pin which we still eagerly await. The Government was going to create tens of thousands of jobs, and one of the ways by which it would do it was through the enterprise fund. The Premier stated:

A Labor Government's main goal in office will be to get South Australians back to work.

The figures have slipped from 8.1 per cent to about 11 per cent during the four months of the Labor Government. It was going to get people back to work. He further stated:

We will establish the South Australian Enterprise Fund to assist expansion of industry in our State. The Enterprise Fund will pump investment into high technology and export industries which are labour intensive.

There is no question about the markets here. We heard a while ago the squawks from the Minister of Mines about the uranium market.

What about the markets where the companies were prepared to risk their money? There was no question where we were going to sell this high technology production: we will get money from the public, invest it in high technology and employ people. It is all very airy fairy, in my book. The enterprise fund would pump investment into high technology. The enterprise fund, according to Labor's economic policy document, would initially draw funds from the Government and from private investors. Unless it is more attractive than the Ramsay Trust, that will be a *non sequitur*. It would, Labor believes, offer an attractive long-term investment and would be required by legislation to make a financial return on its operations. So it goes on.

'We will also introduce a direct jobs programme to provide employment to those people presently experiencing the most serious unemployment problems'—We eagerly await the advent of that scheme, but these were the promises—'The scheme will be based on the funding of employment creating projects sponsored by State and local government and community organisations.' The Premier, when closely questioned during the election campaign, said that he was absolutely sure that they could fund their promises. There was no shadow of doubt about that. They had access to reliable information; they had done their sums. There was no problem at all in relation to the funding of their programmes. However, suddenly the song has changed. We are in difficult economic times. In fact, the Premier used stronger words.

Mr Mathwin: He got quite huffy about it.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: He did indeed. He used quite strong words earlier today when he was talking about how tough things were. That is what we had been saying for months prior to the State election. We were telling the people that there was no easy ride. However, the Labor Party set about buying the teachers' vote, and now it is having trouble delivering. It set about buying the Public Service vote, and now it is having difficulty producing. It told plain untruths in relation to statements like 'People are leaving the State.' Of course, they leave the State: they leave the State on holidays every day of the week, but there was a net increase in the population of South Australia during the last six months of the Liberal Government. However, members opposite told these untruths and sought to alienate sections of the community from the Liberal Party by blatantly buying votes and on the basis that they knew precisely what the financial situation was. They had the programme performance budgeting, the Auditor-General's Report and the Treasury statements. But, of course, that song changed on the very night of the election.

I am concerned about the Labor Government's approach to the financial management of this State. As I say, the only hope to improve the lot of the citizens of this State is that we bake a bigger cake and attract investment and development to South Australia. One of the areas in which we were having some notable success was in the resource area. In fact, the Liberal Government had quite a considerable list of achievements which I believe in fair-weather times would have ensured our re-election. Members of the Labor Party used to make a big song and dance about their international hotel from time to time: it was the Liberal Government which negotiated and built it. We used to hear about international airports from time to time: it was the Liberal Government which negotiated and built it. We used to hear *ad nauseam* about a petro-chemical plant during the life of the Government: the Liberal Government negotiated \$2 billion deals. Only on Friday Premier Bannon was up there unveiling a plaque or turning on a tap to let the first oil flow out to a tanker off Stony Point. That billion dollar project was negotiated and steered through Parliament by the Liberal Government.

The Tonkin Government did not get a mention. All the the Labor Party said to us was that we were rushing it. It said that we rushed the Select Committee. It said that we rushed the measure through Parliament. As I tried to explain to members opposite, if we did not get that Bill through Parliament by December 1980 the financing arrangement for the consortium would break down; we would not get the development. The Labor Party said that we were rushing it but, nonetheless, we got the billion dollar development through the House by absolute co-operation between Government and the companies. In record time we got the largest on-shore hydrocarbon development ever built in the nation.

The irony of the situation, of course, is that the Premier went up there and turned on the tap, saying that there had been a bipartisan approach. However, we did not have a bipartisan approach when the Liberal Government was trying to get on with the business of negotiating what we believed was a very good deal for the State. Further, we successfully negotiated another billion dollar deal in relation to Roxby Downs, although the Labor Party fought that proposal tooth and nail in this House. If it had not been for a former member of the Labor Party, who had the guts and the gumption to put jobs and his own conviction ahead of Party dogma, that development would not have seen the light of day.

Mr Mathwin: The former member for Brighton, Mr Hudson, would have done that.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: No, he would not; the Party machine would have trodden on him. If one member of the Labor Party had not had the courage of his convictions that measure would not have been passed. The Labor Party fought it tooth and nail, but again, that is an achievement of the Liberal Government, namely, a billion dollar project ticking over nicely and mining significant quantities of uranium right now. As I said earlier, that caused repercussions for the Labor Party on the national scene. As well as those developments, the Liberal Government had record figures for tourism, and record growth on any national standard in relation to tourism in South Australia. At a very difficult economic time and at a time of high interest rates, the Labor Party managed to deliberately deceive the public and scrape into office.

We have heard a lot about it on the national scene, but I am concerned that we are seeing a flight of capital from South Australia, and we are certainly seeing a flight of exploration activity in the area that the Liberal Party concentrated on. That is a foreboding climate in regard to the development of this State. Maybe the Labor Party will be successful in giving some sections of the community to which it owes a pay-off a larger section of the cake, but other sections of the community will suffer to finance that part of its programme. Unless there is a growth in real production, and an enlargement of the economic base, then the total prosperity of South Australia will not be enhanced one jot—in fact, it will be depressed.

During the debate earlier today, in an ironic way, we enjoyed the remarks of the Minister of Housing. He is gaining quite a reputation as an orator. I sat through his opening remarks at the State local government meeting. If the Government wants to maintain any sort of credibility or reputation in the community, particularly in the local government area, it should curb the rhetorical efforts of the Minister of Local Government. He has repeated his performance around the State. The Government Whip is making some odd noises. I think that if he aspires to the Ministry he should keep his eye on the Minister of Local Government. That is probably his best chance, because the Hon. Mr Hemmings is making an absolute fool of himself. I thought that his speech was quite insulting to the intelligence of the people at that meeting and to the former Minister (Hon. Murray Hill). The Minister's remarks today were certainly in keeping with the reputation he is gaining, not particularly in this place, but certainly among the community at large.

Mr Mathwin: He is not used to speaking in the House because we have not sat for months.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: That is quite true.

Mr Trainer: We gave you time off to get into your Father Christmas suit.

The SPEAKER: Order! We should not be referring back to a debate which has already concluded, but since I have been so generous to date I will continue to be.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will not dwell on that point, but I wished to follow him earlier today and did not get that chance, so I thought I ought to warn the Government that they have really got a passenger there and, as I say, the honourable member has been making some odd noises in his corner, and that is his best bet.

This afternoon he again put forward this absurd proposition (as the Government does from time to time) enunciated by the Premier, that we should give it a go, and that because we do have some feeling for the people who are having difficulties in finding homes we should let fly with a scheme that our best advisers from Treasury and elsewhere tell us will not fly. That is nothing short of a stupid way in which to approach a very difficult question of providing housing for people in need. As was pointed out, the Liberal Government spent record sums providing welfare housing

(as the Premier described it and to which the Minister took exception) for the public of South Australia. In fact, it was part of our strategy that one of the areas where activity can be generated quickly, and employment created quickly, is in the housing area, and we deliberately took the policy decision to channel enormous funds into this area at a time of financial restraint.

But to come up with the proposition that we should encourage and support a half-baked scheme which the best commercial advice tells us will not fly, and to seek to castigate us because we would not support it, is ludicrous. It would be a squandering of taxpayers' funds, which, as I said earlier in my remarks was an only too frequent occurrence during the life of succeeding Dunstan Governments. I am concerned for the future of this State, and I am certainly concerned for the future of this State under a Labor administration which is already showing the clearest signs of financial ineptitude that one could ever imagine. I believe that they far surpass in their incompetence in these matters the incompetence only too evident during the continuing life of the Dunstan Government.

The real problem today for a Labor Party with a Labor socialist philosophy is that it is starting from a low base. At least Dunstan came in when things were reasonably buoyant. Gough Whitlam came in when things were reasonably buoyant, too. However, it did not take them long to make a mess of things, particularly Whitlam. This government is coming to office at a time when things are at a low base, and when we need prudent and careful Government. We will not get that in terms of the promises made at the time of the election campaign, and we are not getting it, I believe, in terms of the performance of the Government at the moment. The one advantage that this State will have is if we remain a low cost state. We again had that advantage during the life of the Liberal Government, but it is about to disappear once more in terms of massive tax hikes (against the express promises made by the Premier). These enormous tax hikes will put this State back many years and it will take this State years to recover.

I conclude by saying that all of us certainly do not make our remarks in any malicious sense, but we are generally concerned about the way this State is going and for the welfare of its people, which will largely depend on what sort of financial fist the Government can make of handling the finances of the State.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I take pleasure in supporting this Address in Reply debate. I congratulate the member for Brighton and the member for Mawson on the way in which they moved and seconded this motion. I would also like to take this opportunity of thanking His Excellency for the manner in which he opened Parliament. I am certain that His Excellency and Lady Dunstan will carry out their duties with distinction.

We were very fortunate in Port Lincoln to have His Excellency and Lady Dunstan officiate at the recent Tunarama Festival. His Excellency and Lady Dunstan spent two and a half days in Port Lincoln during which His Excellency was able to prove that he was not only a fine ambassador but also an excellent fisherman. He left Port Lincoln after a day's fishing being the proud angler of the largest fish of the catch, when more than four dozen saleable whiting were caught on that occasion.

His Excellency and Lady Dunstan left lasting memories with the people of Port Lincoln, and I am sure that that is indicative of the manner in which they will be received throughout South Australia. One of the opening remarks of His Excellency related to the passing of the Hon. Cyril Hutchens and the Hon. Gordon Gilfillan, and since that time there has been the passing of Mr John Coumbe.

Although I did not know the Hon. Cyril Hutchens, I did know the Hon. Gordon Gilfillan and John Coumbe, for both of whom I had the highest respect and with whom I had the opportunity to work to a limited degree.

Mr John Coumbe sat in the seat now occupied by the member for Glenelg, just in front of where I am presently standing, and often he was able to afford me advice and guidance in the debates in this House. John Coumbe was probably one of the few members in this House in whom I could confide. I do not say that he was the only one because there are others—several of them—but certainly I could speak to John at any time about any subject and know that I would be cordially received. I extend my sympathies to the families of those gentlemen. I trust that their memories will be held in the highest of respect in the community.

I was pleased to be re-elected again as member for Flinders. I was most pleased because my vote held firm despite an additional candidate competing in the field, creating a four-way contest. Fortunately, I was able to come through with more than 53 per cent of the primary vote. That was a most rewarding vote because I had a vindictive campaign waged not so much against me but more against my Party. It was a situation where I contemplated seriously whether or not I should engage in an exchange in the defence of my Party as a result of that campaign. I chose not to, and I am pleased about that decision, because the very areas in which that campaign was launched were the areas in which my own vote increased.

That turned out to be a strong lesson to be learnt for those involved in trying to denigrate my Party and me. People who intend to throw bricks should be careful of the position from which they do it because the areas where the campaign was launched were the areas in which I obtained the best vote that I have ever received in the five elections that I have contested.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Labor Party on its election to the Government benches. I congratulate the Ministers and acknowledge that the job that each of them has undertaken is onerous and is a responsible position in which they will be required to give all their time, effort and energies in administering this State. Further, I congratulate you, Mr Speaker, on your appointment to your high office. I know that you have the ability to carry that office with distinction, and I am sure that your name will go down in the records of this House as being a worthy and fair-minded Speaker in the conduct of the proceedings of this House.

I sympathise with the defeated members who are no longer in this Chamber. Some of those members I got to know personally, and I was disappointed for their sake that they are no longer members of this House because they in turn made valuable contributions to the conduct of the place. Some will probably return, but others may not. The election of 6 November 1982 saw a win gained by the Labor Party as a result of a great series of promises spelling out what it intended to do. It was a style of campaigning to which we have become accustomed over a series of campaigns, not only in this State but in other States as well.

A similar pattern with very good promises followed for the State elections in New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia. The people were told that those promises had been costed out, but almost immediately on election the people were told, 'We did not know.' So, the backdown on all those election promises began almost immediately after the spoils of victory had been gained. I am concerned that the Labor Party's campaign style, which has been very successful, did not carry with it the responsibility that I think we would all like to see in election campaigns. In other words, can those who go to the polls and offer promises

be trusted to keep their promises? I believe we have seen in three individual State elections and now in a Federal election that that is not the case.

The present State Government was elected on the basis that it would not increase State taxation. However, already, we have had an indication, kite flying, or whatever one might like to call it, time and time again, that there will be increases in a majority of State charges and possibly new taxation measures. A transaction tax has been introduced in Victoria and New South Wales. Will a similar tax be introduced in South Australia? I do not know, but it may be one thing that is being considered by the present Government.

As a member who has been elected to represent the people of my particular area, I am concerned about our access to the political platform of Parliament. I think it was said in this place today that the present Government has been in office for 125 days and that this is its sixth day of Parliamentary sittings. That is of concern, not only to myself because I am trying to represent my constituents, but also to the general public. How can they expect their views to be presented when Parliament has not been called together? Obviously, the Government does not want the public scrutiny of its actions.

We were told in December that Parliament would be sitting for two weeks, commencing on 15 March, we would then have two weeks off, two weeks on, and that was to be it. I now understand that there is going to be a further two weeks at the end of that, and I have since been told, less than 15 minutes ago, that even that programme may be changed. For those of us who have quite extensive bookings for that time, particularly in the week just prior to Easter, it certainly throws one's schedule out quite considerably.

Another matter of great concern to me is the fact that the Government has not had Parliament sitting, and on this the very first day of sittings for 1983 we have seen the introduction of a great swag of regulations. In other words, the Government is becoming a Government by regulation and not by legislation. I think that in excess of 85 regulations were tabled today, all of which do not receive active debate in this Parliament. Therefore, the likelihood of good public scrutiny of those regulations is somewhat diminished. We all know that members of Parliament have the right to move for the disallowance of regulations, but we also know that the opportunity for successfully moving for disallowance is somewhat slim. Therefore, it is relatively ineffective in terms of the proper government of this State.

In paragraphs 8 and 9 of his Speech, His Excellency made considerable reference to seasonal conditions. At that time we were still feeling the effects of a rather disastrous drought. His Excellency mentioned that he hoped that good opening rains might relieve that problem in April or May of this year. It is probably fair to say that we have had those opening rains. However, it is with some caution and some trepidation that I make that comment.

We had rain on 28 February, and, in normal seasonal events, that would be far too early a date on which one could reasonably expect the season to be open. When it has rained in February or early March, more often than not the season has closed, and the grass, clover and pasture germinated during the early rain has died. We really have not gained a thing. On this occasion, there was follow-up rain a week later, as well as in the past few days. That has augured well for the germination of pasture, but I still offer a word of caution. We are nowhere near the solution to our problems: the drought has not broken. The magnificent germinations over many parts of the State could wither and die after a few hot days.

This is probably the fastest growing germination that I have ever seen. Already in some of my areas and on some

of the barley stubbles the grass is about 125 millimetres high and is growing very well. However, the germination is very lush: there is no body in the feed, and there is no real value in that pasture.

I believe that primary industry will get this country back on its feet quicker than will any other industry. It can provide for the country an income that no other industry can provide. Of course, the industry relies totally on a good season. We cannot predict that: we just do not know. I suppose that many people have their fingers crossed, hoping that there will be a good season and that good grain returns will eventuate. Even if there is a good season in this State, it does not mean that our crops necessarily will be sold or will attract a good price on the overseas market. We are competing with countries which are dumping grain and which are financing their agriculturalists to a far greater extent than our cost of production.

Those countries are putting grain on to the world market far below our production costs. The Australian producer cannot compete at an equitable level. Our only hope of surviving on the international market is to put out a quality product that no other country can match. We are fortunate in having the seasonal conditions and the type of climate that such a product requires. That is our only means of survival and competition in the international market.

One thing that concerned me after the recent Federal election was that the new Minister for Primary Industry was not included in the inner Cabinet of the Hawke Government. That represents a downgrading of the agricultural portfolio, and it is of concern not only to the industry in general but also to all agriculturalists that the industry will not get a hearing within the inner Cabinet when it sits. I know that one could say that there are 27 members in the Cabinet and that they will all get a hearing at some stage along the line, but the lack of representation in the inner Cabinet is of concern to those people who rely on export markets. That is where we want the strength of our representation.

Since the Parliament last met, the most devastating occurrences in this State have been the disastrous bush fires and the floods. I suppose that many of us could speak all night on incidents that we have heard. Not many members were directly involved, although the member for Kavel and, no doubt, the member for Mallee, were personally involved. There are a lot of lessons to be learned. One of the side effects of that bad day was the very pleasing response from the community, not only in this State but also interstate and internationally, to the plight of the people involved.

On a talk-back programme a couple of days after the bush fires it was mentioned that the area devastated by fire was being compared with part of the area of the United Kingdom and, when it was mentioned that the fire actually wiped out an area that covered many counties and, in fact, half of one of the countries, the magnitude of the fire became obvious to those in that area. It was carrying headline banners for those people.

In our own case, we had an immediate response from farmers who were fortunate enough to have some hay put aside. By the end of the weekend, 11 semi-trailer loads of hay had been donated by farmers for drought-stricken areas. We ran into a technical problem. The hay had been given, when the normal market value was about \$4 a bale, in the interests of the fire-affected people. However, there was a problem in transporting it to the Meadows area. All carriers carried the hay at cost, but those who were able to get back loading from Adelaide to Eyre Peninsula could carry it at a lesser cost than could those who had to return empty.

So, in contact with the Premier's Department, I found that this anomaly had not yet been resolved. One of the things that needs to be brought to the attention of the State

Disaster Committee is, that such problems really need to be planned now. I am not offering criticism of anyone, because nobody was to foresee a disaster of such magnitude, but it has happened, and there are lessons to be learned from it. Hopefully as a result of the experience of this fire, the State disaster plan can include many of the problems experienced. Fortunately, within two hours the Premier's Department was in touch with me, saying that, one way or another, that freight would be covered, because it was rather ludicrous that some farmers would have to pay \$1.90 a bale freight and others only \$1. So, that was in effect evened out.

One thing that concerned me was the manner in which the headlines were blazed in the *Sunday Mail* by the Chairman of the Country Fire Services Board, Professor Peter Schwerdtfeger, who offered the comment, 'Pay them to get out', the inference being that we should pay these people for their losses and then tell them to 'get the hell out of the hills'. The article went on to say:

An irritated and weary Professor Peter Schwerdtfeger wasn't mincing words. As he sifted through the ashes and rubble of his fire ravaged Crafers home, the C.F.S. chief looked in despair around him. 'These hills have to be returned to national parkland,' he said. 'It's the only way we'll prevent future fires of such magnitude. People and machines bring fire. You can't say the thunder of heaven opened up and started all this. It was people and they're criminals.' His head bowed, the C.F.S. chairman spoke with a choking throat.

No-one wants to see anyone lose a home, but we have the Chairman of the Country Fire Services Board living in probably one of the most fire-prone areas of the State. We all know that the nature of the day was such that there was probably nothing anyone could do, but to now come out and suggest that the State should foot the bill to pay the damages for these people and then pay to relocate them is something that I cannot comprehend. People living in the hills know full well that they are taking greater risks than those who live in other areas. Therefore, they should be prepared at least to acknowledge that fact; if they want to take that risk they are allowed to, but they must share some of that risk potential.

I was concerned that our fire chief in this instance should make suggestions as unrealistic as those. I do not think that it need be said that it was Professor Schwerdtfeger who flew over my own electorate on one occasion three or four years ago and came back and told the media (incidentally, he did not even land his plane, but flew over the electorate) that we had a desert on Eyre Peninsula. That desert is still one of the highest producing areas in the State. It is responsible for producing approximately half of the grain production of the State. So, for a desert it is not doing too badly.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: It is fair to say that the comments of Professor Schwerdtfeger have promoted much discussion. He was the gentleman who suggested we should tow an iceberg to Adelaide to solve our water supply problems. Whilst the idea may be quite grand, I believe there may be some administrative and practical problems in carrying out the task. Nevertheless, one day the technology may be advanced to the point where there may be some value in that.

Another factor relating to the fires—and one with which this Government and future Governments will have to grapple—is the relationship between conservation and community protection. Conservationists have, in some areas, angered many people, particularly those on the land. On the other hand, some are practical in their approach to conservation. The roadside vegetation problem was highlighted during the recent fires. I understand that in areas of the South-East (and the member for Mallee will no doubt be able to confirm it for me) the fire front approached the

road and upon hitting it ran for four or five miles along the roadside vegetation before breaking out again into the paddocks. In that situation the roadside vegetation was acting as a wick to carry the fire along. It is a problem and we need to strike a balance between conservation and the protection of our community.

I do not know the ready answer, but I do know that, on occasions when I have stood in this House and have asked the Minister of the day to clear roadside vegetation to outside two metres of the line of white posts, I was berated and ridiculed in the Chamber. When we see on this occasion many farmers wiped out as a result of the fires because of excessive roadside vegetation, we need to take good stock of ourselves and reach a happy balance to get some rationale into the argument.

Another problem that has come up (and I have only heard of it second hand) concerns the handling of pine burnt in the forests. I believe that the timber will only last for six months after the fire; it begins to deteriorate rapidly when a fungus gets into the timber. There is no way that the present mills can handle that quantity of timber in that time. The only way it can be stored temporarily is to immerse it in water. We then run into the problem of environmentalists. The only way it can be stored is to put it in a lake or in the sea and somehow contain it.

Mr Lewis: It has to be fresh water.

Mr BLACKER: I thank the honourable member for that information. If that is the case, a fresh water lake has to be used. There will be environmental damage, but I believe that that damage is minimal and can easily be restored should that be the case. It will be the Government's responsibility to clamp down on any suggestion that various fresh water lakes not be used. The Government should take the strong stand and say that the timber must be saved as there are millions of cubic metres of timber that will rot and will be wasted unless an interim measure of this kind can be taken.

Mr Lewis: Lake Bonney.

Mr BLACKER: That lake was also mentioned to me but I deliberately did not mention the name as I believe a principle is involved rather than a specific area. I mention an ongoing problem that has occurred within my electorate; namely, the Dutton Bay jetty. It is a matter which has hit the media and has angered many of our local people. It has been an ongoing problem for them. The Dutton Bay jetty is a recreational jetty, obviously at Mount Dutton Bay. It is a very good angling jetty.

However, in 1980 some less responsible element of the community lit a fire on that jetty. I think that the excuse was that they decided to have a barbecue. They lit a fire and obviously some of the planks were burned. Another citizen of the area came along and decided to test a plank. He jumped up and down on it and it broke and he went through. He gashed his leg. There was a potential claim for damages against the Department of Marine and Harbors for having an unsafe jetty. The department immediately removed a section from the jetty to prevent public access, and that is when the saga began. The saga has been going on and letter after letter has been backwards and forwards to Ministers and departments. All along the line the department has been quite adamant that either the jetty must come down or it must be cut back to bed 20, from which it could be repaired to a reasonable condition. The local community are arguing against that and they say that on bed 20 there is no fishing, and it is only the outer end of the jetty which is good for recreational fishing. So, the problem has ensued.

I would like to take this opportunity of thanking the present Minister of Marine for seeing fit to inspect at first hand the Dutton Bay jetty, and I extend those thanks at

the request of the Dutton Bay Preservation Committee (I think it is called) and the local community, because the present Minister of Marine, the Hon. Mr Abbott, is the only Minister who has seen fit to inspect the jetty at first hand and to take his officers to inspect at first hand the particular problem there, and that is appreciated.

Whether it will result in the community's wishes being fulfilled is another matter, but at least some responsible dialogue is occurring between the Minister, the department and the local community, and that is very much appreciated. However, I believe that there may be ways and means in which this problem can be overcome. Recreational jetties are a problem and they are a liability to Governments, irrespective of which Government is in power. The present Budget line provides for only \$150 000 for maintenance of those jetties. I know that there is one recreational jetty in this State which at present has an estimate of \$750 000 required to be spent on it.

So, with 43 or 44 recreational jetties across the State, it is obviously an insurmountable problem for the Government. I am aware that there is some experimental work being done by the Department of Marine and Harbors on the use of concrete in connection with *in situ* type piles being used for recreational-type jetties. I believe that this has a cost effectiveness which is far greater than that for wooden piles. It can be done by unskilled labour and, because of the nature of the work and the manner in which it is carried out, it does not require heavy machinery to be transported down the jetty. This has possibilities for recreational-type jetties. I am not recommending it for those that require heavy shipping, but obviously for light boating activities and recreational work, it has this potential. I understand that in operation the pile is sawn off at sea bed level and it is scooped out around the base, and a 600 millimetre form-work is provided. That is poured from the top by wheelbarrows and, as I said, by unskilled labour and cemented in such a way.

What is not known at this time is the life expectancy of such work. However, the nature of the work and the manner in which it is carried out certainly has strong possibilities and I believe that the cost effectiveness is about half of what the pile driven method is. In the case of the Dutton Bay jetty, there have been inquiries made through the job creation scheme and it could be that some potential can occur in that area.

I would like to mention an ongoing saga which I have mentioned many times before in this House. However, each time I rise to my feet there is another chapter in the story, and that goes for the Coffin Bay township and the associated problems that occur with the National Parks and Wildlife Service, the conservation park and the local community in their attempts to obtain a water supply service for that township. There are not very many townships in this State that do not have a water supply of some kind and, of course, this community is obviously angling to get that water supply. I was to speak at some length and express my views about the manner in which certain members of the National Parks and Wildlife Service have been conducting themselves over this entire programme. However, I have had quite lengthy discussions with the Minister for Environment and Planning, and it is hoped that a Cabinet subcommittee or a group of Ministers will soon be able to sit down in a round-table discussion and resolve this saga, which has been going on since the early 1960s without resolution.

An incident that illustrates the way in which the National Parks and Wildlife Service has alienated itself from the local community and the manner in which it has broken down any form of public relations involves the action it took late last November when it fenced off two waterholes

in the Kellidie Bay Conservation Park to prevent access by wild horses. During the course of a weekend I received three telephone calls about the matter. The first was to advise me that some unknown person had fenced off those waterholes. The second caller advised me that the wires were twisted as though a horse or kangaroo had been entangled in them, and the third caller told me that he had cut the wires because a brumby had been caught and entangled in the wires.

The humanitarian aspect of this action astounds me. How could any person fence off a waterhole from livestock? This was during a heatwave and the next available water was some 16 km to the south. As there was a northerly wind, the horses would not have been able to smell the water, and the only natural thing for any livestock to do would be to go upwind where they can smell water and back to the waterholes in question. This was a totally irresponsible action and I believe that someone should be brought to heel. No-one who has had anything to do with livestock can tolerate such an irresponsible action.

Upon my contacting the Minister's office there was a blank response. I do not believe the Minister had any knowledge of this matter, and I do not believe that the full story was given when his officers made inquiries. When I received a telephone call from the Minister's office an hour and a half later, I was given a very mixed sort of story: first, they did not know whose horses they were. However, blind Freddy knows whose horses they were, and anyone at Coffin Bay could tell you. They certainly did not inquire and did not want to know the answer. It was then stated that they belonged to a fisherman who could not be contacted, but that was a load of rubbish. Then I was told that there were only two barbed wires on the fence to enable kangaroos and emus to get through, but within 12 hours it was reported in the local paper that three strands of barbed wire were encircling the waterhole. So the whole saga goes on: it is just one series of events after another. The story from official sources is vastly different from what is occurring in the field.

I could not condemn these people (whoever they are) enough for their irresponsible action. I am referring only to the animal welfare aspect of this matter in fencing off animals in this way. If a farmer did it, he would be called before the R.S.P.C.A., and he would almost certainly suffer a heavy fine or even face a gaol sentence. But, because National Parks and Wildlife officers are involved, it seems to go unnoticed. However, it was not unnoticed by the local community. It was something over which the people concerned must be brought to heel and thus be made to explain their actions. I can go on with a great series of events that occurred in the park in question, but I do not wish to do so because the Minister, in consultation, has paved the way for a solution whereby I hope rational common sense will prevail.

The recent heatwave has brought with it various problems; one such problem involving air-conditioning of the Port Lincoln Hospital, a multi-storey building concerning which the previous Labor Government, in 1979, had referred to the Public Works Committee a proposal involving extensions. Soon after that occurred, there was a change of Government. At that time, the problem of blue asbestos came to the fore. Regrettably, there was a considerable amount of asbestos in the Port Lincoln Hospital. I understand that a rough estimate for its removal involved \$2 000 000. This meant, and let us be practical about the whole thing, that any renovations and upgrading should occur at the same time as the removal of the blue asbestos, requiring major renovation work, and it is hoped that the Government will install air-conditioning at the same time.

Some years ago I raised this matter (in fact, I have raised it on many occasions in this House), but when I did so I was told by the Health Commission and by the Minister that the Port Lincoln climate did not warrant the installation of air-conditioning. Those persons unfortunate enough to be sick in hospital during the recent heatwave would know that that is a most ludicrous situation. It is even more ludicrous when we find that healthy Government officers working in the town and along the seafront mostly occupy air-conditioned accommodation. When we can put our public servants in air-conditioned offices (I am not complaining, because I myself have an air-conditioned office) and not have our sick and elderly in air-conditioned buildings, there is something wrong with our priorities.

I am hoping that at the same time as the renovations and extensions at the Port Lincoln Hospital take place (I hope soon) not only will the blue asbestos be removed but air-conditioning will be installed in all the wards and private rooms. I do not think that it is unreasonable to ask that a hospital be air-conditioned. Indeed, I think that it is unreasonable not to have these standards and also unreasonable to pass this matter off with the statement that as Port Lincoln has an ideal climate the hospital does not warrant air-conditioning. That, as I said, is utterly ludicrous and even more ludicrous when hospital staff are bringing in their own fans as well as trying to get industrial fans into the hospital in order to provide some movement of air.

Another problem gaining importance in my community is the Porter Bay sewerage proposal. The Minister of Water Resources would be aware that this proposal has been on the books for some years now. He would have quite a thick file on the matter. In a letter dated 6 August 1981 the then Minister of Water Resources (Hon. Peter Arnold) indicated as follows:

The need to sewer the area is acknowledged, and in this regard the Engineering and Water Supply Department is preparing a scheme for submission to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works for inquiry and report.

Subject to a favourable report by the committee, the Government will examine its financial position with respect to the Porter Bay sewerage scheme. Although it had been hoped that construction in this area could have commenced during the 1981-82 financial year, it has been necessary to defer a number of schemes throughout the State due to the shortfall in Commonwealth funding. This has meant that, in Port Lincoln, the only existing subdivision in which sewerage construction can commence this financial year, is at Happy Valley.

However, you may be assured of my best endeavours to support the construction of a sewerage scheme to serve the Porter Bay area as soon as funds permit it.

Yours sincerely,
Peter B. Arnold

I followed up that letter with further correspondence, and many members of the community also wrote to the Minister. On 30 November 1982 I received a letter from the Hon. Jack Slater, the present Minister of Water Resources, who stated:

I refer to your letter of 12 October 1982 to the former Minister of Water Resources concerning the Porter Bay sewerage scheme.

Unfortunately no funds were allocated for this scheme during the 1982-83 financial year. However, provision has been made on the capital plan of the Engineering and Water Supply Department for the construction of the scheme during the 1983-84 and 1984-85 financial years.

Provided funds are then available, construction is expected to commence in July 1983 and take approximately two years to complete. It is pointed out that final approval of the scheme will also be subject to a favourable report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works.

Yours sincerely,
Jack Slater, Minister of Water Resources

I raise this subject because there has been some concern about health in that area. Doubtless you, Mr Deputy Speaker, have travelled to Port Lincoln and know the area in question, that is, the area on the eastern side of the Kirtton Point

residential area. It overlooks the Porter Bay slipway and, naturally enough, the area gravitates towards what is now known as Holidayland and the sewerage outfall on Billylight Point. I believe that that proposal is a costly one in terms of the type of terrain in which the scheme must be constructed. There is much limestone present and the scheme will require costly trenching.

However, the difficulties involved in the construction of this scheme explain the difficulties that people in the area are having. There is no drainage. Many people have to pump out their septic pits on a weekly basis. Other people employ a regular contractor to come in and empty the entire pit every three weeks, and sometimes even more regularly. For such a situation to apply in a built-up area on today's standards is totally undesirable. It is totally unacceptable in a city such as Port Lincoln. For this reason I commend to the Government this proposal and trust that the advice given to me by the Minister of Water Resources on 30 November is still current and that the work will commence in July this year. Certainly, if the work commences, I doubt that anyone will mind that it will take two years to complete, as long as work is started.

One of the greatest problems that the State faces is the attitude of Governments to raising finance and their means of balancing their Budgets. I expressed considerable concern, not to the present Government because I have not had the opportunity, but to the previous Government and the Government before that about the way in which Governments use capital funds to balance their Budgets. This matter worries me and, indeed, I have good reason for my concern.

We all know that if we use capital funds to pay our day-to-day expenditure then we are going downhill. I will relate the situation as it would apply to a farmer. If a farmer cannot pay his day-to-day running expenses, and has to sell his back paddock in order to meet those expenses, he is obviously going backwards, losing capital and is not maintaining his equity in his project. As such, it is a financial disaster.

There are farmers who have done that, and they have gone to the wall. I see a like parallel when Governments do the same, because they could easily go to the wall. I oppose that type of project. I say that knowing full well that both the previous Government, which was defeated in November 1982, and the Government before that, did similar things in relation to the use of capital expenditure. Who is missing out on that capital expenditure? I contend that it is the country areas. I believe that it is our road programmes and it is capital expenditure in out of the way areas that are missing out on that capital expenditure.

We know that the previous Government used \$100 000 000 of capital funds as such. That is \$100 000 000 of capital expenditure that was not used for its proper purpose. Was it used in my electorate, or was it used in your electorate, Mr Deputy Speaker? I do not know. However, somewhere in this State that much capital expenditure was not expended in the manner in which it was meant to be expended. I see a problem. I shudder to think that the present Government may consider doing the same thing. I believe that a similar situation occurred in the United States. I am given to understand that every State in the United States of America has now passed legislation which prevents governments from doing this. In other words, if a government has over expended its Budget and has to use loan funds then it is obligated by Parliament to recover those losses in the next financial year.

This means that if capital expenditure is used on one occasion it must be recovered out of recurrent expenditure in the following year. It also means that governments which serve only one term of Parliament cannot over extend themselves and leave the risk and problems of footing the bills

to the next government. It means that governments of the day must live within their means or carry the responsibilities of raising additional revenue by taxation themselves. It is a simple matter: if they want to expend more than their present Budget they must raise that money themselves or cut back on expenditure. That is probably an oversimplification, but by the same token it worries me and it is something that I think we must all bear in mind.

I hope that the present Government is not considering the use of capital funds for the payment of its day-to-day expenditure, because if it does we will continue on our downhill slide. Another thing which concerns me is the manner in which the present Government is talking about raising taxation. More particularly, I am concerned that it is using the plight of our natural disasters, fire and flood, as the means of raising that taxation. I have no argument with raising taxation on a short term basis for a specific need such as drought and fire relief. However, I take strong exception to the victims of fire and flood being used as an excuse to raise revenue for the general Revenue Account. I fear that is what is happening.

I do not believe that the measures being bandied about (I say 'bandied about' because no specifics have been put before us) are designed purely for the fire and flood victims or for the re-establishment of devastated areas. I believe that it is an excuse that is playing on the misfortunes of others to raise general revenue. I believe that the Government should come forward with a detailed statement as to how these funds, which are to be raised by additional taxation measures, are to be expended. That information should be forthcoming before this House supports any proposal for additional taxes or charges. Only time will tell whether that information will be forthcoming.

Another matter that concerns me and my constituents is road funding. I could speak for a long time on the anomalies that occur in the road funding systems. There are bitumen roads on either side of my district, with bitumen roads through the middle as well as across the top. All the intermediary roads, except the Tumby Bay to Cummins Road, are unsealed and generally in very poor condition. A tourist to Eyre Peninsula can travel around the edge of my district but he can travel through the farming areas only on unsealed roads. The people in these areas have battled for many years. They have developed the country and are the highest producing sector. Yet, they have been denied proper and effective roads, which the rest of the community takes for granted.

If one considers the percentage of sealed roads in each district in the State, one sees what I mean. I hope later to table in this House a ratio of the percentage of the sealed roads in my district to the percentage of production from my district that goes into the State economy. One could see from that that there is no parallel. The other thing that concerns me is the history of the present situation. I understand that in the pre-1975 era road funding was provided principally by the Federal Government, and about half the funds had strings attached. Seven classifications were considered by the Federal Government, three of which were national roads, rural arterial roads, and rural local roads. Half the funds had priorities and strings attached. It was up to the State Government to match those funds and to issue its priorities.

In 1976 I had the opportunity to speak to the then Minister for Transport (Hon. Peter Nixon), who stated that my constituents should be pretty happy. I asked him what they should be happy about, and he said that they should be happy about the road funding. I said, 'Why should they be happy? There has been no change.' The Minister told me that there had been a change and he showed me a schedule of road grants, which indicated that grants with strings

attached from the Federal Government for all of the rural area roads, including rural arterial roads and rural local roads, had been increased considerably. In one case there had been an increase of 214 per cent. I told the Minister that my constituents knew nothing about the increases, and I asked when the increases had come into effect. I learned that this had happened some months previously.

The Minister and I expressed concern, because, although the Federal Government was directing its resources to the sparsely populated areas, that money was not filtering through the system. On inquiring, I found that the Government of the day had chosen to re-allocate its priorities, and, instead of increasing or maintaining its country allocation, it reversed the trend and in some cases increased the metropolitan contribution by 200 per cent. So, any move that the Federal Government made to assist the country areas (which it tried desperately to do) was totally countered by the State Government of the day reversing its priorities. The man in the bush did not therefore know about an increase in road funding allocations to country areas. However, that was the prerogative of the State Government of the day, and I believe that that action was subject to condemnation in this House.

On the other hand, when there was a change of government I tried to ascertain whether the State Government of the day was channelling money back into the country areas, as the Federal Government had tried to achieve with its 'strings attached' grants. That was difficult to ascertain, because the seven-category programme on which the system previously worked was changed. There are now only three categories, and, therefore, it was impossible to follow through the schedule of events that had occurred. I contend now that it did not matter which Party was in power: there would have been little or no effect on the country roads programme. One other thing which has come up in relation to roads (and I could talk about them for some considerable time) is—

The Hon. Peter Duncan: You've got seven minutes.

Mr BLACKER: —because the roads that are most pressing go not to Elizabeth, but between Cummins and Mount Hope, between Lock and Elliston, and between Cleve, Kimba and Mangalo. They are the three most pressing roads that were put out in a schedule by the then Minister of Roads, the Hon. Murray Hill, in 1968, I believe.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: What about Elizabeth West to Virginia?

Mr BLACKER: The honourable member has probably got problems in his area—I am not saying that he has not. We have had Governments of the two major Parties of this House which have made promises after promises. We have had the schedule of roads programme that was put out in a five-year programme after the second World War. The road from Tumby Bay to Mount Hope was scheduled on the fourth year of that programme. So far, we have only got from Tumby Bay to Cummins—only half way. The others were programmed with big publicity by the Hon. Murray Hill when he was Minister of Roads in 1968 or 1969. He put out a \$12 500 000 road programme. That same programme is the one which we are still trying to get. So, it does not matter which Government of the day is in power it seems that we are out of the way and of no particular interest to the Government of the day.

I would like again to thank His Excellency for the manner in which he opened Parliament. No doubt, many other issues will come forward. I look forward to the Government introducing an interesting legislative programme. So far, we have not had much indication of that, but again I express my very sincere concern at the manner in which the finances of the State appear to be going. I say 'appear to be going' because we can only go on reports and stories that we hear.

I certainly trust that the Government of the day will not use capital funds for the paying of its recurrent expenditure.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Elizabeth): It will be a hard act to follow that gripping saga of rural life with which we have just been blessed. Nonetheless, I will do my best to keep up the standards that the honourable member has set. I want to open my comments tonight by congratulating you, Sir, on your appointment to the high office of Speaker. It is a great privilege for me to add my congratulations to those of the many other members who have spoken and mentioned your undoubted abilities, your compassionate outlook, and the fact that you are well known in the House as being a fair person. We all look forward to benefiting from those qualities in the future, and I congratulate you very much on your appointment.

I also want to congratulate the Governor on delivering what was undoubtedly the best Speech that he has yet delivered in his high office. In doing so he has set out very clearly the path in which the Government intends to take the State and the path which this Parliament will be pursuing during its currency. It is some time now, of course, since the Governor spoke and delivered his address to us but, nonetheless, when one reads that Speech one sees that the Government has an important programme for the House to consider.

Since the Parliament last sat there have been a great number of changes in our State and nation, none the least of which has been the election of the Hawke Labor Government. There have been other matters apart from that particularly affecting our State. We have been blitzed by drought, fire, rape and flood, and we find ourselves in a pretty sorry position at the present time. There is no doubt that many people in South Australia are in a much more desperate situation than at any time previously in their lives.

One has only to look at the tragedies that have struck recently. When one looks initially at the drought and then at the fires and floods, we can see natural disasters the like of which have not struck South Australia previously in its history. It is a situation wherein the Prime Minister's call to the Parliament and the people of the nation to pull together is extremely timely in the case of South Australia.

The people who have suffered as a result of these natural disasters have my greatest sympathy. A couple of aspects of the situation ought to be brought out in an honest and forthright fashion and should be discussed in the Parliament. In the first place, I believe that, although the situation with the fire victims was extremely grave and most serious in the case of people who lost their lives, nonetheless, in terms of property damage and the destruction of people's living conditions, the floods, for those individuals affected by that disaster, are a greater calamity for this reason: almost all people in the community have fire insurance. Few people who own or rent a house do not have fire insurance; therefore they are covered to a limited extent for some of the damage suffered. On the other hand, many household risk policies (laughingly described as 'all-risk' in many of them) do not cover flood damage. I understand that large numbers of people who have suffered the loss of all their belongings in the floods will not receive insurance. As things stand, they will receive virtually no assistance from Government or other private funds towards rehabilitating and re-establishing themselves.

Mr Blacker: They believed in good faith that they were covered.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Indeed. It is a factual situation. It is known to everybody and the Government should take some steps to ensure—

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Would you accept my suggestion of an opt-out rather than opt-in clause?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Yes, I believe that that is an excellent suggestion. In South Australia we need an amendment to the law to provide for the basic requirements of a household insurance policy, setting out the appropriate risks, and allowing people to opt out and pay a lower premium if they specifically choose to do so. The onus in a sense ought to be reversed. That suggestion has my full support and ought to be applied. In the case of the recent devastations, the fact that many of the flood victims are not covered by insurance ought to be taken up by the Government, and those people ought to be treated in a similar way to fire victims.

One can understand why the fire victims have been treated favourably because, in a sense, the fire was a greater devastation to the State. It was much more visible in its effect on the people of the metropolitan area. For that reason it was brought home to all of us in a more graphic fashion than were the floods. Nonetheless, the floods did serious damage to individuals. I believe that people who suffered from the floods should be entitled to at least the same assistance as are people who suffered in the fires. In relation to the fire damage, I wish to bring to light a matter which has been drawn to my attention and which needs the urgent attention of the Government. I have already brought this matter to the attention of the Minister, and he has indicated that he will look into it with a view to correcting what I believe is an anomaly.

The Premier's and the Lord Mayor's bush fire appeal distribution, as I understand it, is being handled by a committee of donors and citizens. The criteria for distribution of emergency funds have been worked out by the committee and, as I understand it, owner-occupiers are eligible for an immediate cash grant from the appeal funds of \$2 500. 'Mere' occupiers are entitled to only \$1 500 if they own their own furniture. An occupier who did not own his or her own furniture is entitled to only \$750. There may be some other categories as well, but they are the three on which I want to concentrate.

This immediate cash grant is to re-establish people with the basic essentials of life that are needed urgently, such as food, clothing and furniture, and I cannot see any reason why a person who owned his or her own house should be treated in any different fashion for this purpose than a person who was a tenant, who owned the furniture in the house, and who was burnt out.

Mr Lewis: Why don't you take it up with the Government?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: One is not permitted to call members fools, because that is not parliamentary. If the honourable member had listened, he would have heard that I have already taken it up with the Minister, but that he does not have the power to directly affect the situation, because a committee of citizens and donors has decided upon the criteria. Therefore, I raise the matter in the House in the hope that it will be brought by other means to the attention of the committee and, as a result, we may well be able to get this situation changed, because it is quite clearly inequitable.

A person in the South-East who had a large property which he owned freehold and which may be worth \$300 000 or more and whose house was burnt out is entitled to a grant from this committee of \$2 500. I do not begrudge the person that, but I think that it is quite iniquitous that a person who is renting a house, and who owns his or her furniture, is entitled to a grant of only \$1 500. After all, the grants are being made for immediate re-establishment, and I think that that decision making which determined that those who were owner-occupiers should be treated as a different class of citizen from persons who are occupier-tenants shows, to put it mildly, a strange view of the world and, in my opinion, a very strange type of thinking.

I hope that that situation will be brought to the attention of the appropriate authorities and that at an early date we will be able to see some fundamental changes made so that the bush fire funds can be distributed in a more equitable fashion. Since the last time that this House met we have had the election of the Federal Labor Government. I must say that I am as delighted as anyone that there has been a change of Government federally. Nothing could give the people of Australia greater hope than the fact that the negativism of the seven years of Fraserism has now been overthrown and that we now have a Government committed to new policies and initiatives in the interests of all Australians.

Mr Lewis: The most cruel act perpetrated in any election campaign.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Yes, I certainly hope that there will be some order in the honourable member's thinking processes if he is going to continue to interject. I am particularly interested in the well publicised promise of the new Prime Minister to hold an economic summit to seek a consensus in the nation. I was pleased to see that with great speed the invitations went out for that economic summit. The list of persons who are to be invited to this summit was published in the press. I must say that I thought it was a reasonably comprehensive list except in one respect. I was quite disappointed to see that in excess of one million people in this country are not to be directly represented at that summit meeting. I think it is fair enough to say that Labor Party members and the Labor Government would certainly show concern and an interest in representing the interests of those people who are unemployed, but I do not believe that anyone could represent the interests of the unemployed and the other two million people who are on social services in this country better than representatives elected by those people themselves. I certainly think that it would be a great improvement if that economic summit was to have representatives of the people in this society who are the greatest sufferers as a result of the economic crisis that this country is in at present.

I believe that those people have as much right to be there as does any other group in the community, given the size of their numbers in the population at large. Together with representatives of business and industry and representatives of the trade union movement I think that invitations should be sent to representatives of the unemployed and the pensioners in this country, because slowly but surely the number of people in this country who are slipping into grinding poverty, who are on pensions, unemployment benefits, four-day weeks, and on other income levels below the poverty line are becoming a greater and greater proportion of our society. That is the disaster of our times. We who are on Parliamentary salaries may not be feeling the pinch very much, but certainly those of us who represent working class electorates are seeing on a day-by-day basis the terrible tragedy of this poverty which is now engulfing our country. Not before in my lifetime have I seen a situation as grave as the economic situation which confronts the people of my electorate at the moment.

It does me no great credit to stand here in this Parliament, having been here for 10 years, and having to admit that the general level of economic well-being of the people whom I represent is now worse than it was when I came into this place. It does me no credit and it does not give me any pleasure, I can assure all members of that, but I am realistic enough and honest enough to stand in this place and admit that fact, because I think that we all must make a much greater effort.

Mr Lewis: Mr Acting Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I hope people will note, when I am talking about matters as serious as these, that the member for Mallee busies himself about playing the games of the Parliament by calling a quorum. People will judge those tactics on the basis of their frivolity and irreverence. I contrast those tactics with the important matters that I am discussing. I want to get back to—

Mr LEWIS: Mr Acting Speaker, I wish to take a point of order. I take exception to that imputation directed at me by the member for Elizabeth. I was in no way being frivolous and, as he said himself, the subject matter and his remarks are serious. It is not good enough if the Government does not retain sufficient people in this Chamber to hear those matters of such gravity. I take exception to the inflection and reflection upon me.

The ACTING SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: There is certainly no inflection either. I want to get back to the question that I was talking about. We are confronted in this nation and in this State with a crisis in human proportions which, if every member of this House was honest with himself, he would admit is almost getting to the stage where it is overwhelming each and everyone of us. I know that members get up in this Parliament and tell the world what they think ought to be done to solve the problems, but when one starts to consider the size of the problem—one million basically unemployed in this country (and that is not those registered but the real figure) and the problem of finding one million jobs in this country—one starts to be daunted by the task. I think that if we are genuinely concerned about the situation, then the first thing we need to do is to admit that we are unlikely to start really making serious inroads into that level of unemployment for many years to come. I think that the policies of the Federal Labor Government will greatly improve the situation but we will still be stuck in a situation where large numbers of people in our country, hundreds of thousands who want to work, will be unable to work. That situation is one which we ought to come to terms with and we should be much more generous in the way in which we treat those people than we have been in the past.

I am afraid that the situation is not getting very much better. I have people coming into my electoral office every day in quite a desperate situation. If they were living in Asia as they are living in this country, then we would simply be describing them as peasants, because basically the lifestyle that many of these people have is no different from, nor any better than, the lifestyle that many people in Asia have.

When one considers the sorts of problems that many people in my district now have, one sees that there is an urgent need for a complete revision of social services (I am not talking just about the financial services) and the advice services that are given and made available to people. Many people, because of a whole range of issues on which I do not want to embark tonight, are alienated from the available services.

One of the great tragedies is that the people who make the best use of the available services more often than not are middle-class people. They may be poor middle-class people, but nevertheless they are middle-class people who have had a reasonable education and who have some understanding of the way in which the Government and the Government processes work. They are the people who are best able to make use of the services that are available.

Many poor people, working-class people, for a variety of reasons, are not as well able to make use of those services, and I have had many tragic cases come to my office in the past few months. I keep thinking to myself that things can surely not get worse, but it seems time and time again that even more extraordinarily sad cases come in all the time.

A lady who came in the other day was a particularly tragic case. This pregnant lady had been working with a firm in Elizabeth and living with a friend of hers in a Housing Trust house. She and her husband were double bunking with another lady, and she unfortunately came home one night to find that some of her clothing was missing. When she confronted the woman who owned the house the woman admitted that she had taken the clothing, and they had an argument.

The next day my constituent went to her work and in the afternoon the person with whom she was staying telephoned her at work and said that she had found out from the Housing Trust that she did not have to accommodate my constituent and her husband any longer and that she was putting her furniture and clothes out on the street. In great distress, this woman left work and went home. Fortunately, she was able to make arrangements to have their clothes and their furniture taken to her sister's place and stored in her sister's garage, as I understand it. They stayed with her sister that night. The next day this lady went back to work and was told that she had been sacked for leaving work the day before.

When I made a surreptitious inquiry about this (I am not naming the firm), I was told that the firm did not want her anyway because she was pregnant. This poor woman and her husband are now living in their car and have been doing so for about two weeks. Incredibly, this is not the first case of this sort that has come to my attention. On two subsequent occasions this lady has been put into hospital in danger of losing her baby. That really sticks in my guts because what is really happening to this woman is that she and the health of her child are being put at threat through the lack of housing in our society because she is unable to find any decent place to stay at the present time. I forgot to make one point. She rang the Emergency Housing Office and was told that she could go to a mission hostel in Adelaide and that her husband could go to a Salvation Army hostel, the family being split up in that fashion.

As I have said, this sort of thing is not good enough in Australia, nor South Australia, in 1983, but it is going on. The day that that was brought to my attention was the same day that I picked up the *Advertiser* or the *News* and read some frivolous rubbish about the fact that 2 500 kilograms of nappies or something were being flown out here for Prince whatever-his-name-is to wear while he is in Australia. I think that there is something very fundamentally wrong with a society that, on the one hand, allows a poor pregnant woman to have her health and her baby's health put at risk while, on the other hand, expenditure is outlayed on such things as flying out from the United Kingdom to Australia nappies for the royal child.

Mr Meier: What about the Moomba workers who are striking for over \$800 a week?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I think that sort of comment from the honourable member shows his total lack of knowledge in relation to industrial procedures.

Mr Meier: It is a part of our society, which you were just pointing out.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Do you know anything about ambit claims?

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that we are not going to have a conversation across the floor.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: This is the sort of situation that is occurring in my district day by day, and it is not an isolated event. It is not an isolated case. Those facts might shock many nice, middle-class members of Parliament who will all be going home to their snug beds tonight. Nonetheless, there are people in our society who are sleeping on the streets, in squatters accommodation and in cars, and this

Parliament ought to be more aware of that situation than it is at the moment.

I now turn to what I think we should do to improve our economy and our society. It is quite obvious that, while the Deputy Leader of the Opposition makes the sort of speeches that he made tonight—

Mr Trainer: It was good stuff!

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: It was absolute backwoods stuff. While the Deputy Leader of the Opposition makes the sort of speech that he made tonight concerning the development of any industry in South Australia in which the Government has any involvement at all, we will continue to slip and slide down the economic pole until we are much closer to the bottom than people of our generation have been used to.

Mr Oswald: The track record is not too good.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: We could debate the track record all night. I want to put a simple proposition to members of this House. This State and its population have been built up on a manufacturing base. It is going to be almost impossible to provide adequate employment in this State by any means except manufacturing. I accept the fact that high technology manufacturing and variations in relation to traditional manufacturing are desirable and necessary. Nonetheless, manufacturing, inevitably, must be the basis for any future employment creation that we get into. When one looks at the economic situation as it exists in the world today, and one takes the position of a multi-national entrepreneur who is going to establish a manufacturing plant and who has the choice of establishing a plant in either, say, the Philippines, Taiwan or South Australia, I put it to the House that very few entrepreneurs are likely to decide to come and invest in South Australia.

Quite simply, the reason is that, in the Philippines, Taiwan, and the like, lower grade labour can be employed for \$27 a week for a 10-hour day and a six-day week. In fact, employees in Taiwan may work seven days a week, and the only reason that workers do not work a seven-day week in the Philippines is that the Catholic church has a strong influence and on the seventh day all workers have a rest.

Mr Lewis: That is better than the situation in Moscow.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: In those circumstances, no capitalist is likely to invest in this State or in this country in a large way. Some of the more backwoods thinking members opposite will say that the simple solution to that problem is to reduce wages and conditions in this country to the same level that applies in some of the slave wage areas of Asia—then there would be plenty of investment. That would be the attitude of the member for Eyre, for example. I do not believe that that attitude is acceptable: it is certainly not acceptable to members on this side, nor to the people of South Australia or Australia.

If there is to be manufacturing development in this State, we must experience another mini-industrial revolution, not like the expansion that took place after the war but more like the industrial revolution that occurred in the 1920s, when a lot of home-grown industries expanded quite rapidly into small to medium-size manufacturing industries. Perhaps 20 to 30 industries developed at that time, such as Kelvinator, John Shearer, General Motors-Holden's, Richards, and so on. A whole range of industries developed in that period from almost small blacksmith shops to small to medium-size engineering and manufacturing organisations.

I believe that we must again look to the development of home-grown industries and their expansion. There are dozens, perhaps hundreds, of small manufacturing organisations in South Australia which, with the right sort of assistance, could expand quite rapidly into medium-size manufacturing concerns. Many of those small and medium-size manufacturing organisations will require far more assistance than is

available at present. Many of them do not simply require financial assistance; they also require managerial assistance and marketing experience.

I had a rather unsettling experience recently when I visited some of our wineries with one of my friends who is opening a business in the restaurant trade in Tasmania and who wants to purchase wine from small South Australian wineries. I must say that I was amazed at the inefficient way in which small wineries deliver their produce interstate. My friend wanted to purchase five dozen and 10-dozen lots from a range of wineries and to have it shipped to Tasmania. The first thing I was amazed about was that none of the wineries had any information on shipping produce directly from Adelaide to Hobart on the Holyman shipping service: they had information on road transport only. None of the wineries could arrange for a person to pick up all of the wine from the area and take it to a depot in Adelaide. Generally, the marketing was, to say the best, poor. That is symptomatic of many of our small manufacturers.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: We set up a transport advisory service for small companies like that and found it very valuable. I agree with you.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I am pleased to hear that. I agree with the former Minister that that is a service that is needed and I am only sorry that it has not had greater penetration. There is an urgent need for a much greater marketing effort on behalf of small and medium-size companies in South Australia, and we will not get that sort of effort by our standing here talking about it. It needs Government intervention to set up some sort of marketing authority to send people out to these small firms to actively encourage their participation in any such activity.

Unless the Government takes this entrepreneurial role, we will not get any great development of the small to medium-size manufacturing sector in South Australia. It is probably about time that we had some honest home truths in relation to many of the people who are running these sorts of firms. They are basically bankruptcies waiting to happen. It might not happen in this generation, but in the next generation it is quite likely to happen. I am not planning to name any companies, or to embarrass anybody, but it is a fact that many of the small businesses in this State are very good technically at their particular narrow area of expertise, but when it comes to marketing, transport and management they are absolutely rank amateurs; they have no idea. Their egos are big enough to convince them that they are good at all those skills, but they are good only at the one thing they excel in—their technical expertise in production is good, but that is the limit of it. There is an extremely important role for Government to play in this area.

Another area where the Government almost certainly ought to play a much greater role is in protecting South Australian businesses from interstate takeovers and raids. I have always been an admirer of the completely duplicitous attitude of Mr Bjelke-Petersen in this matter. Nothing could be more hypocritical than the way he constantly spews out a tirade against socialism, as he calls it, on the one hand, whilst, on the other hand, using the Queensland Government Insurance Office to buy shares in—I think that I would be correct in saying—all of the larger medium-size Queensland industries. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Minister of Mines and Energy): I move:

That this House do now adjourn.

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): At the moment the all important and overriding issue confronting South Australia and the whole nation is the necessity for the wages pause to stick. The case for Australian wages and labour costs in the current economic context is undeniable, and I believe that it stands apart from politics. There can be no doubt that a policy of labour cost restraint is in the interest of the total community. It is regrettable that most reporters in the electronic and print media saw fit to portray the former Prime Minister, Malcolm Fraser, during the recent election campaign as engaging in no more than political posturing whenever he attempted to draw attention to the central difference between ourselves and the A.C.T.U.-controlled Labor Party. However, members of this House should not allow that to obscure the need for the community to stand firm, solidly against any wage increases in the immediate future.

The consequence, of course, is (as outlined by the member for Elizabeth) disaster for employment prospects in the country. Nor should the A.C.T.U. and the Labor Party tactics during the election campaign of minimising industrial disputes be allowed to lead to complacency on anyone's part. The clear intention of the A.C.T.U. during the campaign as well as that of some unions since is seen as simply to break down the wages pause. I need only to refer to remarks made by Mr Carmichael in that connection to illustrate the point. If it succeeds in that aim, the consequences for all of us will be disastrous. If the outrageously excessive wages hikes of the early Whitlam years and of late 1981-82 are repeated this year against a background of the disastrous drought and the fires of the immediate past, the unemployment rate in Australia will easily exceed 14 per cent. If we are to believe the member for Elizabeth, it already has.

We should all note that recently the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission handed down a decision implementing the wages pause. I would like to quote that decision and let members reflect on it, not only now but also after they have had the talkfest to be held in Canberra shortly, I understand, in the House of Representatives, as organised by the Prime Minister. I refer to the commission's comments as follows:

The commission is faced with an unprecedented situation: first, Australia's experience in the worst economic recession since the 1930s; secondly, all our Governments agree that a wages pause is necessary on economic grounds;

That refers to seven Australian Governments. It continues:

... thirdly, all Governments agree that action should be taken to freeze the public sector wage and salary increases for a period of at least six months; fourthly, all Governments, with the exception of Cain in Victoria, have specified the action which has been taken or will be taken to ensure that a similar freeze applies to private sector employees [that's if we can trust the Premier in this State]; fifthly, the Governments, including Victoria, have a variety of ways by which they can not only stimulate employment but also hold down Government charges.

They are the verbatim comments of the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. In coming to its decision, the commission considered the arguments presented by Governments, trade unions and employers. The views of the A.C.T.U. were on this occasion rejected by the commission. The unions should now accept the judgment of the tribunal, regardless of whether it is affiliated with the A.C.T.U. It is not good enough to state that they are going to set about destroying that decision of the commission simply because it does not suit them.

To take such an attitude is to exhibit an intolerable double standard. The A.C.T.U. and those unions to which I have referred must be reminded. I must say that I was pleased

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

to see the about-face made by the President of the A.C.T.U. as quoted in the most recent issue of the *Sunday Mail* where he indicated that the Council would accept the wish of the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission and the previous Government to observe the freeze. I trust that all member unions of the council will likewise accept that position.

They must not, and simply cannot, accept decisions that they like and seek to smash, by using bully tactics, other decisions which they dislike and which they find unpalatable. No doubt, every member in this place will agree that the A.C.T.U., like any other representative organisation or individual in our society, is entitled to its view. We are all entitled to our view.

However, for any union or group of unions to impose by force its will of that view, a view which did not succeed in the rational debate before the commission in this instance, is an act of gross social irresponsibility in my judgment. No unions should show a calculated and callous disregard for the unemployed. Moreover, and more important, it would indeed be callous and insensitive of them to do so, in that they would be ignoring the employees of businesses which are in serious financial difficulties now because of the actions of the unions in the demands that they have made on them up to this point. Any increase or escalation in the cost of labour for those people who are experiencing difficulties will mean that their employees by some degree will join the ranks of the unemployed.

The policies of such greedy advocates for those unions that seek to smash the wage pause are designed to favour only those members of their unions who will be lucky enough to keep their jobs. I doubt that many union members realise the serious diabolical problems that they face if such views are allowed to prevail over common sense to the detriment of their jobs.

It is quite all right for anybody, union official or otherwise, to be vocal in his disagreement with the commission's decision. I have already indicated that; that is one thing. It is quite another thing to plunge the country into industrial chaos, and soaring unemployment by committing the wage pause to the history books. We need to recognise that it is axiomatic (that means that it simply follows automatically) that employment cannot be maintained in this country unless employers generate sufficient income to pay their bills. In the public sector, that means putting up taxes. In the private sector, that means getting profits, that is, what is left after one meets the cost of producing the articles that one sells.

An honourable member: It is all right to put prices up then.

Mr LEWIS: We need to remember those businesses that must be left alone. Unless employers can generate sufficient income to pay their bills and get some profit from which to expand their enterprises, there will be no increase in the number of people who have jobs and, accordingly, no decrease in the number unemployed. If there are rising costs, without at least matching increases in total productivity, prices must rise and jobs will go. These are axiomatic facts that the simplest person should be able to understand. They cannot be changed by rhetoric.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I never cease to be amazed by what I consider the stupidity of the member for Mallee. Tonight we have heard him speaking about the callousness of the trade union movement, but he did not mention businesses or employees. He referred to greedy unions and industrial chaos, but there was not one word of criticism of employers, and he was not pragmatic about the whole issue of unemployment or profits, which he is so apt to push every time he stands up in this Parliament. We did

not hear any words of criticism about employers. We have seen not only the recent illustration of this concerning General Motors-Holden's, which I will refer to later, but also Kelvinator in laying people off, waiting until after the elections in support of their conservative friends before laying people off. Yet the member opposite has the temerity and the gall to stand in this place and talk about the callousness of the trade union movement—what hypocrisy and stupidity to peddle such garbage in this Parliament. If the honourable member had criticised employers, and perhaps made some constructive criticisms of the trade union movement, I would be prepared to listen to him and consider it a reasonable contribution.

We have seen the callousness of G.M.H. in this State. Whilst I was away it became apparent what G.M.H. intends to do in this State, and I refer to retrenchments. I recall that many years ago the re-elected member for Hindmarsh predicted, when he was secretary of the metal workers, the eventual demise of the G.M.H. plant at Woodville. At that time buckets from a great height were poured on him by the media and by the conservatives in this State. However, in my opinion his predictions will be borne out. It is my understanding from my colleagues and from the media that this multi-national company has chosen to ignore the wishes of the Government of the day in respect to employees within one of its plants.

I am aware of the problems at Kelvinator, where employees who get their pay on a Friday night are then told to get lost; they are out the gate, and they do not have a job. Let the member for Mallee come down to the north-western suburbs and talk to those employees who have been given no prior indication that their jobs are on the line. I vividly recall talking to a former Kelvinator employee one Friday night in the Finsbury Hotel. I knew him well and walked up to him and slapped him on the back, saying 'How are you going, Bill?' However, when he turned around he was crying, because he has just lost his job. He had just bought a home on time payment and had other commitments. The member for Mallee does not mention these problems. I would have thought that, because of the problems, businesses should be consulting their employees, but there was not one word about this from the man who is supposed to be concerned about people and social issues.

This afternoon the story was related to me about a colleague who was dismissed. I do not want to offend the widow of that man, who went home and hanged himself. We hear about the callousness of the trade union movement, but what about the social ills and problems with children, and so on? There is no doubt that the G.M.H. plant at Woodville will close. Some years ago I realised that there was a problem, and just after coming into Parliament I wrote to the then Minister of Industrial Affairs and to his offside in Canberra. We were given promises, but we got zilch. The member opposite who refers to the callousness of the trade union movement should have a good think about what he has said.

From my involvement in the trade union movement I know that it is not without fault. I am the first one to admit that, but I would have thought that, if the member for Mallee was so concerned about the unemployed people in this country, or in this State in particular, at least he would mention the problem of employers not consulting with employee organisations. He wonders why we have industrial disputation in this country. We have the Conciliation and Arbitration Act: what do we have from employers? Arbitrary decisions like 'You're out the gate; stiff.'

Having said enough on that matter, I want to raise one other question, because it does affect my electorate, and that is the effect that G.M.H. redundancies will have on the small business people in my electorate and associated

electorates. I have raised this question time and time again since I have been in this Parliament. What do we hear from the member for Mallee about this? What about the traumas, the unemployed and other sackings? Yet he stands up and talks about callousness. He should take a good look at himself before he makes statements such as those. The other question I want to raise is one—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON:—which I have been pushing for a long time and one which I feel very strongly about. It concerns the outrageous situation at the Adelaide Airport. Certainly, I will be pursuing this matter, even though my Party is in power in Canberra. I have been strongly critical of the facilities. Whilst on a study tour I looked at international airports. I am dismayed by the stupidity of the previous Federal Government in relation to the Adelaide International Airport. As I have said, it was a political gimmick to get that airport 'open' before the last State election.

I am concerned about the loss of money to this State because of the lack of facilities at the airport. A report in the *News* today states:

Big lift in South Australian and London air traffic. British Airways expected to carry 18 000 passengers through Adelaide on its international flight services during the next 12 months, the airline manager said ...

Mr Mathwin: What is wrong with that?

Mr HAMILTON: There is nothing wrong with having the service here, but, once they get to South Australia, what duty free and other facilities are available to passengers at the airport? I suggest that the member for Glenelg should acquaint himself with the facts if he has not been there yet.

Mr Mathwin: I have been there.

Mr HAMILTON: He should be quiet. Let us look at the amount of money that is being lost in this State because of lack of facilities at the airport. When one speaks to passengers, as I have, and they say that it is like a Hicksville, what do we do? We have the previous Minister of Aviation, Mr Fife, saying that the airport was to be completed in February; then it was going to be March; and one would suggest that, if they had been lucky enough to get back into power, it would have been April or June, or whatever.

There is no doubt in my mind that, with the pressure of my comments in the Parliament to upgrade those facilities, we will get them finished much more quickly. The money being lost is money lost to the State. One has only to go to Melbourne or Sydney, or any other international airport, to see the amount of money spent by passengers going in or out as well as in transit passengers who spend an hour at the airport. That money is being lost to South Australia. Job opportunities are being lost to South Australia. Opportunities for business people to sell their goods are being lost. Then we have people like the member for Glenelg interjecting. I do not want to hear; I can talk over the top of him. Opportunities are being lost for this State, and that is what it is all about. It is about time he woke up to himself and realised the loss that is occurring in this State.

Mr LEWIS: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): I wish tonight to address a situation that has caused me great concern in the District of Todd. I wish to refer to two factors. First, I refer to the most unfortunate bush fires that occurred some weeks ago. Over half the District of Todd in area was ravaged by the fires on Ash Wednesday 11. In fact, the fire that moved through my district also ravaged the District of Kavel.

The total area covered by that fire was greater, in fact, than the area covered by the fire in the Greenhill area.

Despite the fact that the devastation in the north-eastern area was at least as great as that in the Greenhill area, and despite the fact that the area burnt out by the fire was greater than that in the Greenhill area, for some inexplicable reason it was the only area of the State ravaged by the fires that the Premier did not visit.

The Premier visited the Greenhill area, he went to the South-East, he went to Clare, but he did not take the trouble to come and visit an area that was just as severely devastated as were the other areas to which I have referred. I have raised this matter because I have been inundated with telephone calls from my constituents, many of whom I am sure would not have voted for the Liberal Party in the last State election, but who said they could not understand why the Premier did not take the trouble to come and visit an area that was so severely devastated.

I have used those comments in my lead-up, because the callousness of the Premier in this regard has been reflected by the Minister of Water Resources who has shown clearly that he is not willing to provide a water supply to one of the areas affected by the fire, although I have written to him on several occasions and, more importantly, he has decided despite a commitment given by the previous Government that a mains water supply was to be provided. The present Minister of Water Resources, even after the fires, is still refusing to allow that water connection which the previous Government stated in writing would be provided.

Mr Whitten: When did they do that? Was it before the election?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ASHENDEN: I am delighted that the honourable member has asked that question, because now I can go into the correspondence which shows clearly the disregard of the present Minister of Water Resources for my constituents in this area which has been subject to bush fires.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. It is an important matter that is being raised concerning people who have been devastated and I hope that there will be total silence. I will take the appropriate action if there is not.

Mr ASHENDEN: The issue at hand was first raised by me in the latter part of last year when the previous Liberal Government was in power. I subsequently received a letter from the then Minister of Water Resources dated 30 September. He stated:

... an alteration to the water supply policy operating in the metropolitan watershed area has been approved by Cabinet. While there has been no change in policy in relation to the granting of indirect services outside of defined township areas, the revised policy permits the consideration of extensions of water main to unserviced allotments anywhere in the catchment area.

However, approval for an extension of water main is subject to certain conditions being met. In this regard, a return of 15 per cent on the estimated construction cost of the main must be achieved from the water rates that would be charged on all properties served by the extension. Where the required 15 per cent return is not forthcoming, for the extension to proceed, a cash contribution towards the cost of the work is required from the applicant.

Although a preliminary investigation of an extension of water main to ... property indicates that it would be an expensive proposition ..., I would be pleased to arrange for the financial aspects of an extension of main to be determined should it be considered desirable.

In other words, the only point that had to be met by my constituents was that they would agree to meet certain costs in relation to the extension of the mains. On receipt of that letter I wrote to my constituents and advised that the mains could be connected, but that it would involve additional expense. I asked whether they were interested and whether other residents were interested. I was told by my constituents that they were very much interested in relation to the con-

nection of water, because the cost in relation to the laying of the mains that they could incur would be very small in comparison to the cost of having to rebuild their homes and properties should a fire occur. Of course, this was prior to the fire.

I then wrote to my constituents advising them of that fact. Based on the information that they gave me I then wrote back to the Minister and (paraphrasing) said, 'Yes, my constituents are interested in the mains connection. Could the study be undertaken to determine the cost?' The previous Minister wrote back to me and said (again, paraphrasing), 'Right, that will be done.' That occurred just prior to the change in Government. Following the change in Government, I immediately wrote to the new Minister of Water Resources and pointed out the facts that I had outlined to the previous Minister, enclosing all previous correspondence and asking the Minister whether he could please ensure that I would be provided with the costing of the installation of the water main.

After many months I had not received a reply and I had to follow up on three occasions. Finally, on 21 January I received a letter from the Minister stating that the previous offer was withdrawn and adding:

I am not prepared to approve further extensions to the system.

In other words, the previous Government had given a commitment that, provided my constituents were prepared to pay a certain amount, they could have a water connection. The present Minister said (paraphrasing), 'No, that is not on. We will not provide the water.'

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: That's not true.

Mr ASHENDEN: That is absolutely true. I have the correspondence with me.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is interjecting out of his seat.

Mr ASHENDEN: I still did not accept that answer. I went back to the Minister and outlined in a letter to him the full quote that I have already read to the House. I said that a commitment had been given by the previous Minister

of Water Resources. That commitment was that water could be connected provided my constituents were prepared to pay some of the costs. They have indicated to me that they are probably prepared to do that. However, the Minister has written back to me saying yet again, 'We will not allow the mains to be extended.' I have gone back to him subsequent to the fires and pointed out that this is one of the areas that was devastated. Had that mains water been there they would have had a supply to assist them.

Mr Whitten: You will not come clean.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will give no further latitude.

Mr ASHENDEN: The cost, if the honourable member is interested, was around \$14 000, that is, the contribution required from my constituents. The sum of \$14 000 is far less than the cost they are facing now to replace fences, sheds, outbuildings, and houses. That is the point that I am making. They are prepared to contribute towards the connection. They have suffered awful devastation. Despite that devastation, the Minister is still saying that he will not allow that water connection to proceed. What on earth do we have to do? How do you think my constituents feel? A Government had given them permission for a water main to proceed; the new Government came in and said, 'Forget what the previous Government said: we will not allow those mains to be extended.'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members will be quiet.

Mr ASHENDEN: I believe that that is callous treatment of my constituents. It is treatment that is tied up with the fact that the Premier did not go to that area and it indicates to them only too well the disastrous result of the election of a Labor Government to the Treasury benches in South Australia.

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

Motion carried.

At 10.30 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 16 March at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 15 March 1983

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

VERTEBRATE PESTS AND PEST PLANTS

2. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Agriculture:

1. Will the Minister proceed with legislation to merge the vertebrate pests and pest plants authorities and, if so, will its application be throughout the State forthwith or, if not, upon proclamation, which council areas and/or regions will be exempted from the requirements of the new Act?

2. Will the Crown be bound by the legislation and, if not, why not?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. A Bill for the proposed amalgamation of the two pest control authorities and of their activities is presently the subject of discussion between departmental officers and the Parliamentary Counsel. The date of application of the proposed legislation depends on the Government legislative programme and administrative arrangements.

2. Consideration of matters such as exemptions of council areas, and binding of the Crown, will be given when the latest draft of the Bill is received for evaluation and possible approval.

MARKET FACILITY

7. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Agriculture: Does the Minister intend to establish a new market facility for the marketing of fresh fruit and vegetables in accordance with his pre-election promise (the *Advertiser* page 9, 25 October 1982) and, if so, where and when and if not, what specifically was meant by his announcement in view of the East End Market companies proposal to carry out a feasibility study on the redevelopment and/or relocation of the current East End facilities?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Government policy announced at the last State election was:

An A.L.P. Government will assist the industry to overcome present problems with inefficient and high cost handling that have resulted from the continuous use of the overcrowded East End Wholesale Market.

An A.L.P. Government will provide a suitable site on favourable terms and conditions and will assist the industry to build a new market on that site through the establishment of a statutory co-operative on the model of co-operative bulk handling. The new market co-operative would build up new markets for growers and merchants.

The policy is being discussed with representatives of growers, merchants and retailers.

SILO ASSESSMENT

9. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Agriculture: Will the Government uphold the previous Government's commitment to Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd to legislate to allow the assessment of silos for municipal rating purposes to be based on capacity in lieu of facility valuation in time for the 1983-84 year?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The A.L.P. policy at the State election was:

An A.L.P. Government will assist co-operative bulk handling and local government to develop a rational and reasonably uniform system of rating silos. The new system will be supported by legislation.

This policy will be implemented.

RURAL INDUSTRIES ASSISTANCE

13. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Agriculture: How many applicants has the department received in response to the Government advertisement for Rural Industries Assistance Assessors (the *Advertiser* of 13 November 1982) and who were the successful applicants?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: There were 42 applications received in response to the advertisement published in the *Advertiser* on 13 November 1982. The successful applicants were: Mr Brian Rodda, Mr Noel Christophersen, Mr Bill Davidson, Mr John Venning.

SEED INDUSTRY

15. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Agriculture: Will the Minister uphold the Liberal Party's undertaking to the seed industry of South Australia that there will be no competitive marketing of seeds by the Government within or outside the State and that the Government will only facilitate the supply of both cereal and pasture seeds in times of shortage, in full co-operation with the State's recognised seed industry?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: New marketing arrangements for seed produced by the Department of Agriculture are being developed in a manner that will reduce costs and improve efficiency.

LIVE SHEEP TRADE

16. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Agriculture:

1. Will the Minister support the Liberal Party policy in relation to South Australia's live sheep trade and the export of interstate sourced sheep through the State's ports?

2. In the event of union and/or other groups or individual interference with this trade at any level between the paddock and the released loaded ship, will the Minister take prompt action to ensure the free and unencumbered movement of the livestock?

3. Does the Minister accept the Department of Agriculture economists assessment that this trade was worth \$34 000 000 to South Australia's economy in 1981-82 and that the million sheep from interstate, shipped through South Australian ports during 1981-82, were worth an additional \$32 000 000 to the national economy at F.O.B. prices?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. No.

2. The matter is the responsibility of the police.

3. The Department of Agriculture has made an assessment which appears to be a reasonable estimate on the basis of statistics that are available.

RURAL CHARGES

23. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Agriculture:

ture: Which, if any, Department of Agriculture services, literature, brochures and fact sheet productions does the Minister intend to charge primary producers for?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: A more rational policy for determining charges for fact sheets, brochures and other literature is currently being developed and will be announced in due course.

DAIRY PRODUCE PRICES

24. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Agriculture: Will the Minister support all recommendations for milk and cream price adjustment when derived in accordance with the Act and presented to him by the Metropolitan Milk Board and, if not, under what circumstances will he refuse to do so?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Minister will make his decisions in accordance with the Act.

RURAL YOUTH OFFICER

25. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Agriculture: When will the position of Rural Youth Training and Advisory Officer in the Department of Agriculture be filled?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Ms Suzi Quixley commenced duties as Rural Youth Training and Advisory Officer on 28 February 1983.

STATE DEVELOPMENT BANK

26. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Agriculture: Does the Minister support the Liberal Party policy of establishing a State Development Bank for the purpose of financially assisting young persons into primary producing and associated businesses and, if not, what form of assistance does the Government propose for these young potential farmers and business persons?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Government's proposals for setting up institutions and procedures for the purpose of financially assisting young persons into primary producing and associated businesses are set out fully in the election policy statements. I refer the honourable member to them.

M.V. TROUBRIDGE

27. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Agriculture: Does the Minister support the Liberal Party policy of 'not unduly disadvantaging country people because of their geographic location in South Australia' and, if so, will he support maintaining the current schedule of M.V. *Troubridge* space rates until they are consistent with mainland rail space rates over comparable distances and index them thereafter in the interests of parity between Kangaroo Island and mainland primary producers?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: A full investigation by departmental officers has been instigated into the operations of the M.V. *Troubridge* which will include the question of tariffs. The Government will determine its policy when that report is to hand.

SAMCOR

28. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Agriculture: Does the Minister intend to keep Samcor's Port Lincoln meat works in operation and, if not, why not and, if so, how is it proposed to minimise the annual financial losses at those works?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The continued operation of the works will be reviewed on a cost and benefit basis.

WOODS AND FORESTS

29. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Forests: Will continued assistance be given to local government to upgrade, maintain and, where appropriate, build forest roads in lieu of introducing a policy of council rating of Woods and Forests land in South Australia?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Government does not propose to introduce a policy of council rating of Woods and Forests land in South Australia. Existing arrangements for assistance to local government with respect to forest roads will continue.

WOODS AND FORESTS

30. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Forests: Does the Minister agree that it is in the interests of all Woods and Forests organisations for them to discuss their problems with both the Government and Opposition and, if not, why not?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: All private woods and forestry organisations are free to discuss their problems with whom they like.

LOG HAULIERS

31. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Forests: Will the Minister give paramount regard for South-Eastern based log hauliers when issuing contracts by tender for all new work during the Government's term in office and, if not, what is his policy with regard to the allocation of future new log haulage work in the South-East forest region?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: All tenders will be considered in light of the appropriate Acts of Parliament and Government policy.

FIRE BREAKS

32. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: Will a programme of controlled strip burning be introduced in national parks throughout South Australia and if not, how is it intended to adequately protect the parks, wildlife and adjoining neighbours from the ravages of summer fire outbreaks in the absence of such strip burnt breaks?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The National Parks and Wildlife Service is progressively implementing a programme of controlled burning in national parks reserves throughout South Australia. Such burns were completed in appropriate sections of four conservation parks prior to this fire season. The question of controlled burning in national parks is a contentious one, and the National Parks and Wildlife Service

has therefore published a Fire Management Policy Guideline Manual which is being made available to local authorities, environmentalists and the Country Fire Services. A copy of that document is available in the Parliamentary Library.

Initially, most prescribed fuel reduction burning will be restricted to perimeters and along access tracks. Such burns will be carried out with a frequency which will be determined according to the ecosystems protected in each park. Due to limitations upon its resources, the service will be reliant upon the assistance of local C.F.S. units to expand and maintain this programme. With this mind, discussions are currently being held between the C.F.S. and the N.P.W.S. to organise activities in the coming cooler months.

NATIVE FLORA RESERVES

33. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: Will land previously developed for pasture, currently surplus to Government nature flora reserves, be disposed of where that land is identified as suitable for cultivation and/or stock grazing?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: No.

RURAL REPRESENTATIVES

34. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: Will the present practice be maintained of appointing rural representatives on all authorities responsible for planning in rural regions of the State including existing authorities without such a representative?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Where appropriate, the principle and practice of appointing rural representatives to relevant planning authorities will be upheld. The Planning Act provides specifically for one member of the Advisory Committee on Planning to be a person with wide experience in rural affairs. If it is considered that there are other existing authorities responsible for planning in rural regions of the State without appropriate representation, advice of such bodies would be appreciated.

ON-FARM TRAINING SCHOOLS

35. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: In which districts is it intended to establish on-farm training schools during 1982-83 and 1983-84?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: In 1982 the On-Farm Teaching Scheme was offered in Eyre Peninsula, the Riverland and the Mallee. Schemes will continue to be offered in these locations in 1983. New schemes are to commence in 1983 centred at Bordertown and Jamestown; the organisation for these schemes has been almost completed. It is intended to commence a scheme in the middle of 1983 on Yorke Peninsula and a pastoral training scheme with an on-farm type structure will be offered in the north of the State. Schemes will be offered in all the locations mentioned in 1984. During 1983 consideration will be given to what expansion of the scheme could take place in 1984.

PLANNING CO-ORDINATOR

36. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: What does the Government see as the role of the Planning Co-ordinator?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Monitor problems experienced by applicants and by planning authorities in relation to the operation of development control throughout the State, and advise the Director of the Development Management Division of the Department of Environment and Planning of any desirable changes to the Planning Act, 1982, or regulations thereunder suggested by these problems.

Provide advice to the abovementioned Director, to councils and to applicants, as appropriate, in relation to the provisions of the Planning Act, 1982, and regulations thereunder, with particular reference to securing expeditious decision-making on development applications.

Undertake research to identify ways in which the development control system may be further simplified and streamlined.

Provide advice and assistance to the Planning Act Review Committee established to review operation of the Planning Act and associated regulations.

NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

37. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to retain the consultative committees established to assist with appropriate liaison between officers of the National Parks and Wildlife Service and the community?

2. What does the Government see as the role of these consultative committees?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. To encourage liaison between the local community and the National Parks and Wildlife Service; to provide a means for community input and support for the parks and reserves under the control of the Department of Environment and Planning; for management and other activities in the National Parks and Wildlife Service.

MONARTO ZOO

38. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: Has a programme been prepared for the staged development of the open range zoo at Monarto and, if so, what is that programme and when is it anticipated that the project will be completed?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: A programme has been prepared for the development of Stage I of the Monarto Open Range Zoo, which comprises a breeding and agistment area occupying 160 hectares of the south-east corner of the site.

Expected completion dates for key aspects of the programme are as follows:

Perimeter fences—early February 1983.

Internal fences—end of February 1983.

Renovation of Kalabar Homestead and hayshed—end of March 1983.

Animal Shelters and water points—mid April 1983.

Introduction of Animals—progressively from April until June 1983.

Appointment of Farm Manager—mid March 1983.

Completion of First Draft Overall Plan—by end of February 1983.

Comprehensive Tree Planting Programme—May to August 1983.

Until a draft plan for the whole park has been agreed upon, costed and staged, no overall programme for the zoological park as a whole can be produced.

However, the Government has given the project its full co-operation and is keen to see completion as quickly as

possible commensurate with availability of funds. This support is evidenced by the Government's action, upon taking office, to immediately agree to transfer responsibility for the whole 1 018 hectares of the zoo site to the Minister for Environment and Planning area.

BEER BOTTLES

39. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: Is it Government policy to place a mandatory deposit on beer bottles and, if so, when is it intended to implement this policy?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: No.

ABORIGINAL RANGER TRAINING PROGRAMME

40. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: Will the Government support the establishment of an Aboriginal Ranger Training Programme within the National Parks and Wildlife Service and, if so, how will this programme be implemented and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The Government intends to give its full support to the Park Management Training Programme proposed for the Gammon Ranges National Park, involving local Aborigines. Officers of the department have advised me that the Australian National Parks and Wildlife Service has recommended the appointment of a training officer who is scheduled to begin work on the park in early March this year. This officer has had significant experience in areas of Aboriginal education in the north of the State—he has also had initial involvement with the Adnjamathanha people in this role.

The South Australian National Parks and Wildlife Service has had discussions with the Federal Department of Employment and Industrial Relations which administers the National Employment Strategy for Aborigines. An interviewing panel is about to be set up involving that department, the National Parks and Wildlife Service and representatives from the Adnjamathanha tribe to interview prospective applicants for the Aboriginal training scheme. It is intended that four Aboriginal trainees be appointed. The National Employment Strategy for Aborigines will meet the wages and certain operating costs for the Aboriginal trainees. It is intended that the training programme be developed in consultation with Australian National Parks and Wildlife Service officers running a similar programme on the Kakadu National Park in the Northern Territory.

CLELAND CONSERVATION PARK

41. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: What new developments are planned for Cleland Conservation Park that were not being proceeded with under the previous Government?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Development at Cleland will proceed along the lines of those commenced by the Cleland Conservation Park Trust, and no major departure from that plan is envisaged at this stage. However, the Government may wish to change the developments priorities when it has had time to fully assess the situation.

PLANNING SYSTEM COMMITTEE

42. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning:

1. What are the names of the people selected to constitute a committee to review the new planning system and why was each chosen?

2. Will the Advisory Committee on Planning have any role to play in such a review, if so, what will that role be and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. The people appointed to the committee to review the implementation of the Planning Act are: Mr Jim Hullick—nominated as the representative of the Local Government Association. Mr Brian Turner—chosen as a member of the Royal Australian Planning Institute and because of his experience and standing in the profession. Mr Michael Bowering—chosen because of his experience in legal matters particularly as they relate to planning. Mr John Hodgson—a senior officer in the Department of Environment and Planning and Director of the Development Management Division, chosen because of his involvement in the preparation of the new planning system and detailed knowledge of its intent.

2. The Advisory Committee on Planning will have an on-going role to play in the implementation of the new planning system and in the review process. Directly, the Advisory Committee will be able to refer matters to the review committee as it sees fit. In addition, the Advisory Committee's Subcommittee on Procedures and Standards will be able to maintain an on-going watch over administrative procedures and difficulties associated with the implementation of the Act beyond the life of the Review Committee. The Review Committee has been asked for an initial report by the end of April 1983. It is anticipated that the committee will have a limited tenure.

URBAN LAND TRUST

43. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning:

1. What changes, if any, does the Government intend making to the structure or administration of the Urban Land Trust?

2. What role will the private sector play in the structure and administration of the trust?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. The matter is currently under consideration by the Government. In the meantime the Urban Land Trust will continue to function as in the recent past.

2. *vide* 1.

NATIONAL CONSERVATION STRATEGY

44. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: Does the Government support the National Conservation Strategy for Australia; if so, what involvement will it have in the further preparation of this strategy, and what steps will it take to develop a strategy for South Australia?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The Government supports the development of the National Conservation Strategy of Australia, and in this regard senior Government officers will be participating in a conference in February to discuss the strategy. The Government will await the final strategy before assessing the need for and the way in which a State strategy might be formulated.

HILLS FACE ZONE

45. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: What action will be

taken by this Government to implement, or otherwise reject, the recommendations of Judge Roder in the Supplementary Report of the Inquiry into the Boundary of the Hills Face Zone of the Metropolitan Planning Area?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: As the honourable member is aware, this is a complex matter and one which was inherited from the former Minister. It is intended, however, to deal with the matter expeditiously in order that those people who made supplementary submissions may have an answer as soon as possible.

SEMINAR ON COASTAL PROTECTION

46. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: Is it intended that a seminar be arranged to make the public more aware of coast protection matters and, if so, when, what form will the seminar take and who will be involved and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The reply is as follows: A seminar to discuss the role and philosophy of coastal management is to be held on 6 April 1983 in the A.M.P. Theatre at 7.30 p.m. Representatives of local government, members of Parliament and persons with particular interests in coastal management of the Adelaide metropolitan foreshore will be invited to attend.

PROMOTION OF SOUTH AUSTRALIAN WINE INDUSTRY

47. **The Hon. D.C. BROWN** (on notice) asked the Premier: Will the Government continue the effort and financial assistance provided by the previous Government over the last few years to promote South Australian wines in Asia, especially in Japan, Hong Kong and Singapore, and if so—

- (a) what financial assistance will be given during 1982-83;
- (b) how will this financial assistance be spent;
- (c) what other assistance will be given; and
- (d) will the Premier be personally involved and committed to the same extent of the previous Premier?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The reply is as follows: The South Australian Government recognises the effort, which has been made in conjunction with the local wine industry, to promote South Australian wines in Asia, particularly Japan, Hong Kong and Singapore. It will be the intention of the Government to continue its support of the wine industry in its efforts to achieve overseas successes. No firm decision has been made in relation to the amount of financial assistance or the method by which co-operation with the wine industry will be extended by the Government due to the fact that the Budget is currently under review.

SCHOOL BASED CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT STAFFING

48. **The Hon. M.M. WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Will primary schools be given a school based curriculum allocation of staff in 1983 and, if not, why not?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The reply is as follows: Staff for school based curriculum development and implementation is already provided as special needs staffing in some primary schools. The policy of this Government is to introduce in primary schools an allocation of staff for school based curriculum development for a three-year period on a

pro rata basis according to enrolment. This proposal is being developed by departmental officers for implementation as early as possible.

PRE-SCHOOL FACILITIES

49. **The Hon. M.M. WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: When and on what basis will the Government's election policy that pre-school facilities be extended so that all children can have access to four sessions of pre-school per week be implemented?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The reply is as follows: It is the Government's intent that within the next three financial years all pre-school children who are in the year immediately prior to entry into primary school will have access to a minimum of four sessions per week.

PRE-SCHOOL BUDGET OPERATING GRANTS

50. **The Hon. M.M. WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Will the Government index pre-school budget operating grants beginning with the first term of 1983 and, if not, why not?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The reply is as follows: It is Government policy to annually index according to cost of living increases the level of pre-school budget operating grants that existed at the time of the election. The next indexing will be done in Term III 1983. It is not proposed to supplement the partial indexation to these grants provided by the previous Government in Term III 1982.

KINDERGARTEN UNION

51. **The Hon. M.M. WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: In which year will the Government double the Special Services Section of the Kindergarten Union and what is the estimated cost of this initiative?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: In accordance with our policies, the Special Services Section of the Kindergarten Union will be doubled during the next three years and arrangements will be made to commence the expansion in the 1983-84 Budget.

SEAWINDS CENTRE

52. **The Hon. M.M. WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: When will the Government honour its promise to allocate an extra \$10 000 per year to the Seawinds Centre and what other pre-school centres catering for the disabled will receive assistance?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The promised allocation to the Seawinds Centre will be a part of the next Budget.

COUNTRY KINDERGARTENS

53. **The Hon. M.M. WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Has the Minister yet determined which off-site kindergartens wish to move onto school sites and, if not, why not?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I am in consultation with the Kindergarten Union and understand that at this stage kindergartens at Coomandook, Glencoe and Port Broughton have expressed interest in moving to school sites.

SCHOOL ASSISTANTS

54. **The Hon. M.M. WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Which personnel will carry out the review into the role of school assistants and when will it be completed?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The review into the role of school assistants will be carried out by appropriate officers of the Education Department. There will be consultation with the South Australian Institute of Teachers and the Public Service Association. It is anticipated that the review will be completed by the end of June 1983.

STAFFING FORMULAE

55. **The Hon. M.M. WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: When will the 12-month study involving all schools into the concepts of needs based staffing and funding be undertaken and who will carry it out?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: A review of staffing formulae, with a view to incorporate the concepts of needs based staffing, was commenced several months ago. This is being conducted by officers of the Personnel Directorate of the Education Department.

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

57. **The Hon. M.M. WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: When will the examination of the area of curriculum development occur and who will conduct it?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Curriculum Co-ordinating Committee is stepping up curriculum needs analysis in 1983. Every major curriculum area in primary schools is undergoing a substantial revision, with the review of secondary curriculum well into its advanced stages.

TEACHING STAFF

58. **The Hon. M.M. WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Of the 950 teaching staff to be redeployed over three years as enrolments decline—

- (a) how many will be used to effect reductions in class sizes;
- (b) how many will be used to improve non-contact time for teachers;
- (c) how many will be used to provide school-based curriculum support; and
- (d) how many are estimated to be principals and deputies?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: It is not possible to provide a detailed breakdown for the next three years into the particular categories listed in the member's question as there are a number of other areas in the Government's policies on education that relate to the deployment of teaching staff. All these will be addressed over the next three years; the actual deployment of teaching staff will be the subject of

consideration each year at budget time as more positions are notionally 'liberated' by declining enrolments.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HOUSING TRUST

59. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing:

1. What is the policy of the South Australian Housing Trust in relation to people moving from the city to country trust accommodation?

2. Are these people given priority over residents of a town who have applied for accommodation with the trust in that town?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The replies are as follows:

1. The Housing Trust will transfer city tenants to country towns on the basis that they await their turn for housing in line with new applicants for the particular area and house type required. Tenants of long standing are given the benefit of reduced waiting times when approved for a transfer.

2. Tenants seeking transfer from the city to country areas are given priority where there are strong medical, family or social reasons for the transfer. In order to assist local industries priority may also be given to city tenants who have been employed by a country industry or business concern which has requested housing assistance for employees who must move to the town.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HOUSING TRUST

60. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing—

1. How many applicants for South Australian Housing Trust accommodation are on the waiting list for Murray Bridge and Mount Barker, respectively?

2. What is the anticipated waiting period for the various classes of trust accommodation in Murray Bridge and Mount Barker, respectively?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The replies are as follows:

1. The number of applicants for South Australian Housing Trust accommodation is as follows:

Mount Barker: 133 applicants for family accommodation, 5 applicants for cottage flat accommodation.

Murray Bridge: 226 applicants for family accommodation, 43 applicants for cottage flat accommodation.

2. The waiting times for South Australian Housing Trust accommodation are as follows:

Mount Barker: Currently housing September 1981 applications. There are five applicants for cottage flats in Mount Barker. As there are no existing cottage flats in the town, waiting time is not applicable. However, the trust has commenced joint venture negotiations and this may ultimately result in cottage flat additions to the trust's rental stock in the town.

Murray Bridge: Waiting times are as follows:

- Single unit houses—currently housing December 1981 applications.
- Double unit houses—currently housing February 1982 applications.
- Cottage flats—currently housing December 1980 applications.