

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 16 August 1983

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

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make provision by Bill for defraying the salaries and other expenses of the several departments and public services of the Government of South Australia during the year ending on 30 June 1984.

PETITION: WATERLOO CORNER RUBBISH DISPOSAL

A petition signed by 24 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to prevent the establishment of a rubbish disposal depot in the Waterloo Corner area was presented by the Hon. Lynn Arnold.

Petition received.

PETITION: POLICE HANDGUNS

A petition signed by 107 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to reject any change in policy on the wearing of exposed handguns by the Police Force was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

PETITION: RUNAWAY CHILDREN

A petition signed by 775 residents of South Australia praying that the House support the establishment of an independent inquiry into the Department for Community Welfare's attitude to juveniles, particularly runaways, was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

PETITION: KANGAROO PRODUCTS

A petition signed by 82 residents of South Australia praying that the House support moves to ban the export of kangaroo products was presented by Mr Becker.

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*: Nos 2, 8 to 10, 22, 23, 25 to 28, 31, 34, 35, 38 and 46.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: LOW SECURITY PRISON

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

Leave granted.

The **Hon. G.F. KENEALLY**: I wish to advise the House that Cabinet yesterday, as a matter of some urgency, agreed

to the provision of a new low security prison in South Australia. It has been agreed that a proposal is to go forward to the Public Works Standing Committee. Our intention is to get minimum C division prisoners out of Yatala Labour Prison at the earliest opportunity. This is in line with the clear recommendations of the Swink Report into Yatala management.

Recommendation 5.2 of that report suggests we move minimum security C division inmates outside the prison perimeter. Mr Swink believed, and we concur, that the practice of housing minimum security prisoners inside the perimeter of a high security institution such as Yatala presents a number of problems. Moving C division inmates out is a major step towards our ultimate objective of making Yatala a high security prison. The Government is anxious to shift these people out as soon as possible. We have set a target for completion of the new prison by late December this year. The new institution will be established in the grounds next to the Women's Rehabilitation Centre, on Correctional Services land immediately east of Yatala. It will provide accommodation for up to 40 low security male prisoners in 10 four-person masonry units.

Also, there will be additions to the existing security fencing in the area. As well as prisoner accommodation, we intend to provide a visiting centre and staff recreation facilities. There will be an outdoor recreation area. As members appreciate, there have been severe pressures on Yatala accommodation after several serious fires this year, resulting in overcrowding and consequent increased potential for friction within the institution. Upon receiving a favourable report from the Public Works Standing Committee, tenders for the construction work will be let. However, tenders will be called as soon as the necessary documentation is completed, to enable work to begin at the earliest date.

I regard the decision by Cabinet to push ahead with this project with such a time table as immensely helpful in tackling problems that beset our prison system. I would hope that this decision by Cabinet will receive unanimous endorsement from all members of this House as a substantial and very constructive step forward.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: FOOTBALL PARK FLOODLIGHTS

The **Hon. J.W. SLATER (Minister of Recreation and Sport)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. J.W. SLATER**: As Minister of Recreation and Sport, it was with a great deal of satisfaction that I received the announcement last week that an amicable solution had been reached on the Football Park floodlighting issue. I would like to congratulate the parties involved, the South Australian National Football League and West Lakes Limited, for solving this matter with tolerance and understanding. There were times when it appeared that a solution could not be reached. However, it is pleasing that an agreement has now been reached in the interests of Australian rules football and the sporting public of South Australia.

I would also like to inform the House that the Premier and I held constructive discussions with the parties involved in an endeavour to assist in the dispute. I trust that those meetings were beneficial in the mutually accepted agreement that was reached last week. I believe that the West Lakes Residents Action Committee is in full support of the agreement, and this acceptance by the local community cannot be under-stated. The floodlighting by early next year will help Football Park to achieve maximum use and realise its full potential as a sporting and entertainment venue.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Labour, Department of—Report, 1982.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Food and Drugs Act, 1908-1981—Regulations—Exemptions.
- ii. Medical Practitioners Act, 1983—General Regulations, 1983.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Lottery and Gaming Act, 1936—Regulations—Draw Poker Machines.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Coober Pedy Progress and Miners' Association Incorporated—By-law No. 1—Motor Vehicles for Hire.
- ii. District Council of Mount Barker—By-law No. 28—Dogs.

QUESTION TIME

The SPEAKER: Before calling on questions, I advise that questions to the Minister of Community Welfare will be taken by the Premier.

WATER CHARGES

Mr OLSEN: Has the Minister of Water Resources received advice that water, sewerage, and irrigation rates will have to rise again this financial year as a result of the Government's decision to charge all departments and agencies a common public sector interest rate?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: In regard to increases in water rates I take it that the honourable member is referring to the general increase rather than irrigation charges: is that the correct interpretation?

Mr OLSEN: Have you received advice that there is to be another lot of increases as a result of the policy on common public sector interest rates?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: No, there is not to be a further increase. The increases that we have announced are in regard to the general increase in water rates for this year, which is 45 cents per kilolitre. I have also announced the increases for irrigation charges and drainage charges in regard to irrigation rates in Government irrigation areas, which is 28 per cent. It is not anticipated that there will be any further increases in those charges this financial year.

PAROLE LEGISLATION

Mr GROOM: Will the Chief Secretary report to the House his intention with regard to new parole legislation and its contents? An irresponsible statement was reported in today's *Advertiser* attributed to—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is debating the matter in his explanation: he must refrain from doing so.

Mr GROOM: I will try to give a qualitative assessment of that statement.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I did not hear that comment: it is probably lucky for the honourable member that I did not. The member for Hartley.

Mr GROOM: A statement appeared in today's *Advertiser* attributed to the member for Murray, as follows:

Prisoners seem to be running the prison system, and now the Minister wants them to run the parole system as well.

He also added that the proposed legislation was a complete sell-out to prisoners. Accordingly, will the Minister report to the House on the proposed parole legislation?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I was disappointed about the negative attitude of the Opposition (particularly that of the member for Murray and the Hon. Mr Griffin) in relation to the issue of the discussion paper. This was the only sour note in what was otherwise a very positive response. I acknowledge the role of the Opposition in its duty to oppose, but I believe that the emotive terms used in the *Advertiser* can only help to inflame what is now an extremely sensitive situation. Whilst I am sure that that was not the intent of the member for Murray when he made his statement, I point out to him that is very likely to be the result of such statements.

The discussion paper that I have issued highlights three areas. The first is that it places with the courts the responsibility of determining the length of time for which a prisoner will stay in prison. Whatever the legislation that Parliament brings down, the court will always have the power, and should always have the power, to determine the length of time a prisoner spends inside a prison. Currently some of that power and responsibility is vested in the Parole Board itself, and I have argued, as have many other people, that it should not be there. The discussion paper canvasses other options.

The second principle is the provision of certainty to prisoners when they are sentenced. Currently they have no real idea of how long they are likely to spend in prison. The discussion paper provides options to ensure that, when a person is sentenced, he has a reasonable security in the knowledge of the length of time that sentence will take.

The third principle is that, within the discussion paper, there is incentive for prisoners to behave within the prison so as to ensure remissions that are available to them. Failure to behave in prison will ensure that the prisoner will spend longer there, so it is within the capacity of the prisoner to determine whether he wants to spend in prison all of the non-parole period as assessed by the court, or whether he is eligible for remission. Honourable members should recall that the court itself will take into consideration non-parole periods and remission of non-parole periods when it applies the sentence. The court will always determine the minimum and maximum length of time a prisoner might spend in prison, having regard to the prisoner's personal actions within the prison.

I am most anxious to receive submissions prior to mid September from all concerned people in South Australia who have an interest in this matter. I would encourage Opposition members, if they felt so inclined, to make submissions. However, they may wish to wait until legislation is introduced into the House and debate the matter here; that is quite appropriate. If they felt inclined to make submissions, then I would welcome them. I point out that, in this discussion paper, we are not reinventing the wheel. All the provisions currently apply in other States of Australia, and in fact it is modelled on the Victorian legislation which was re-introduced into Victoria by the Hamer Liberal Government.

WATER CHARGES

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Will the Minister of Water Resources say (and this question is supplementary to that asked by the Leader of the Opposition) whether water, sewerage and irrigation rates will be increased further this financial year as a result of the Government's decision to charge all Government agencies a common public sector interest rate?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: On a point of order, Sir, it is my submission that the question is very similar to, if not the same as, the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I could not hear the last part of the point of order because of the interjections. Will the honourable Deputy Premier repeat the last two sentences?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I shall repeat it all, so that there can be no doubt. It would be my submission, in taking this point of order, that it appears that this question is very similar to, if not the same as, the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Minister's point of order raises the same sort of difficulty as was raised in the last Parliament and has been raised in this Parliament about Ministers' explanations and how far one can go. It is a very delicate line. My personal view is that I will certainly investigate the matter and bring down a considered report. If in any doubt at all, at an appropriate time on my feet, I will give the benefit of the doubt to the Opposition.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Despite the Premier's promise in his election speech that State charges would not be used as a form of back-door taxation, the Government already has increased water and sewerage charges by an average of 22 per cent this financial year and irrigation charges by 28 per cent. On 25 July Cabinet endorsed, in principle, new arrangements for the allocation of debt to Government agencies and for charging of interest. As a result, all Ministers were given a paper summarising proposals which had been developed for particular agencies for which they are responsible. In the case of the E. & W.S. Department, the paper states that the new arrangements for the payment of interest rates would add about \$12 000 000 to the department's debt servicing costs this financial year.

Of this, between \$6 000 000 and \$7 000 000 would relate to the debt of the metropolitan water works and sewers and this amount would, according to the paper, under normal charging procedures be passed on to metropolitan consumers of those services. The paper also said that the remainder of the increased debt servicing costs related to country water, sewerage and irrigation would be borne partly by increased charges. In view of the comments in the paper and the fact that the Premier proposes to implement these new arrangements from 1 September, what impact will these proposals have on water, sewerage and irrigation rates this financial year?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The answer to the question is 'No', as I answered the previous question: there is no likelihood of further charges in water this financial year other than those already announced by me a few weeks ago. That is the normal water charge of 45 cents a kilolitre and irrigation charges at an increase of 28 per cent. The answer is definitely 'No, there is no likelihood of any further increases this financial year'.

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the next question, I make one further comment in relation to the point of order. I am dealing now not with the point of order, as I am going to report on it, but from matters arising from it. It seems that this is agreed by everybody, as a matter of common sense, that supplementary questions are desirable if, in fact,

they are supplementary questions. However, I believe that it would be a matter of courtesy (and I am not prejudging the issue) in future, when there is a fine line area of doubt, if the Speaker were to be told in advance of the differentiation between the two questions. Honourable members would be quite certain that that information would be held in strictest confidence.

PUBLIC SERVICE PAY-ROLL

Mr WHITTEN: Has the Premier's attention been drawn to the statements by the Leader of the Opposition, made both in this House and to the media, that the Government has added 2 000 people to the Public Service pay-roll since November last year? If so, would he inform the House whether or not these claims are correct? My question is prompted by an article which appeared in the *Advertiser* on Saturday, headed 'P.S.A. tells Olsen to put up or shut up' and which states:

The Leader of the Opposition, Mr Olsen, has been told to 'put up or shut up' by the Public Service Association on his claims about rising public servant numbers. Mr Olsen said on Thursday Public Service numbers had risen by 2 000 in five months under the Bannon Government. He called for a freeze on Public Service jobs. The acting secretary of the P.S.A., Mr T.S. Adams, said Mr Olsen's comments were grossly misleading and mischievous.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have seen in the press the reports to which the honourable member has referred in his question. They are based on part of the speech made by the Leader during the Address in Reply debate. Among other things, he said in the debate that we were interfering in the Riverland cannery. I wonder whether the member for Chaffey would like to support his Leader in the request he made for the Government to cease its involvement there.

However, getting on to the question of claims about employment, I despair of members opposite learning how to use and interpret statistics, when we see statements like this. It is very much in line with the way in which the previous Premier constantly misused statistics. Certainly, they are Australian Bureau of Statistics figures. However, like his predecessor, he has fallen into the trap of making totally unseasonal comparisons.

It is not a question of comparing like with like, which is the first essential in attempting to reconcile statistics. In choosing to compare December with April, he has attempted to gloss over the fact that, in around November each year, a large number of contract staff, particularly teachers employed on a part-time basis, are taken off the employment statistics as their contracts expire. This artificially depresses employment levels until February, when the school year starts again. However, in that instance, there is no net increase.

The Leader could have chosen (and more accurately should have chosen) to compare bureau statistics from April 1982 to April 1983. If he had done that (whilst this is not a completely fool-proof method of comparison), at least it would have eradicated some of the seasonal factors which I have just mentioned and he would have seen a very small increase, well below that which occurred in Victoria, Western Australia and Queensland.

It is important to note that the A.B.S. definition of State Government employees includes not only administrative employees but also all other employees of Government bodies on services such as transport, factories, marketing authorities and public hospitals, which includes all employees of statutory authorities and public trading enterprises. Furthermore, the A.B.S. definition of employment includes full-time and part-time employment. Thus the statistics published by the A.B.S. show a far higher level of State Government employment than is indicated by those applying to the

normal definition of State Government employees, and by the more accurate indicator of levels of employment, which is the number of full-time equivalent employees.

The Government does not in any way apologise for its commitment to the public sector. We believe that, by maintaining public sector employment, we are making a direct contribution to the stimulation of our regional economy and ensuring that those services which Government must supply in order to retain the health of our economy are supplied to the level expected by the community. Indeed, in that we are responding to the sort of claims that are constantly being made on this by a number of members opposite. Our commitment at the last election was that we would maintain public sector employment at the levels that applied at 1 July 1982. As at 30 June this year, there had been a slight increase, but certainly much less than 1 per cent. To a large extent that increase relates to employment required to undertake the bushfire clean-up and salvage operations and to increased employment of teachers, an area in which we are under constant demand, of course.

My Government was left with massive financial problems and the inability to develop public sector enterprise, except in a most marginal way, until we get our financial house in order. The Leader's claims that we have added 2 000 to the pay-roll at a cost of \$45 000 000 are not only absurd but simply do not stand up to statistical analysis.

WATER CHARGES

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Does the Premier agree with the Minister of Water Resources that no further costs will be passed on to water consumers in South Australia as a result of the changed circumstances in relation to interest charges which the E. & W.S. Department is being asked to bear?

An honourable member: This financial year?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: This financial year. The information given to the House by the Minister of Water Resources does not line up with the endorsement of Cabinet, as I will detail to the House. That Cabinet document states:

An increase in the interest rate on that debt of the order proposed (roughly from the 10.9 per cent assumed by E. & W.S. in their budgeting as the average Treasury rate over 1983-84 to 12.4 per cent as the average common public sector rate) would add around \$12 000 000 to the E. & W.S. debt servicing costs compared with what they might have been in 1983-84. Around \$6 000 000 to \$7 000 000 of that additional interest bill would probably relate to the debt of the metropolitan water works and metropolitan sewers and would, under normal charging procedures, be passed on to metropolitan consumers of those services.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not know from which document the Deputy Leader is quoting but, if it is the Cabinet submission dealing with this general question raised by the Leader of the Opposition last week, then I would suggest that the Deputy Leader is simply highlighting the inadequacy of quoting from documents without full possession of the facts, the thinking behind them or the nature of the approval. That is fine: the Opposition is so overjoyed with the fact that it has a leaked document, a Cabinet minute, with all the appropriate annotations, that it is letting its enthusiasm carry it away a bit. The document does certainly explore the possible implications of a decision in principle which is taken by the Government, a decision in principle which I stress, as I stressed in relation to questions last week, is an extremely sound principle.

The Hon. Michael Wilson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The implications of that decision—how it will affect tariff rates charged by ETSA,

E. & W.S. and any other authority—while adverted to in that submission, are in no way finally concluded. It is not expected that that decision will affect the charges made by the E. & W.S. Department in the 1983-84 financial year. However, even if it did, let us get back to the principle involved. Let us relate it to something members opposite may possibly understand. Members know that the interest rate on housing loans rises and falls with the market, which means that at different times one is paying different rates of interest, and therefore the repayments one is making on the loan match the cost of that money in contemporary value.

I pose the question: why should public statutory authorities be exempt from some sort of impact from the market? Why should they be exempt in that way? The logic of it is that money which is raised by them through the Government loan-raising programme has to be raised at the time it is raised at current market rates. It is usually a better—a lower—rate than in the case of the general market, because the Government has particular advantages in terms of creditworthiness and the ability to raise loans. Nonetheless, there is no reason why those authorities should be subsidised indirectly in that hidden way.

If subsidies are to be given, they should be applied directly to the organisations. That is the principle that the Government has adopted. I think it is a sound one and, as I suggested last week in reply, a number of members opposite would probably support it. Indeed, there is one member opposite who has only recently left our midst, the former Premier, whom I might quote in aid in this matter. Former Premier Tonkin, dealing with the South Australian Government Financing Authority Bill, said on 1 September 1982:

The financial relations between the Government and some of its authorities are quite complex and often reflect decisions taken some time ago when circumstances were considerably different from what they are now. The relationships are in some cases such that it is difficult to see clearly the amount of Government financial assistance being currently provided to the activity concerned.

This occurs, for example, when such assistance is provided in an indirect way through interest rate concessions, and the like. This situation is inconsistent with our programme budget objectives and, in the Government's view, clearly needs to be approved.

The then Premier then goes on to explain what is being done in relation to SAGFA. There, quite clearly, is the principle under which the previous Government operated for three years. Now, they are turning on us, criticising us and saying that there is something fundamentally wrong in a decision which makes sound financial sense and one which we are quite happy to endorse. Those are the words of the Opposition's previous Leader.

If members opposite have thrown that policy out of the window and do not believe in the aspects of statutory authorities being identified in terms of their subsidy, let us know and we can debate the matter clearly. All this shock horror nonsense surrounding it is completely bogus and hypocritical, and I do not think it requires much more attention in this place.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There cannot be different rules for the Leader and the Deputy Leader and everybody else. I call each of them to order.

WINE TAX

Ms LENEHAN: Can the Premier assure the House that the South Australian Government has made strong representation to the Federal Government in respect to the proposed wine tax issue? I have recently been approached by both winegrowers and winemakers who live within my elec-

torate and other constituents expressing concern about the possible detrimental effects of such a tax on the South Australian economy and on employment in my area.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I thank the honourable member for her question. Certainly, we have made and are continuing to make very strong representations to the Federal Government over this issue, and I would anticipate the support of the Opposition in so doing as well. In February 1983 the now Federal Government announced in terms of its A.L.P. rural policy that a Federal Labor Government would not introduce a wine tax in the life of this Federal Parliament. We believe that the Federal Government should observe that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the honourable member for Alexandra to order. I call the honourable member for Coles to order. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Recently, as the honourable member has mentioned, there has been press speculation about the possibility of such a tax. I, along with all South Australians, am quite concerned about such speculation if it has some basis. I am not able to say, because I am not privy to the internal secrets of the Federal Budget, whether or not that speculation has basis. All I can say is that it is the attitude of my Government, very strongly expressed over all the period that we have been in office, that not only would a wine tax be detrimental to the industry generally but, in particular, it would have discriminatory and large effects on South Australia itself.

On 30 June at the Premiers' Conference I delivered to the Prime Minister in person (and also to a number of other senior Commonwealth Ministers and those who were participating in the conference) a submission very widely setting out South Australia's case against the wine tax. I have also written to the Prime Minister seeking his affirmation that this would represent the policy of his Government.

On 5 August the Prime Minister responded to me saying that he would not wish to comment on speculation about possible changes prior to presentation of the Budget to the Parliament. That is the position at the moment: it is only speculation. However, I would like to place very firmly on the record my Government's belief that a wine tax would be detrimental. Our submission has set out very clearly and concisely the reasons why it should not be imposed, and I call on all South Australians to assist us in our campaign against it.

STATE BUDGET

Mr BECKER: Can the Premier inform the House when the State Budget will be introduced and whether the document is currently with the Government Printer?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am not prepared to state the exact date of Budget presentation at this time. We have a target in mind, but it will depend on a number of factors, including the presentation of the Federal Budget, which is listed for 23 August, and any possible changes or implications which may arise from that. As the honourable member would be aware, in broad terms much of the budgetary work has been completed, although a number of matters require final determination. However, preparation is well advanced, and I would hope to be able to present the State Budget soon after the Federal Budget.

CHILDHOOD SERVICES

Mr MAYES: Will the Minister of Education say what steps the Government has taken to co-ordinate the provision of childhood services in South Australia in view of the disbanding of the Childhood Services Council?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Some months ago I answered a question in this House indicating that the Government was concerned about the number of reports that had been commissioned over the past two years concerning the early childhood services area and the fact that they had not yet been tied together in any co-ordinated approach, and that all that had really happened was that we had seen the demise of the Childhood Services Council and the creation of a few other bodies that had to operate in seemingly semi-isolation from each other.

The Government is very concerned about this matter and the Ministers of Health, Community Welfare and Education were charged by the Human Services Subcommittee of Cabinet to look at some way of resolving the issue. Cabinet has now approved the decision to appoint Ms Marie Coleman as a consultant to investigate this area, her job being to look at all the previous reports undertaken and to try to tie them together to find out what the best model will be for the early childhood services area, looking at pre-school and child care.

A number of reports that we have should be taken into account in such a proposal. There is the report of Children's Services in Metropolitan Adelaide, 1981, the Review of the Administration of the Childhood Services Council, 1981 (otherwise known as the Burdett Report), the Review of the Kindergarten Union of South Australia, 1982 (the Lees Report), the Toy Libraries Report, 1982, Children's Services in Australia—the State of Play (a review of Commonwealth and State policies), 1982, and also the Towards a National Child Care Policy, 1983 report.

All of those reports make recommendations which we believe should be tied together. We believe that the model that we presently have of, among other things, the Early Childhood Services Education Advisory Committee, responsible to me as Minister, and the Community Welfare Advisory Committee on early childhood matters, responsible to my colleague the Minister of Community Welfare, is not giving us the best service. This is not because of the people involved in those committees (in fact, I commend them for the work they do) but because they must operate in semi-isolation from each other. The exact details of Ms Coleman's duties will be announced in the coming days, and it is hoped that we will have a report back within a very short period.

WITHHOLDING TAX

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Is the Minister of Public Works aware that the 10 per cent withholding tax of the Federal Government will cause severe liquidity problems and administrative difficulties and cause a sharp rise in building costs for the building and construction industry? Will the Minister ask his Federal Labor Party colleagues, particularly Mr Hawke and Mr Dawkins, to have the operation of the tax deferred for at least three months and to have a complete review undertaken of the operating procedures?

On 1 September a 10 per cent withholding tax will apply to the building and construction industry, the transport industry and the cleaning industry. I understand that the Australian Taxation Office has sent out something like 30 000 letters to people who would be affected in South Australia by that 10 per cent withholding tax. I also understand that so far a very small number of applications for either vari-

ations to or exemptions from that tax have been returned to the Australian Taxation Office. I have received complaints from the building industry that it is extremely difficult to fill out the appropriate seven-page form with detailed financial information in order to obtain an exemption from that tax.

A spokesman for the building industry has indicated that it will substantially increase the cost of Government tenders, and hence it will have an effect on the amount of building work that can be achieved in South Australia. In addition, I understand that it will cause significant administrative problems within the Public Buildings Department, where about 3 000 tenders are let in any one year. For the sake of the entire building industry, as well as the transport and cleaning industries, I ask the Deputy Premier to make sure that his Federal colleagues do not proceed with that tax in the way in which they are proposing. I stress that none of us would want to stop the Federal Government from bringing those people engaged in the cash economy under the principle of taxation.

The SPEAKER: Order! While I can appreciate that the honourable member might like to elaborate on that matter, clearly the explanation has now become not merely a controversial series of statements but also a speech on another matter. I withdraw leave.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I am aware that certain complaints have been lodged with the Public Buildings Department, although I am not sure of the number. We should understand from the beginning that this is an attempt to discipline people who are dodging their responsibility to pay tax. I think that it was the member's own Party that introduced this tax, and it has been accepted by the Federal Labor Government. I do not know whether the honourable member is supporting the right of people to evade paying tax: I would hope that he is not.

I received a report last week from the Public Buildings Department that it would be necessary to employ six or seven more people in order to facilitate the machinery required to examine all of these matters. In a later report I have been told that that it is not necessary now because there will be an exemption for State Government departments. This matter may have gone down the track too far: I do not know whether it has or not, but obviously the Government would not, in any circumstances, want to decrease the number of or interfere with the prospects of any building projects in South Australia: quite the reverse, as we want to encourage them.

The best that I can do to determine whether or not people are educated enough to fill in the forms and to meet the various complaints of the honourable member is to obtain a further detailed report from the Public Buildings Department. I have already received one and I am waiting for the second (which I have had verbally) as to what effects this matter will have on the building industry in South Australia. If the Government is able to suggest to the Federal Government anything to assist the building people in this State, it will do so, and if the honourable member has any ideas as to how that can be effected I shall be pleased to hear from him.

CORPORAL PUNISHMENT

Mr KLUNDER: As most members have recently received a circular from the Parent and Teacher Organisation Against Violence in Education, can the Minister of Education indicate what the present position is with regard to corporal punishment in South Australian schools, and what changes, if any, are envisaged?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The present situation in South Australia is almost exactly the same as it was before the recent election, with one principal difference. Corporal punishment is administered in South Australian schools by direction of the principal or deputy principal and that situation has not changed. However, as a result of much community concern on this matter, I have indicated that there should be some further work done and that a discussion paper should be designed to solicit community views. A wide range of parental and teacher opinion exists about what should happen in regard to corporal punishment. The department has done preliminary work on this matter and, within the past couple of weeks, has given me some information, but it is a matter of considerable difference of public opinion. Some parents support corporal punishment being maintained in schools, whilst others are totally opposed to any form of corporal punishment. It is a difficult situation for Government schools to operate in that climate and to decide on a policy that will be satisfactory to all concerned.

There seems to be another issue that we should consider, namely, why we have corporal punishment at all. The basic principle is to enable teachers to educate children in the classroom and to do so against the backlash of any child who may be causing a discipline problem: in other words, to enable teachers to control a discipline problem that may be undermining the educating of children in the classroom. That opens up the wider question of coping strategies available to teachers in the classroom in order to handle discipline problems. In some instances teachers are not able to cope as well as others, and that may be because they have not had the opportunity to learn coping strategies that may be appropriate in those situations. I will ask that the discussion paper address itself not only to corporal punishment but also to alternative coping strategies within the classroom.

The other point raised was the difference between the policy that previously operated and the one that now applies. I have indicated to the Director-General of Education that parents should have the right to say whether or not their child will be subjected to corporal punishment. Many schools in the State in a *de facto* sense use that principle, which is a very wise one within which to operate. Others have not formally accepted that principle in the past. I have indicated that parents should have the right to say whether or not their child is to be subjected to corporal punishment. However, they must respect the fact that, if they nominate to the school that it is not to use corporal punishment, the school will then have to use alternative discipline strategies in order to cope with problems that the child may create. Notwithstanding the issue of this discussion paper, that is a policy matter that had to be put in place at the earliest possible opportunity. Any further changes to corporal punishment policy will await the results of community discussion on this matter, after which we will know what the community thinks and know what we should be doing in various schools.

NON-GOVERNMENT SCHOOL FUNDING

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Does the Minister of Education support the policy, indeed the great principle, which has prevailed over many years in South Australia that every student attending non-government schools is entitled to a basic per capita grant expressed as a proportion of the cost of educating students at Government schools, and that additional moneys are then made available on a needs basis, or does the Minister support the policy of the Federal and Victorian A.L.P. Governments that the per capita grants should be gradually done away with and that future funding of non-government schools should be on a needs basis only?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: It looks as though I am about to send out a third copy of the Government's policy on education to the shadow Minister. That matter was spelt out in our policy and has been spelt out several times since. The policy of the State Government for non-government schools is that South Australia has a system of global funding and then a needs-based allocation to individual schools. The policy of the previous Government was to take up the global average from 23 per cent to 25 per cent of the per capita costs of the Government standard schools cost. Our policy was to maintain it at 23 per cent, and that is what we have done. We said that we wanted an extension of the needs-based principle in terms of allocating that 23 per cent. The honourable member has asked whether I supported the proposition that that per capita grant should be allocated as a matter of right to all schools.

That is not quite the situation at all. Because that 23 per cent (before the election of this Government) was allocated on needs, it was not previously allocated automatically on the basis of per capita right, because the best resource non-government schools were receiving only 85 per cent per capita of what the worst resource non-government schools were receiving. We have said that every non-government school (as we promised before the election) will receive some funding, but we want to extend the amount we allocate according to needs. For the 1984 academic year, Cabinet has accepted on an interim basis the proposals put to me by the non-government schools advisory committee that suggested a formula that extended from the 85 per cent figure, to which I have just referred, to a figure of about 75 per cent.

In the interim process we will be considering a further extension of that to apply in the 1985 academic year. However, there is no doubt that all non-government schools in South Australia which are registered schools will receive some State Government funding. Our policy provides for an extension of needs funding, not for the total basis of all funding on that premise.

METROPOLITAN RESERVOIRS

Mrs APPLEBY: Can the Minister of Water Resources advise whether any consideration is being given to metropolitan reservoirs and reservoir reserves being used for recreational activity and, if so, what reservoirs could be considered appropriate for public access and recreational use?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: This matter has been around for some time, but in July 1977 the then Government established a committee of inquiry under the chairmanship of Dr Melville to report on issues of public access and recreational use of reservoirs and reservoir reserves in South Australia. On the basis of that report, an interdepartmental committee was later established to develop a general management plan for recreational use of appropriate reservoirs and reserves. The findings and recommendations of that committee are contained in a report entitled 'Recreational Use of Reservoir Reserves.' I point out that that report was submitted to the previous Government, but no action was taken. A major aspect of that report was the proposal to use the South Para reservoir for several activities including sailing, rowing, fishing and canoeing. The estimated total capital cost of the South Para reservoir being used for such recreational purposes would have been about \$320 000, with an annual operating cost of \$150 000.

I think that it is important to draw to the honourable member's attention that the monitoring of water quality and environmental aspects must also be carefully considered. At times, such as last summer, the water level at the South

Para reservoir is particularly low. I do not believe that recreational activity should be allowed when levels are low, or at any time when there is a likelihood of any detectable deterioration of water quality. The matter is still under consideration, and I intend to make a submission to Cabinet soon. We must determine whether it is in the public interest to open up reservoirs for recreational activities.

CANEGRASS SWAMP ROAD

Mr INGERSON: Can the Minister for Environment and Planning advise the House of the Government's decision about the payment of any extra costs involved in the rerouting of the road at the Canegrass Swamp? This morning it was reported in the *Advertiser* that a possible rerouting would cost about \$500 000. It was also stated at the same time that a reported statement of the Minister was that the Government would not make any payment for this.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The position of the Government is that it does not believe that it is under any responsibility to make a compensation payment in this matter. In any event, no decision has been made on it. My understanding is that some negotiations will take place between the company and the people representing the Kokatha people before any decision is taken.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: But whatever it is—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: There is an existing road through what is claimed to be an Aboriginal anthropological site and the company believes it would be possible, even given that particular sites would be identified within this area, to be able to use the existing road as the basis for a road which would go through the area and which would be able to successfully circumvent any sites identified.

My understanding is that the Aborigines and their representatives now claim that in fact the whole area is the one site and not a series of sites, and in that circumstance there should be no activity on the road and, indeed, that road which is currently there should be abandoned as a road and the area allowed to regenerate to its natural condition. The Aborigines undertook to peg out a possible deviation road. When we talk about deviation we have to appreciate the fact that no additional distance is involved, although additional costs would almost certainly be involved because of the difficult nature of the terrain on either side of the swamp area, which in most places is a dry swamp. That has been done and the company has been considering the additional costs it might have to undertake.

No final decision has been made by the company as to what it will do about the matter. I believe perhaps we should wait and see what decision the company takes before the Government determines how best it can continue to assist the ongoing negotiations and the successful realisation of them.

ETSA SECURITY BONDS

Mr HAMILTON: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy advise whether there has been a significant increase in the number of requests by ETSA for security bonds from consumers, and, if so, what economic assistance is available from the trust to meet the needs of those consumers?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Yes, I can give some advice, because recently I have discussed this and related matters regarding the payment of accounts, the time taken to pay accounts, and so on, with both the Chairman of the board and the General Manager of ETSA. As I understood the answer to my questions, there has been no significant increase

in the requirement for bonds by ETSA, although there has been some increase. I think it is relevant to mention that this matter is often brought to the attention of members of Parliament by the needs of their constituents. Only recently the member for Price discussed with me the predicament of a constituent. He had made representations to ETSA on behalf of his constituent and had received accommodation in this regard.

The trust has a budgeting scheme whereby persons who might find difficulty in paying quarterly accounts, which often represent a significant sum to be paid at a given time, may pay in regular amounts, for example \$5 or \$8 a week, so that when an account falls due there is money available towards its payment.

However, this sometimes leads to disputation, and I think it fair to record that the member for Elizabeth drew to my attention earlier this year some rather Draconian statements appearing on notices sometimes sent to persons who have not paid electricity accounts on time. Whilst the notices are not directly issued by ETSA, they are sent out by a collection agency employed by ETSA for that purpose. When my attention was drawn to this notice, I took the matter up with the trust. I am happy to say that there was a ready understanding of the problem. The trust treated the matter with sympathy and humanity and I understand that those notices are no longer issued in that form.

INTEREST RATES

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Has the Minister of Water Resources, or have officers of his department, had discussions with Treasury officers in accordance with the Cabinet decision of 25 July to rearrange the interest rate repayment arrangements for Government departments? The Cabinet decision of 25 July endorsed in broad principle the proposals for debt and interest rate restructuring outlined in the Cabinet submission and the attachment to that submission.

The attachment referred specifically to the need for higher water, sewerage and irrigation charges to cover increased E. & W.S. Department debt servicing costs that will result from the new arrangements approved by Cabinet. The Cabinet decision also authorised Treasury officers to consult with agencies on the details of the proposals so that they could be brought into the 1983-84 Budget papers, with the aim of being implemented by 1 September 1983. I therefore ask the Minister whether he has or any of his officers have had those discussions with Treasury, because the *South Australian Government Gazette* of 7 July 1983 (page 17) set a fee by Cabinet decision to give a result in respect of the 1983-84 period which is at variance with the later Cabinet decision.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I have not had discussions with Treasury but my officers have sought information about this matter. I re-emphasise that water prices and charges are calculated on an annual basis and I have already announced those prices for the 1983-84 year. In answer to the question, there is no intention or likelihood of increasing charges for water or sewerage services in the 1983-84 financial year.

MEDICAL REPORTS

Mr FERGUSON: Will the Chief Secretary ask the Minister of Health whether there is any code of conduct for medical practice on the disclosure of patients' records? It has been put to me by one of my constituents that members of the work force visit industrial clinics, especially the Mile End industrial clinic, at the insistence of employers and some

State Government departments. Constituents have told me that their medical records have been discussed between treating doctors at these clinics and various employer and departmental representatives.

They have informed me that their records have been discussed without any reference to them or without their permission. It has been put to me that this practice of the transfer and discussion of medical records from industrial clinics without consultation with the people concerned is a gross breach of privacy. Would the Minister be prepared to investigate and make a statement on this practice?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: This is a matter, of course, that will need to be referred to the Minister of Health in another place. I am sure that he will investigate the circumstances outlined by the honourable member and provide a report in due course. I must say that the situation, as outlined by the honourable member, is a worrying one. One can understand why his constituents feel some need for a code of conduct. I think that every member of this House would hope that any medical practitioner would treat confidentially the information to which he is privy in relation to his patients and not provide it to people who should not have access to it. If there are, in fact, medical practitioners in South Australia who do contravene in this way, then I think that this matter ought to be researched and the appropriate action taken. So, I will refer this question to my colleague and have a report brought down as soon as possible.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: ADVERTISER REPORT

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a personal explanation. Leave granted.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I have been grossly misrepresented by the Minister for Environment and Planning in statements by the Minister reported in the *Advertiser* on 12 August. The Minister alleged, among other things, that because I was an enthusiastic proponent of the Roxby Downs project this had completely outweighed my role as Chairman of the select committee of this House which inquired into the indenture Bill and that as a result the present Government had inherited many difficulties in regard to the project. The Minister also alleged that the former State Government's desire for the project to proceed had led it to ignore ethnographical studies.

Mr Speaker, I reject each of these allegations, for the following reasons. The Minister was a member of the select committee to which he has referred. Following the tabling of its report in this House, the Minister said on 2 June:

I would want to compliment the Minister on the way in which he chaired the committee and his courtesy to all members and his endeavours to be as co-operative with us as he possibly could.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: We have the usual buffoonery which indicates some discomfiture, but I will continue. It is true that the Minister then went on to question whether Ministers should chair select committees. He raised this, however, as a matter of principle, based on his experience of other select committees as well as this one, rather than as any criticism of my role as chairman of this committee.

During the evidence which the select committee took, the Minister heard all the difficulties which had developed in communication between Roxby Management Services and the Kokatha Aborigines. The response of the company to those difficulties was explained at length to the committee. Every member of the committee was given full opportunity to question both the company representatives and the advis-

ers to the Kokatha who gave evidence. As a result of all the evidence, the report presented to this House by the Government members of the committee referred in some detail to communication between the company and the Kokatha, and recommended that, because the Kokatha had funds to employ an anthropologist to provide information on matters of significance to that community, the preparation of the environmental impact statement should proceed normally.

The Minister for Environment and Planning and his colleague on the committee, now the Minister of Mines and Energy, presented their own report to this House which did not refer at all to the Aboriginal question. Nor did they raise it in any way during further debate in this House on the indenture. They did not question comments of the Government members in relation to the protection of sacred sites. Subsequently, in October, the draft environmental impact statement for the project was released for public comment. In that statement the company said this in relation to the Kokatha people:

At the time of writing, a satisfactory basis for exchange of anthropological information was still being sought with the Kokatha People's Committee.

In the company's supplement to the draft environmental impact statement, presented to the present Government in April this year, difficulties with the Kokatha representatives were again referred to in the following terms:

Further discussions have failed to reach agreement in relation to the principles for the conduct of anthropological surveys and exchange of information. Consequently, Roxby Management Services has advised the South Australian Government and the Kokatha People's Committee that, in accordance with the guidelines, no further anthropological information can be included in the final e.i.s.

That situation notwithstanding, Mr Speaker, the present Government announced, on 28 June, that it had approved the environmental impact statement. In their joint statement announcing this decision, the Minister for Environment and Planning and the Minister of Mines and Energy made no reference to the many difficulties which the Minister for Environment and Planning now claims exist as a result of the policies of the former Government.

I refer now to other evidence given to the select committee which further completely disproves the Minister's suggestion that I neglected Aboriginal interests and over-rode the involvement of the Department of Environment during the former Government's dealings with this project. At page 188 of the evidence given to the committee, the Director-General of the department, Mr E.J. Phipps, said this in answer to a question from the present Minister of Mines and Energy:

I think the company has been most co-operative with us. The only instance where we were surprised was when we came across an Aboriginal site in the area of which we were not aware. The company drew our attention to that site very quickly to obtain our co-operation in assessing whether it was significant. If the company had not been alert the site could very easily have been damaged. There has been no instance in which the department has been displeased.

And Mr Madigan, then I believe Deputy Director-General of the department, said this at page 189 of the evidence:

It is the department's belief that the joint venturers have been diligent in reporting to us any sites or suspected sites that they have come across during their activities. We have investigated a site which has been significant and they have taken steps to see that the site is protected. Apart from that, there is nothing else of significance in the area that has been found. There are no historic reserves or prohibited areas in the area in question.

As well as expressing satisfaction with the work of the company—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will need to seek further leave if he wishes to continue.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I seek leave to complete the explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you, Mr Speaker, and I thank the House. As well as expressing satisfaction with the work of the company in relation to the protection of Aboriginal sites, the department also expressed satisfaction with its role in all environmental matters affecting the project. The department gave evidence that it had been involved in assessment of a whole range of matters for a number of years before Roxby Management Services decided to advance the project to its present stage. For example, in December 1979, the department issued draft guidelines for preparation of the e.i.s.; in April 1980, it completed an evaluation declaration of environmental factors; in November 1980, evaluation for the declaration of environmental factors for the road from Olympic Dam to Purple Downs; in March 1981, an evaluation for the declaration of environmental factors for the road from Purple Downs to Phillip Downs; in November 1981, evaluation of a proposal for the development of a storage area; in February 1982, evaluation and approval of the programme for treatment and transportation of the ore from the exploration stage; and in March 1982, evaluation and approval of an extension to the ore storage area.

Mr Speaker, all of this information demonstrates clearly that the Minister's statement as reported in the *Advertiser* last Friday had no foundation whatsoever in fact. The Minister's department was entirely satisfied with its own involvement in assessing the environmental impact of the project, and with the work of Roxby Management Services in meeting any requirements relating to environmental impact and the protection of sites of significance to Aborigines. The evidence is on the public record. The Minister heard that evidence. His statement last week is condemned not only by his own silence at the time this indenture was before this House, but in the subsequent approvals which his own Government has given to the project. It is clear that the Minister is now under strong pressure from interests which want to see this project stopped.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable gentleman is now clearly debating the matter and doing so in a controversial fashion. That is out of order. I must ask the member to come to order.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will leave that out. At your direction, Sir, I will leave out that section of the statement. The Minister is weak and he has resorted to the traditional ally of the weak—misrepresentation.

The SPEAKER: Order! Having been given one direction, the honourable member has then defied the direction. Unless he immediately gets back to the straight and narrow path, I will withdraw leave.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will have to leave that bit out, and I think the next bit, too. The House needs to be clear that the current difficulties which have arisen at Roxby Downs have only one cause: the total and consistent refusal of advisers to the Kokatha Aborigines to co-operate in the preparation of the environmental impact statement. The former Government gave Aboriginal groups every possible opportunity to present views about the significance of sites in the area of the Roxby Downs development. Other Aboriginal groups with interests in the area have co-operated in a way which has been rejected by the Kokatha advisers.

In these circumstances, the present Government has a clear responsibility to ensure that this project proceeds under the terms laid down in the indenture. The publication and assessment of the environmental impact statement gave the Kokatha advisers every opportunity to make available information in relation to any sites of significance to that community. I totally reject the Minister's imputation regarding my chairmanship of the select committee, and his distortion of the facts.

Also, the convenient leaking at this time of two documents, a letter from the former Premier to Western Mining Corporation, and also an unrelated Cabinet document, have been the subject of gross misrepresentation by those who seek to impute to the former Government blame that is not there. As I have said, that cannot be attributed directly to the Minister, but it has compounded and added weight to the complete falsehoods that the Minister has been promoting.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

Standing Orders having been suspended, the Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to apply out of Consolidated Account the sum of \$375 000 000 for the Public Service of the State for the financial year ending 30 June 1984. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides \$375 000 000 to enable the Public Service to carry out its normal functions until assent to the Appropriation Bill is received. Members will recall that it is usual for the Government to introduce two Supply Bills each year. The earlier Bill was for \$320 000 000, and was designed to cover expenditure for about the first two months of the year.

The Bill now before the House is for \$375 000 000, which is expected to be sufficient to cover expenditure until early November, by which time debate on the Appropriation Bill is expected to be complete and assent received. I commend the Bill to the House. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the issue and application of up to \$375 000 000. Clause 3 imposes limitations on the issue and application of this amount.

Mr OLSEN secured the adjournment of the debate.

At 3.25 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 9 August. Page 83.)

Mr WHITTEN (Price): I support the motion so ably moved by the member for Unley and seconded by the member for Henley Beach, and congratulate them for their contributions. I am sure that those who listened intently to them, as I did, would agree with me. I also compliment the member for Albert Park for his contribution.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: And the member for Bragg.

Mr WHITTEN: I will be magnanimous at this time, and congratulate all members for their contributions, including the member for Bragg, who made his maiden speech in this debate. I join with the Governor in expressing my regret at the passing of the late John Coumbe. Although he was a Liberal, in many ways he was unlike Liberal Ministers of Labour who have followed him. The late John Coumbe was a man with whom I had many dealings whilst he was Minister of Labour from 1968 to 1970. He was a humane person, and a man who understood the industrial movement. He also had a great feeling for apprentices. People from the trade union movement who went to John Coumbe seeking to improve the conditions of apprentices received a good

hearing. If he was able to assist them, he did so. I cannot say the same thing about the honourable member who just interjected in regard to the time when he was Minister of Labour: he was a totally different person. His term of office was during the short time when the Labor Party was in Opposition (although it was only three years it seemed like 13), and he was totally different to John Coumbe. I do not wish to say any more on that score, except to say that I regret the passing of the late John Coumbe. I am sure that the member for Torrens would join with me in that sentiment, because John Coumbe ably represented the district of Torrens. I am sure that the present member endeavours to follow in his footsteps.

I particularly want to pay a tribute to the Government for what it has done for Port Adelaide during the short time it has been in office. Members who take an interest in Port Adelaide would know that just over 12 months ago things were to happen in Port Adelaide that would have been a continuation of plans of the previous Labor Government but, unfortunately, some of those projects were cancelled. One in particular was the court complex, and also the police complex to be built on the old Port Dock station site. Conditions under which the police work at Port Adelaide are intolerable. I believe that in about July 1982 the then Deputy Premier told them that in regard to the police complex they would not get anything done at Port Adelaide for six years. However, the complex is necessary. I do not know when the present Government will be able to do the necessary work, because of the severe financial constraints that now exist, brought about largely by the mismanagement of the previous Government that occurred over the past three and a half years.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: Absolute rubbish, and you know it!

Mr WHITTEN: The member for Alexandra might wish to interject in such a manner, but I wish he would have a talk to some of the people whom he represents on Kangaroo Island.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: Only when you are talking rubbish.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Alexandra is out of order.

Mr WHITTEN: Thank you very much, Mr Deputy Speaker.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WHITTEN: The member for Alexandra says that he interjects only when he considers that rubbish is evident: I wish that he would talk to some of his constituents on Kangaroo Island in regard to their talking about blockading Port Adelaide. I believe that one of his great supporters, Mr Nigel Buick, has already been told by seamen on the *Troubridge* that, if he wishes to continue with the rubbish that he is talking about blockading Port Adelaide and cares to put the *Lady Buick* right in the middle of the Port River where there is unrestricted speed on the *Troubridge* and, providing Nigel Buick himself is on the *Troubridge*, he can look after himself.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: That's a nasty thing to say.

Mr WHITTEN: I am relating what some of the people on the *Troubridge* have said.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: He lived at Port Adelaide for years. What are you talking about?

Mr Mathwin: He's one of your constituents. He probably voted for you.

Mr WHITTEN: He would never vote for me while—

The Hon. W.E. Chapman interjecting:

Mr WHITTEN: All he can do is channel money at election time into the interstate press supposedly as the author Nigel

Buick, but in actual fact as a mouthpiece for the Liberal Party of Australia.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: He's a great citizen, and you know it.

Mr WHITTEN: There are some other great citizens at present, particularly among Liberals in Queensland. It would not surprise me if in South Australia the National Country Party member, who now sits over there with the Opposition—

Mr Lewis: 'Country' has gone; it's all National.

Mr WHITTEN: Gone, all right! It went in the last three years with the Liberals, that is where the country went. What I intended to say was that it would not be surprising if an attempt was made to form a minority Government involving one member (because that is what is happening in Queensland) with the concurrence of Liberals—Liberals who are afraid that they are going to lose their Ministerial salary. Mr Doumany—

Mr Trainer: Do nothing!

Mr WHITTEN: Do nothing, as the member for Ascot Park says. That is the sort of people who are in the Liberal Party. However, I do not want to be put off from what I intended to talk about. A couple of months ago the Premier of South Australia—

Members interjecting:

Mr WHITTEN: Mr Speaker, I will endeavour to speak over these inane interjections; I think I can do so without a great deal of trouble. Recently the Premier of South Australia came to Port Adelaide and told the business people there that, after three years of neglect and the cutting off of finance for Port Adelaide, \$1 400 000 would be made available to continue with the redevelopment of Port Adelaide, a project that was stopped by the previous Liberal Government. There is a very historic area in Port Adelaide regarded as the birthplace of South Australia.

Mr Mathwin: That's in Glenelg.

Mr WHITTEN: A fellow by the name of John Mathwin keeps interjecting. I thought that I would speak for approximately half an hour, but from the way he is going, I will be speaking for an hour.

Mr Lewis: I don't believe you can.

Mr WHITTEN: Don't you bet on it.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: What were you going to talk about?

Mr WHITTEN: If the member for Alexandra wishes to have a fight across the Chamber, that is all right by me. If he wishes to go outside and have another fight, that is still all right by me. I do not run away from these sorts of things.

Mr Mathwin: The Bays had a good win on Saturday.

Mr WHITTEN: I do not want to be put off about my football team, either. Last night an article in the *News* showed that Port Adelaide has been responsible for every record set at Football Park, with the exception of the lowest score. My football team, on which the honourable member wants to bait me, is not doing a bad job. The statistically minded will be interested in some of the records at Football Park: the biggest crowd for a full minor round in 1981 was 35 213. Which teams played on that occasion? Norwood versus Port Adelaide, when Port Adelaide won! The highest score at Football Park was kicked by Port Adelaide in 1980—37 goals 21 points. The biggest winning score was 161 points, by Port Adelaide. In 1978, the highest score in any game at Football Park was recorded—325 points.

Mr Mathwin: That's in the past—in the good old days.

Mr WHITTEN: Unfortunately, the honourable member may be right, as far as this year is concerned. However, I assure members that the team supported by the member for Glenelg will not be anywhere, either. Let me talk about what will happen in Port Adelaide. A maritime museum will be developed in the old bond store as an adjunct to

Weman's sail loft. The establishment of a maritime park is expected to be funded by the Commonwealth Government. There are three ports in Australia in the running for the maritime park: one is Sydney, another is Hobart and the other is Port Adelaide. The maritime park will provide an opportunity to preserve some of the history of our State. Already the *Fearless* steam tug has been floated into a channel which will become part of the maritime park. Also at Port Adelaide is the tug *Yelta*, which will be used as a tourist attraction. This all involves the maritime park, but the great thing about it is that it will be coming out of Commonwealth money, and it will help Port Adelaide.

As to the State's contribution, the museum is extremely necessary. So many of the artifacts and documents involving the heritage of Port Adelaide are stored all over the place and, as no attempt has ever been made to store them properly, many of them are deteriorating. I point out that Keith LeLeu has set up his own museum and spent a lot of money (practically all his wages) preserving the history of Port Adelaide. I pay a great tribute to Keith LeLeu. However, his collection and other collections could be stored in a museum using a facility such as the one we have now in the old bond store. The old bond store itself is a building well worth preserving; it was the first bond store at Port Adelaide. It is getting close to 150 years old and is a magnificent old building which, with money spent on it, could be restored and be of great use in Port Adelaide. Local business people now have some sort of confidence and are spending a lot of money on restoring old Port Adelaide buildings that have been decaying and neglected. With the knowledge that we now have a Government that is interested in South Australia and prepared to put some money there, people in private enterprise are now also spending money and providing employment through the incentive provided by this Government.

The other matter to which I refer in regard to Port Adelaide is the attitude shown and the help given by the Housing Trust. For a long time, before the redevelopment of Port Adelaide occurred, many of the old houses were deteriorating to such an extent that they were uninhabitable. However, the Housing Trust bought some of the old houses, and has restored them. Those that were beyond restoring were acquired and demolished, and new houses were built on the sites.

All the people in Port Adelaide who lived in the old houses were told that they did not have to leave the Port and that they would be rehoused when the new houses were built. Nothing is more soul destroying or upsetting for old people, who have lived in an area for many years, to be told that their house is to go as it is not up to the required standard, and that they have to live elsewhere. Even if they are adequately housed elsewhere, people are upset and their lives are shortened. I commend the Housing Trust and the Government for the money they have spent in Port Adelaide to enable people to remain at the Port.

Also, I commend private enterprise, particularly the Adelaide Brighton Cement Company, which realises that it owes the wealth of its company to many workers of Port Adelaide. In conjunction with the Housing Trust, it has provided money to enable four cottages to be built in Port Adelaide for retired employees or widows of retired employees of that company. Those people are happy and enjoy a low rental, and will be able to live out their years in some comfort without any problem or worry that at some time they will be thrown out or have to leave Port Adelaide. I commend the Adelaide Brighton Cement Company and the Housing Trust on the way they have worked together.

Mr Mathwin: What about the Myer redevelopment at Queenstown?

Mr WHITTEN: I am pleased that the Queenstown site will now be built on. It will go back to what it was originally and will be used for the housing of people. It will, in fact, be better than it was originally, as three building companies now have that land. Houses built there will be close to the Port and to transport: it is an ideal site for housing. I hope that some of the necessary facilities that go with a new housing estate will be available. I am pleased to talk about what is happening on the Myer Queenstown site.

Mr Mathwin: Are you going to ask Myer to build a shopping centre there?

Mr WHITTEN: No. I have always opposed a shopping centre there, but I did want and still want Myer to build a departmental store in Port Adelaide, as I believe the land offered to it could be a viable proposition. I do not know whether we will get a departmental store, as there has been much growth (and money spent) at Arndale, Kilkenny, or Westfield Shopping Centre, as it is now known.

Millions of dollars have been spent on new facilities in that complex, which I believe will attract many people from between Kilkenny and the Queenstown site. With the extension of West Lakes, a departmental store would not be viable at Port Adelaide. However, I want and expect to see Target or some other discount-type store built on the vacant site. That will help the retail traders and the people of Port Adelaide.

Now that the member for Glenelg has me talking about shopping in reference to the Queenstown site, I can tell him that much has been done in Port Adelaide, particularly in what is now called the Old Port Market. Those who have not been down to the Old Port for some time, will be surprised if they visit the Old Port Market, with about 50 stalls and some excellent shops. From my discussions with the owners, it seems that in the main they are doing well. Close to the Old Port Market is a Coles store and people who read in an endeavour to find out what is happening will know that the Coles store in Port Adelaide, according to *Choice* magazine, has the cheapest prices of any store in Australia. People who shop at Coles will certainly then go to the Old Port Market and shop there. It has helped bring people back to the Port. The other development that will bring people back to shopping in the Port is the new Half-Case Warehouse being built. It is a large warehouse and I believe it will attract many more people.

I am concerned about the reduction in car parking facilities, particularly for all-day parking. People who used to park all day around that area will have to move out, and the land will have to be bought for the benefit of the shoppers and shop owners. Some restrictions will have to be put on the number of hours that people are allowed to park in that area. It will be great for Port Adelaide.

Mr Mathwin: You're not having one-armed bandits, are you?

Mr WHITTEN: The member for Glenelg should not bait me on that, as he knows my view on poker machines. I do not mind who knows it: I have always supported them. If poker machines were allowed only in sporting clubs, they would help make the clubs viable. However, I am a realist, and I do not think it will happen in South Australia during my lifetime. Sporting clubs have to get some extra money from somewhere to keep viable. In regard to tobacco advertising, we will not have the sporting events in South Australia or in Australia that we have had in the past. A couple of days ago it was stated that people who supported soccer were greatly upset because there will be no televised count for the Rothmans medal this year. It is the trend to knock tobacco. I know it is no good for anybody, but plenty of people use it. I do not think that the Benson and Hedges series, the Winfield Cup, and so many other events encourage people to smoke. I would never encourage anyone to smoke,

although I have smoked for more than 50 years. I will never knock it off unless I get a warning, like some other people have had, and get told by my doctor, 'If you don't give up smoking, don't come back to me as your doctor.'

Mr Mathwin: It is a sign of frustration.

Mr WHITTEN: Perhaps it is a sign of frustration for the member for Glenelg who has to listen to all the good things that the Government has done for the district of Price. The Labor Government has given the people of Port Adelaide much more confidence.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

Mr WHITTEN: Those people had no confidence whatsoever in the previous Government, particularly in the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. He made an interjection which I did not hear properly. More than 12 months ago he told police that they had no hope of getting a new complex in Port Adelaide for another five or six years or even longer.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: I think that you have got the wrong leak.

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! It is very difficult for the Chair to work out which member is making this speech with the interjections by the member for Glenelg.

Mr WHITTEN: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. Actually, the interjections do not worry me one iota, because I will merely treat them with the contempt they deserve, if I so wish. However, if they want me to answer the interjections and if you do not pull me up, Mr Deputy Speaker, I will answer them.

Another good thing that will happen soon in Port Adelaide is the establishment of a community health service. It is something that has been lacking. Members will recall that I expressed my concern that the previous Minister of Health had some idea that the special clinic at Port Adelaide may be closed. I saw some documents on this matter indicating that consideration had been given to the closing of the special clinic. Only two special clinics are in South Australia: one is at Port Adelaide and the other is at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. The one at Port Adelaide is open at hours making it accessible to people in the evening, whereas the Royal Adelaide Hospital special clinic closes at 5 p.m.

Perhaps another thing we might talk about is not only the possibility but the probability of the redevelopment on a grand scale of the Port River south of the Jervois Bridge. A large area has been bought by a private developer and the Housing Trust, and it is intended to build high-quality town houses right on the river where people can have their own marinas, lawn down to the sea front, and their own boats. There will be the same type of high-quality housing as there is at West Lakes Shore.

However, there will also be rental accommodation plus rental purchase accommodation. This will make a great mix for Port Adelaide. Some people will have sufficient finance to put a substantial deposit on and build high quality houses, and others are unfortunately some of the 27 000 or 28 000 people now waiting on the Housing Trust lists for rental accommodation. Altogether, \$20 000 000 will be spent on the redevelopment of this area. Some exciting things will happen, and I am pleased that I have been part of the Government that has committed itself to do this sort of thing.

I refer to the sporting facilities proposed for Port Adelaide, with a regional park. Much land has been reserved, and the Port Adelaide Rugby Club already has a good oval and an excellent clubroom. An area will be reserved for Australian Rules football, soccer, hockey—

Mr Mathwin: Lacrosse?

Mr WHITTEN: I am not sure about lacrosse. However, I hope that there will be lacrosse facilities, because I hope

that all sports will be catered for at this regional park, which will be used as a sporting area, because the more younger people who play sport, the less problems there will be, as there have been in recent times.

Whilst on the subject of sport, I am proud that in Port Adelaide we have the largest sporting and recreation centre in the State. That was established by the Labor Government in about 1979, when it purchased an old factory and show-room that belonged to Massey Ferguson. The Port Adelaide City Council and the Labor Government jointly bought that big factory and converted it into a sports and recreation centre.

Mr Mathwin: No Federal money?

Mr WHITTEN: Not that I am aware of. It was a joint venture of the council and the State Labor Government. I do not think that there was any Federal money. However, that is also a facility that has come about because of a sympathetic Labor Government. That facility has been well used not only as a sports and recreation centre but is also now being used extensively for police blue light discos, and they are doing a great job.

Mr Mathwin: Hear, hear!

Mr WHITTEN: However, without the assistance of the State Labor Government, Port Adelaide would have been neglected, because it has been traditional that Liberals will not spend money in strong Labor districts. This is unfortunate, because this State Government is prepared to spend money in other areas. I am sure that the member for Chaffey must be very happy.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: You have taken away the Berri bridge.

Mr WHITTEN: I have been reminded by the member for Chaffey, interjecting from out of his seat—

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: The money was committed. You took it away. You made an election undertaking, and so did Keneally. You know that.

Mr WHITTEN: The member for Chaffey would know full well that there is only a limited amount of money to be spent. However, this State Government is spending much money in Liberal areas, particularly in Chaffey. I refer to the rehabilitation of the irrigation scheme: let him say that he does not want money spent there.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: You have just terminated the salinity control programme for the benefit of South Australia, not for the irrigators in Chaffey.

Mr WHITTEN: I do not intend to answer that. If the member for Chaffey wants to go to Renmark—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Appleby): Order! The member for Chaffey will stop interjecting from out of his seat.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: I am holding the position for the Leader of the Opposition.

The ACTING SPEAKER: That is all right, but you will stop interjecting.

Mr WHITTEN: I should like the member for Chaffey to tell people at Ral Ral that he does not want money spent there. That is how it seems to me, because if he wanted that money spent there, he would say, 'Right, you are doing a good job up there.' I should think that his sour grapes concern the fact that he wanted it spent at Cobdogla first, and let the people at Ral Ral go wherever they wanted to go. I believe that the member for Chaffey is so upset because he expected it to be done at Cobdogla, which is quite a few miles from Renmark. The need at Renmark is much greater than is the need at Cobdogla. However, I wonder whether it is some personal incentive concerning who owns what in Cobdogla, Renmark, or Ral Ral. I am pleased, and I know that the member for Glenelg is pleased that it will go on at Ral Ral.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Price can continue his address without interjection from the member for Chaffey.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: I rise on a point of order, Madam Acting Speaker. I request that the member for Price deal with the facts and be honest in his statements.

The ACTING SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Mr WHITTEN: I have hit a sore spot. The member for Chaffey knows that what I am saying is the truth, and he does not like it. People at Ral Ral have given us evidence of the need for the rehabilitation of the Ral Ral irrigation areas. Let the member for Chaffey tell the people through the *Renmark Pioneer* that he does not want the work done at Ral Ral, but that he wants it done at Cobdogla. I was giving praise where praise is due. I have given praise to the State Labor Government, and I do not intend to answer any more of the inane interjections: I will treat them with the contempt they deserve.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: Speak the truth.

Mr WHITTEN: I do not like being told that I am not telling the truth. I am a truthful person. I always intend to speak the truth, and whilst I speak the truth—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! We will have less interjecting. Will the member for Price continue his speech.

Mr WHITTEN: In deference to you, Madam Acting Speaker, I will not continue with that part of my speech.

Mr Mathwin: Why don't you get back to Port Adelaide?

Mr WHITTEN: I am coming back to Port Adelaide. The State Labor Government is not the only body deserving of praise for what has been done in Port Adelaide. The project manager of the Port Adelaide development, Mr Hugh Davies, had doubts last year about whether or not he would have a job this time this year. With the injection of money from the State Labor Government his position has been assured, along with that of his assistant, Miss Terry Quinn. Those people have dedicated themselves over the past few years to the redevelopment of Port Adelaide, and they have done a wonderful job.

A community college was established in Port Adelaide during the life of the previous Government. At that time it was the only college in South Australia offering a course in maritime studies, which was very appropriate for a college at Port Adelaide. People at that college have told me that a maritime studies course is now offered at Port Lincoln. This became necessary because of the many fishermen who wished to become qualified but could not afford to travel to Port Adelaide in order to obtain the certificate. The present Labor Government saw fit to set up this course at Port Lincoln, and I am sure the member for Flinders, if he were present in the Chamber, would agree with me that the Labor Government has done well in providing a maritime study course at Port Lincoln as well as at Port Adelaide.

Mr Mathwin: It was a Liberal Government that gave you that college of further education, wasn't it?

Mr WHITTEN: I was being truthful and I said that it came into being during the life of the previous Government and I thank it for that; it is great, it was necessary because the old facilities were terrible.

Mr Mathwin: It cost a lot of money, too.

Mr WHITTEN: It cost about \$1 000 000, but you get nothing for nothing. I believe that the present Government is doing a lot for people, and that is what it was elected to do.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I support the motion, which has been moved on this occasion by the members for Unley and Henley Beach. I congratulate them on the honour that has been bestowed on them by their Party to undertake that particular role, and I also congratulate my colleague, the member for Bragg, on his first Address in

Reply speech. We have heard little from him yet because of the limited time he has been here, but I am quite sure that the House and the State of South Australia will benefit from his presence in this place as time goes by. He has already demonstrated that most ably by the manner in which he has addressed this House.

Whilst I congratulate those who have moved this motion, and it is natural for the motion to be supported, it is most unfortunate that the document to which they were referring is so light on in so many places. That is by no means a reflection on His Excellency the Governor who was pleased to open the Parliament, because it is the document that was handed to him that is such a grave disappointment. On the other side of the coin, I welcome the contribution that Sir Donald Dunstan and his wife, Lady Dunstan, have made to the South Australian scene, their very genuine interest in the activities of people in this State, and the manner in which they are applying themselves to the life of South Australia. I do not know that he always necessarily barracks for the right football team, but he has already identified himself with a broad cross section of the community by his involvement in that particular sport.

As has been indicated by other colleagues in this House, it is a disappointment to have to record the death of one who was so close a friend, the late John Coumbe. Due regard was given to that circumstance when this House moved a motion of condolence, which was subsequently passed on to his family, and although the days, weeks and months have gone by I know that his place on earth is sadly missed by many people to whom he was a genuine friend, as well as by many organisations not the least of which was the general education field to which he made a sizable commitment.

Mention is also made of the problems that beset South Australia in 1983 as a result of fire and flood. Much has been said about the effects of the drought, but it is a myth that the drought has ended. Whilst many areas of the State are having a magnificent season, we should not believe that that is necessarily the case throughout the whole State. Although rain about a fortnight ago has greatly improved the situation for people in the outer north-eastern areas and beyond Jamestown, there is still a long way to go.

I am not yet aware whether the rains that we have had during the past 24 hours have reached all of those places. If they have not, then the light benefit that these people received two weeks ago will have been for naught. It is only within the past two weeks that the people in the area of Morgan, which is in my district, have been able to cease carting water for the first time in two and a half years. That seems to be an impossible situation to those people who do not have to do other than turn on a tap to receive water. For people in the pastoral, semi-pastoral and some agricultural areas, it is an ever-present difficulty in the carrying out of their activities to know whether the necessary resources are going to be available to them.

It was most unfortunate that the E. & W.S. Department saw fit to advise those people who had been given a grant of special water rights to raise water from the Murray River in an endeavour to safeguard the balance of their flocks that the licences would be withdrawn on 30 June and that there would be no extensions. Notwithstanding the fact that there was a genuine drought and they had expended funds on pumping equipment, on the preparation of the pasture, and on the maintenance of those small but vital flocks, they were told that the licences would cease on 30 June. I believe that is another clear indication of the inhumanity that plays such an important part in our bureaucratic system.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: There had been heavy rain in Queensland.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Heavy rains fell in Queensland. The Darling was well on the way down. There was going to be an abundance of water available in a very short time, yet these people were told that there would be no continuance of that licence. The matter has been taken up with the Minister. I recognise that he is beholden to his officers to report back to him. Notwithstanding that it is now the middle of August and the cut-off point was 30 June, there still has not been an answer to that very urgent and important request. As I say, it is a matter which shows the inhumanity of (or is it an inability to want to understand?) the ramifications of the bureaucratic actions which occur in so many departments.

Much could be said about that in practically every department which exists. I highlighted one aspect of that sort of activity in this House in the grievance debate only last week when I mentioned the transportation of home units. Overnight, a company which had more than \$1 000 000 worth of orders for homes for people (and I stress that they were homes for people) was told that as from that day it would reroute the delivery of those houses, at a considerable additional cost and, that the prospective owners would pick up the tab. The Minister and his staff acted very quickly to overcome that difficulty. There would be no denial of the movement of those units until there has been adequate discussion with the industry and a period of time during which they will reorganise their contractual bases with their clients in a manner which will allow them to adjust to departmental requirements.

But to suddenly say to some 50 or 60 people who had entered into a contract for the delivery of a house on site at a given price, funds having been raised from the various financial institutions, knowing full well, as we do in this place, that there is not much leeway after the contract has been written, that these people were to be loaded at Murray Bridge with an additional \$500 to \$650 for the delivery of their homes was most unfair. That has been cleaned up. I do not want to say more about it at this juncture. But, I will say more about the bureaucratic jumble a little later in the points I want to raise.

Referring back to the flood and the fire, it will be known that a number of my constituents in Clare had the misfortune in that two-week period to suffer both disasters: the fire in the middle of February and, two weeks to the day later, the ravages of the flood. Those people, in the main, have been very happy with the assistance given to them by the various Government instrumentalities. There have been some delays and difficulties, and there are still a few loose ends to be sorted out, but I congratulate all those in the volunteer groups and those who in the departments undertook an additional work load to make sure that what assistance could be given was given to those people, not only in Clare but on the broader field. However, I highlight those people because of the doubly difficult situation in which they were involved.

The true spirit of the people who are affected by those adversities is, I believe, portrayed by the almost 80-year-old Mr John Hope, of Wolta Wolta, at Clare. That home, built in the 1840s, full of memorabilia associated with those early years of South Australian history, and freely made available to touring parties of people interested in our heritage and our history, was lost on that February day.

Fortunately for Mr Hope he had reinsured about 15 months previously. He has committed himself to the rebuilding of Wolta Wolta to as near as is possible to its original form. The original architectural drawings are still available, a contract has been let to local builders, and Wolta Wolta is being restored as a significant part of South Australia's heritage.

It will not be possible for Mr Hope or for anyone else to put into that restored building all of the treasures that were originally there. Certainly the sympathy and interest shown by a large number of people of like mind will mean that a number of articles will be placed in that home on extended loan, so that those who come later will be able to go through and see what a typical home of that era would have looked like. It will contain many implements, furniture and normal culinary utensils from the period. I take off my hat to the spirit of a person of that age who thinks so much of the future heritage aspects of this State that he would bother at this late stage in life to do that.

Much has been said about various aspects of finance and a great deal more will be said about that as time goes by. But I want to pick up one portion of a sentence which appears in paragraph 7 of His Excellency's address in which the Government, addressing itself to the funds which it must find, indicates that it is necessary to raise revenue 'to satisfy the demands placed upon Government by the community'. Those same demands have been made on every Government. They have been made not only in the State, but certainly in the Commonwealth field, interstate and overseas.

I genuinely believe that the time has come when Government needs to stand up and say that the demands have been too great and that, for the best interests of everybody, there is a time when it is necessary to say, 'No', or, 'No more', and when it is necessary to retract from a position which has become a matter of acceptance or a matter of expectation. I believe that the Hawke Government took one quite vital step in this direction in the mini Budget which it brought down earlier this year, and whilst it was not palatable it was at least a step in the right direction. I believe that Governments, no matter of what political persuasion, will need to address this sort of philosophy in the future if we are to survive as a credible State, nation and world before there is an internal riot or internal conflict because of the inability of the younger people and working people to pay for those continuing demands. The Hawke Government did seek to make quite definite change to the pay-out to people over 70 years of age.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Madam Acting Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I appreciate the fact that members of the Government have come in to listen to me praise the Prime Minister, Mr Hawke, and his Government for at least biting the cherry and saying that enough is enough in relation to the amount of money being handed out in welfare payments. I was highlighting the fact that to a degree that has been done in relation to funds being made available to people over 70 years of age. Whilst it is distasteful to some people, at least it is a starting point. I made my comments against the background of the fact that it was recently reported that some 15 years ago four people were in employment to sustain the value of a benefit being paid to one person by way of unemployment, sickness, age benefit, or whatever.

Today, one person on a pension is sustained by two working people and, with an increase in the age expectation of many people across Australia, in the not too distant future the section of people over 60 and 65 years of age will be a much more significant proportion of the population than at present. Obviously, unless we are able to restructure the whole economy and get the work force in employment, the number of workers associated with the provision of a benefit will be something less than two workers per beneficiary. That is where the danger lies. That situation has been experienced overseas, where at this moment there is a 'quiet' revolution of the people who are being called upon

to pay for the others. I am not suggesting for a moment that there should not be funds available for those who are in need, but this is a matter that requires a great deal of urgent consideration in the interests of a stable community.

Before turning my attention to the housing area, I wish to refer to various other matters. At paragraph 12 of his Speech the Governor stated:

For more than two decades South Australia has relied for its prosperity and growth on the manufacturing sector.

That is not disputed. Benefits accrued to South Australia due to the foresight of Tom Playford and those who lived during his era who were prepared to support him and accept his philosophies. During the last session I drew to the attention of the House during a grievance debate the problems that a manufacturing business in South Australia was experiencing in relation to the cost of labour for an hour's work.

Indeed, the member for Henley Beach, who is in the House at present, acknowledged the importance of the contribution being made and the difficulties arising as a result of our fast diminishing competitiveness. The honourable member requested copies of documentation that I had, details of which appear at pages 1264 to 1266 of *Hansard* of 5 May 1983. On that occasion I pointed out the very great difference that existed in regard to the per hour cost for a furniture tradesman's labour. I have a small table which defines only the hourly aspects of that contribution and which also refers to the number of hours worked annually in regard to the England, New Zealand and Australia scenes. It is purely statistical, and I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Figures applicable to March 1983 for a furniture tradesman

Country	Work Hour Cost \$	Annual Work Hours
Australia	9.00A	1 687
England—Union	6.35A	1 856
England—Non-union	6.21A	1 896
New Zealand	4.92A	1 832

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: This table will fortify some of the statements made on that previous occasion about the imbalance that exists. It picks up more particularly the fact that not only is there an imbalance in relation to dollars and cents for the cost of labour, but that there is a great imbalance in the number of hours worked in a year. For example, in England the hours worked per annum are up to 1896, and in New Zealand 1832, while here in Australia (and, in fact, the figures are taken out in respect to South Australia) the number of hours worked is 1687. There would be no difficulty if the rate of productivity was considerably greater during that period, but regrettably it is not.

I gave a warning on that previous occasion about a number of small businesses that are asking why they should continue in operation when they can send a pattern, for example, to New Zealand, have the work performed there, and have the end result transported back to Australia and put on to the market at a considerably lower cost than that which would apply if the product was manufactured here. On earlier occasions I have spoken about the motor vehicle industry and of the contribution made some years ago in the presence of the Hon. David McKee, at that stage the Minister of Industrial Affairs, by the then Sales Manager of General Motors-Holden's in Australia, when he indicated that we had had an export market for our Holden motor vehicles which had been doing very nicely until someone said, 'Send us the package, but leave out the transmission' (because the

transmission was going to be manufactured off shore). It was not very long before someone else said, 'Send us the package, and leave out not only the transmission but also the engine', the reason being that that was being manufactured off shore at a much more competitive cost. The difficulties that the motor vehicle industry has do not have to be spelt out. They have occurred not only because of lower-cost imports but also because of the availability overseas of vehicles cheaper than we can produce and export from Australia.

My colleague the shadow Minister of Education and the Minister have frequently mentioned that books being used within the education system are often not printed in Australia. They might have been written in South Australia or in Australia, they might have been accepted by the education system here and be part of the curriculum or the bibliography associated with our courses, but they are being printed in Hong Kong or Taiwan and brought back. This is restating the sort of problems which we all know exist. Unfortunately, many care to overlook the existence of those realities, and I wanted to make the point in relation to the claim of what the Government is doing.

I give my full support to the effort that the new State Director of Development will be undertaking on behalf of the Government. Hopefully, he will find some solutions, but the solutions that he finds will be only as good as is the preparedness of the Australian community to put in effort and to guarantee productivity which comes somewhere close to the sort of effort, cost structures and productivity which exist off shore, and which are having a disastrous effect on many of our manufacturing organisations.

The Government also referred to small businesses and their importance. My colleague the member for Bragg has had a great deal to say about the small business situation, which is not improved by the sort of activities which both State and Federal Governments continue to impose upon it. Whilst the members who now sit on the Government benches were very critical of the members who now sit on this side (when the members on this side were in Government) about increasing costs, they cannot hold the candle to the increases which their Government has imposed upon small businesses and which will increase if it undertakes the activities that it has publicly stated.

Referring again to the small furniture business of which I spoke earlier, the manager recently rang me and said that his company had an excellent workers compensation record. The amount called upon has never got within cooee of the annual premiums paid, but premiums in 1982 were 86 per cent higher than in 1981, and for 1983 are 50 per cent up on the premiums for 1982. There we have an 86 per cent increase, and a 50 per cent increase. Where do we stop? In addition, there is now the Federal tax on all transactions. If the company is subcontracting or having subcontract work done, it has to impose an additional work load because of the 10 per cent withholding tax which is to become effective from 1 September. Its council and water rates have gone up, its basic fuel supply (electricity) has gone up, and so it goes on, and on, and on. Whilst the Government might give lip service to what it is doing for small businesses, I say that it needs to do a lot more and to rationalise on the imposts, of which they are a part, and which are going to further reduce the employment capability of the people in this area of activity.

Earlier I mentioned that I would speak about housing. I draw to the attention of members of the House a booklet called 'Housing Trust in Focus', a publication which has been circulated by the South Australian Housing Trust, and which gives an excellent summary (in its 31 pages) of the services available from the trust. It sets out in a statistical

form some of the difficulties that the trust will have to meet and some of the changed circumstances of recent times. For example, in relation to the housing market (page 2) the document states:

In recent years the population of South Australia has been growing quite slowly. Between June 1976 and June 1982 the State population grew from 1 274 000 to 1 331 000, an average annual growth rate of 0.8 per cent per annum.

This is picked up in table 1, which is a statistical table, and I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Table 1: Population of South Australia

30 June	Population	30 June	Population
1976	1.274	1980	1.308
1977	1.286	1981	1.319
1978	1.297	1982	1.331
1979	1.301		

The same page, under the item, 'Housing Tenure', shows that in the 1981 census, 69.3 per cent of South Australian households owned or were purchasing their own houses, compared with 70.1 per cent in 1976. So, between 1976 and 1981, there was very little change (.8 per cent) in relation to the number of people who were either in or purchasing their own homes.

At a time when there is so much money available in the private sector for housing (it does not matter whether you go to a bank or a building society; it will acknowledge that it has more money than it knows what to do with), there is an ever-increasing demand for what is genuinely and sincerely known as welfare housing. I say 'genuinely and sincerely welfare housing' against the unfortunate quip made by the South Australian Minister of Housing earlier when he completely cut across the recognition of his own Premier that, no matter what one may like to call it that is less grating, it is still recognised on a Commonwealth basis as welfare housing.

Even though there is such a demand, and that there has been an increase at an astronomical rate, between 1981 and now, of the number of people wanting housing, and the tremendous amount of money available for housing, there is that lack of involvement by people who control the funds or who could make funds available for rental housing in the private sector to make that rental housing available. The dice has been loaded against the private owner in many instances. There is a real need for a return to a positive understanding that not only has a tenant rights, but that an owner has rights. There is an urgent need for a fine tuning of the tenancy law which acts as a distinctive disincentive to the private owner to make housing available.

I doubt that any members of this House could honestly say that they had never been contacted by owners indicating that a tenant had failed in the manner in which he had managed the property, such owners, after giving warnings about the legal requirements, having been forced into requesting the tenant to vacate the premises, only to find that that tenant eventually left the house in such an unsatisfactory condition that costly renovation was necessary. That has occurred on many occasions.

It may well be that it is a factor associated with the era in which we are living, the depression and the lack of interest shown by many people because they cannot find employment or see a future for themselves. At a time when that money is available and could be providing homes for people who genuinely need them, it is a great pity that the persons who would initiate that development find the laws of our land such a disincentive that it is not worth their while to do so.

A greater demand falls on the South Australian Housing Trust, and that builds up an even bigger backlog. Members on both sides of the House would appreciate the difficulty that that brings about in the trust's day-to-day activities. The present problem is compounded by the fact that the South Australian Housing Trust had large sums of money made available to it only in effect, not in a physical sense, as a result of the funds coming to South Australia in the wage pause. It has not implemented a number of these projects.

We had the rather unfortunate spectacle of the Prime Minister of Australia having to say to the States (including South Australia), 'Moneys have been made available to you for housing and for job creation schemes, and you have been sitting on both sums. Therefore, we will not let you have any more until you show us you are able to function and are able to make use of the funds which you have already received.' We in South Australia, through our Housing Trust, have suffered. I will not try to quantify it, as I am not in a position to do so. However, I know from people in the building industry, who have been builders for and on behalf of the Housing Trust, that they are still waiting for contracts which were originally expected to be put into effect in May of this year.

Also affected are a large number of suppliers of materials, including bricks, timber, tiles and many other components which go to make up the building requirements of a house. These suppliers are to be considered apart from the white-goods manufacturers and others who subsequently provide for the furnishing of those homes and who are sitting around twiddling their thumbs because the incentive that was available and the opportunities that existed to get on with a viable job have not eventuated. Apart from all the other things that this Government is undertaking, I hope it is seriously concerned and considering the requirement to make use of the funds which are available because people are screaming out for the end result.

That broad and general comment on the housing industry is fortified by the fact that the group of people estimating the number of homes that are likely to be built or commenced within a 12-month period have had to reduce that number in South Australia by a factor of several per cent, even this early in the financial year. One reason is the lack of action to which I referred a moment ago, another being the confusion which exists in the building industry generally about the form of building and a further reason being concern by those involved in artisan activity (which has proven most successful) about the 10 per cent withholding tax. These people are concerned about the imposition by the union movement of forced union membership of persons who are genuine self-employed subcontractors.

Recently we saw, in the district of either Ascot Park or Mitchell, Pioneer Homes being picketed, the subcontractors involved having been refused permission to go on to or continue on the site because someone wanted them to join a union and, halfway through the contract period, the cost of the project was to be increased.

We have a problem (to which I adverted recently) in relation to workers compensation, involving the utter confusion existing in many areas of the total building industry as to responsibility for workers compensation in respect of the contractor and subcontractor. Many organisations—be they primary contractors or the subcontractors seeking to obtain workers compensation covering their own activities—are finding it almost impossible (apart from the charge) to get an insurance company to undertake the insurance. Indeed, the furniture company which I mentioned previously was advised by its broker that only two out of 22 companies approached would even consider providing workers compensation for that company. One of the two organisations involved was S.G.I.C. I have subsequently been advised

that only four insurance companies operating on the South Australian scene are prepared to accept workers compensation insurance. I have no positive knowledge of that situation other than that which has been relayed to me by people who have found themselves in the position of having to try to obtain the cover and who have been told by a number of brokers and others that that is the position.

Having mentioned the Housing Trust and the difficulty that has arisen in getting a number of contracts or projects under way, I also mention how unfortunate it is that the Housing Trust should find itself in major conflict with groups of people when it seeks to undertake projects. I refer specifically to the Surrey Downs situation and another which I am told is developing in the Morphett Vale area.

I believe that, as a Parliament, we will have to look very closely at the policy which has existed during the life of two Governments of different political persuasions, whereby every block of land which is surplus to the needs of one Government department shall, under all circumstances, first be made available to other Government departments which may use it for virtually whatever purpose they decide.

Indeed, as the member for Newland will know only too well, land at Surrey Downs was originally set aside for a high school for the Education Department. That land has now been designated surplus to Education Department needs and has been taken up by the Housing Trust. Initially, there were to be 80 rental units in the middle of what I would call a prestigious project involving a private development of South Australian Land Commission land. I use the term 'prestigious', because that was indicated by the manner in which the South Australian Land Commission sold the areas surrounding the development. It involved the manner in which the people concerned approached the building operation that they were to undertake on that land, on which a facility for the Education Department was to have been constructed. They developed that land knowing that that likelihood existed. Quite rightly, these people are indignant that 80 housing rental units will be superimposed in the middle of their area.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: And no school.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I am not criticising the fact that there will be no school because we have found for a long time that the best estimates of planners were based on the fact that we would have a rising population, but that was before there was a migration down-turn, before abortion became a fact of life, before the contraceptive pill played a significant role in this matter and before the economic down-turn occurred. It would be ridiculous to proceed to put a high school on that site if there were no students or if students had to travel by bus to the site from a long distance away.

However, that apart, I think that it is wrong that the sale of homes in that area (the school situation being accepted) is now in jeopardy, as the people see it, because of the nature of the Housing Trust development which the people concerned have been told will go ahead. I know that the member for Newland presented a petition to this House last week. I took the opportunity of looking at that petition, because I can understand the feeling of these people. The petition, signed by 473 people and presented in this House on 10 August, states:

The humble petition of the undersigned residents of South Australia sheweth:

That we feel the building of 80, three bedroom, rental houses by the South Australian Housing Trust at Surrey Downs as proposed will:

- (1) devalue properties in the surrounding areas;
- (2) create a community within a community thus isolating the new tenants;
- (3) create a socio-economic division within the established community;
- (4) over-tax schools in the area;

(5) create a potential death trap for children outside of the Surrey Downs Primary School by connecting Illyarrie Avenue with Sylvan Crescent.

The above five points are not in any order of importance and are to be read as having equal importance.

Your petitioners therefore pray that your honourable House will use every endeavour to dissuade the South Australian Housing Trust from building in the area under proposal, as proposed, and request that the South Australian Housing Trust be required to give due consideration to existing residents of established areas before submitting proposals that place everyone at a disadvantage by their actions. We also request that councils have more control over proposed South Australian Housing Trust developments within their jurisdiction.

I am led to believe that this sort of development is starting to arise in Morphett Vale (if that is not in the member for Baudin's area, it would be the honourable member for Mawson's area) in what was originally a Hooker estate. It happened to a degree some four years ago at Gawler at a site known as Evanston Gardens, where the Beneficial Finance organisation created a subdivision. That company found some difficulty in selling the blocks at the speed with which it would have liked. It then found itself in the position of offering the blocks at a discounted value to the South Australian Housing Trust. That created quite a ruckus until the Housing Trust very effectively entered upon a scheme of 'design and erect' homes over a graded period on a rental-purchase basis. Common sense prevailed, and a very harmonious development has taken place.

The activity at Surrey Downs is currently in the hands of the council and the Planning Commission, is (as I noticed in the newspaper last Thursday morning) receiving the consideration of the Ombudsman. If it is to go ahead at all, would not a private sale be a better proposition, so that there can be a realisation of the asset?

Mr Klunder: It has to be rental housing, because your Government insisted on it three years ago.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: You wouldn't let the trust build houses for sale.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I am quite interested in this comment, because it is at variance with advice I have received. The point I am making is that there is another form of development which would even comply with the situation adverted to by members opposite, and that is rental housing where the accommodation required is for the aged. Returning to the publication entitled *Housing Trust in Focus*, to which I referred previously, I quote from page 23, under 'Aged Housing', as follows:

One of the greatest challenges in recent years has been the provision of specialised units for the aged, not only stemming from new applications but also to facilitate the movement of aged tenants currently under-occupying family dwellings. This challenge will increase in the future as South Australia's population aged 65 and over is expected to grow from 135 000 in 1981 to reach 209 000 by 2011, an increase of 55 per cent.

In an effort to meet this need, a high priority has been placed on the construction of cottage flats for the aged. During 1981-82 a record 471 cottage flats were commenced representing 26 per cent of all buildings commenced during that year. By comparison, in 1977-78 only 71 cottage flats were commenced representing 4 per cent of all commencements for that year.

Mr Klunder: I have asked the Housing Trust to do that.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I am very pleased that the member for Newland has undertaken that approach. I believe that there is a great deal of merit in what is currently a very vexed difficulty for a number of people, and it would be an on-going vexed difficulty for people if the original proposal were to be undertaken. Indeed, as I highlighted from my own experience in the Evanston Gardens area, if part of the area were utilised for rental-purchase homes or 'design and erect' homes, a blend of that with accommodation for the aged may be an answer. I do not want to suggest that it would necessarily be the total answer for the people who feel aggrieved because of the imposition they see being placed upon their amenity of the area in which they purchased and built in all good faith.

I dwell on the word 'amenity', because it is a word referred to so often as being one of the ultimate rights of the populace. I believe it is one of the ultimate rights that the people in this area should enjoy and, indeed, that may well apply to the people in the Morphett Vale area who are likewise being imposed upon at present.

Many other aspects of the housing industry are coming into focus because of the increases being forced on to the cost structure of houses. Those aspects will undoubtedly be mentioned in other debates as we proceed, but any action taken at this time to force up the cost of a house for young people, people in need (involving \$5 000 to \$6 000 in the next four to 12 months) is a position which we as members of Parliament should not tolerate. It is a position which we should be endeavouring, with every skill available to us and with every assistance that we can give, to overcome in this sensitive area so that we do not force the Housing Trust figures to escalate rapidly at a time when we would all genuinely like to see then reduced.

As we all know, the dollar goes only so far but it is extremely important that every dollar spent produces a dollar's worth of product, and if there is a means, by common sense or increased productivity, every opportunity should be taken to help those in the greatest need. I see no area of need greater than that involving housing. There is a problem at present with an increase being forced upon housing costs by the cost of land upon which the houses are to be built. The Minister for Environment and Planning made available to me quite recently some planning details which indicate the real lack of serviced land available immediately.

Some time ago we all saw advertisements such as 'Hillbank selling out fast—buy soon'. That land has now been sold and that situation applies in other areas where developed blocks were available. There will be some speculation by groups seeking to capitalise on having purchased land at a lower cost. The unfortunate aspect of this is that the replacement of those blocks will be expensive because of the increases in the cost of providing water, sewerage and electricity supplies, as well as the roadworks needed to provide a serviced block.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Appleby): Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Glenelg.

Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the motion and take this opportunity of paying tribute to a past member of this House and a personal friend of mine, the Hon. John Coumbe. He served this Parliament well in a number of capacities, and at various stages held the Works, Labour and Industry, Education, and Marine portfolios. During his 21 years as a member, John Coumbe served this Parliament with honour not only to himself but also to the Party he represented. He was a friend of mine, and he was of great assistance to me when I came into this House in 1970.

I would also like to pay tribute to the previous member for Bragg, who retired voluntarily. The Hon. David Tonkin represented Bragg in this place from 1970. I welcome to this House the new member for Bragg, who made an excellent and commendable maiden speech last week. He has a number of qualities which will be of benefit to this place. I regard him as a man of great ability but, when I learned that he had at one stage of his life played in trial games for the Glenelg Football Club, my estimation of him was lifted immediately. I understand that he did play some games for that club.

The Hon. Michael Wilson interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: We certainly could not have done with him last week when we thrashed Port, a matter dealt with by my friend the honourable member for Price.

The Governor's Speech comprises 40 paragraphs dealing with various matters. I am concerned about paragraph 8, which states:

While the economy shows some signs of improved growth, the immediate situation remains bleak. In important areas, South Australia's relative performance shows signs of improvement; however, there is no early prospect of substantial reductions in unemployment.

That paragraph is meaningless—it is merely padding. Paragraph 15 refers to the excellent record of industrial relations in South Australia and states that Government will introduce a Bill to adapt the legislation to meet current conditions. What does that mean? Does it mean that because we had a good industrial relations record over the period of the Liberal Government that this Government will change that? Why change it if it is going so well? The Speech continues:

My Government recognises the great potential that tourism has for generating economic activity and employment and is engaging in extensive and sophisticated promotion of this State's holiday attractions . . .

One well knows that one of the greatest tourist attractions in this State is the District of Glenelg, not because of its member, but because of what that district encompasses in its own right. It is the birthplace of the State. We have the Old Gum Tree, where every year the proclamation is re-enacted. The many modern attractions include the Buffalo Restaurant, a model of the first ship that came to South Australia. Not only is it a great monument but it is a very great restaurant, and there are many others in the Bay. Upgrading of Moseley Square has been going on for many years.

I believe that we need a mall down Jetty Road. I have suggested on a number of occasions, and indeed only last year, to the council and local traders that they should copy the example set in Tel Aviv, Israel, where one road is barricaded each Sabbath and becomes a mall. Traffic is kept out, and people shop if they wish or drink coffee and other beverages on the sidewalk. Local people and tourists take the opportunity to meet.

Jetty Road, Glenelg, provides an excellent opportunity for becoming a temporary mall, possibly from December to February or March yearly. Each Sunday it could be barricaded. Of course, trams would still have to run down the road, but that would not matter. Traffic would be excluded, and it would provide a great attraction for tourists as well as business for traders at the Bay. A great many people visit Glenelg, not only from this State but from interstate and overseas. In fact, the Queen came once to look at Glenelg.

Mr Oswald: She landed at Glenelg.

Mr MATHWIN: As my colleague, neighbour and friend from Morphett says, she landed at Glenelg.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Your colleague is out of his seat, and he is interjecting.

Mr MATHWIN: He has been known to be naughty at times, my friend the member for Morphett. I draw attention to another matter, and it is a pity that the Minister of Transport is not in the Chamber—

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I'll tell him.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: I know his staff; they will pick it up.

Mr MATHWIN: Good. We have for protection the Minister for Environment and Planning, who has mentioned in the local paper what I propose to talk about. I read from that paper, as follows:

My Government's decision in June this year that the North-South transportation corridor is not now required . . .

Who provided that information? It was certainly not a local person. It might be someone who has emigrated to the south from somewhere closer to the city, but anyone with local knowledge of the road system in the south would know that it is urgent and important that that corridor be provided.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: I wonder if he has asked his own electors.

Mr MATHWIN: I will read what the member for Baudin said. He is in the unique position of having a very great majority, so he does not give a damn what happens to his constituents.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: That's hardly worthy of you, you know.

Mr MATHWIN: Maybe I was a little strong, because the Minister is a friend of mine. He is an honest man, I believe, but he has made a grave mistake. Obviously he has listened to people who do not know what they are talking about. It is grand to know that he can get into the local paper; I cannot get a thing in there. He had his photograph and a statement published. The headline read: 'Hopgood backs the scrapping of freeway plans'. That was in heavy black print. The report states:

Dr Hopgood believes the Southern Regional Organisation has been 'chasing a mirage' in advocating the construction of the freeway. 'On the evidence available to the Government the freeway would never be built, nor was there the necessity for it,' Dr Hopgood said. 'Various options were being considered for improved road access to the south with particular emphasis on sorting out the 'Darlington bottleneck.' Trying to find funds for a freeway which would have only marginal benefits to the south would only divert effort from these more constructive and realistic approaches.'

I wonder how small minded the Minister is. He would know that in the metropolitan area there are two main industrial areas: one at Port Adelaide, and one at Lonsdale in the south.

He would know that no-one would voluntarily chance driving up South Road anywhere near peak traffic, yet he prefers the heavy transports going down South Road to get out of the city. His Government plans to increase warehouses and industrial areas at Regency Park, which is now almost full, and extend into the Wingfield area, which is now operating as we have heard at the Public Works Committee. The time will come when industry will have to move some of its holdings and storage from Port Adelaide to Regency Park and the other areas mentioned. How does he think those transports will get through the city? Is he saying, in reality and honesty, that those transports and the people who want to go from north to south will have no problems? Does he say that the fact that they have opened the area from Lonsdale right through to Brighton and Glenelg is sufficient? Has he no consideration or thought for the electors outside his own area, my constituents in Brighton and Glenelg?

I am sorry that the Minister is leaving the Chamber. I hope that he will listen to me on his intercom set. I am very disappointed with his outlook. At least one member of the Labor Party, the member for Mawson, had the guts to stand up and say that she did not think it was right. The member for Brighton has been strangely silent and has not opened her little mouth on this. The member for Mawson said, as reported in the paper, 'I had mixed feelings about the decision.' I suppose that is as far as she could go, because they would probably stand on her neck if she said much more against the Party pledge. She would lose her endorsement if she stuck out too far for it. The newspaper states:

She did not agree that people in the south would be disadvantaged by the loss of the corridor. There were many factors to be considered when looking at the transport needs of the south. Ms Lenehan said there was still the possibility of a loop railway system, and it was not known what effect widening of the South Road, the extra carriageway on Ocean Boulevard, and the planned overpasses at Hove and Oaklands would have on future traffic. 'The population in the south hasn't kept pace with predictions'.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Do you think the member for Brighton was concerned about additional traffic on Brighton Road?

Mr MATHWIN: I do not think that the member for Brighton is concerned at all about the traffic on Brighton

Road. I do not think that she worries about it at all. A major road in the metropolitan area, Morphett Road, runs from Anzac Highway, over the Oaklands crossing to Seacombe Road, up the hill, and it stops at the top. At the top there is a little country lane that goes up towards Trott Park—this is right in the heart of Adelaide! I understand that the Minister and his representatives have said that they will not develop this section of Morphett Road. Majors Road carries a lot of traffic from the south, and it is pushed on to either South Road or Brighton Road, whereas it should be filtering down Morphett Road. However, if there is a little bit of rain, a shower or two, motorists cannot use the road. It is what could be called a fine-weather run. I understand that this matter was discussed at a council meeting where one of the Minister's representatives had the audacity to say that the road is too steep.

That seems a joke, coming from a man who is supposed to be educated in matters of transport and the building of roads. What a shocking apology it is to say that Morphett Road cannot be developed as a main road because it is too steep. The Minister was reported in the local paper in regard to this matter as follows:

The north-south transport corridor had been scrapped because it was unlikely it would ever be needed, according to Transport Minister Roy Abbott.

A statement like that from the Minister of Transport indicates that he knows nothing about his portfolio. The Minister relies on his staff; he lets them say whatever they want, and he just nods his head. The article continues:

Total value of property held by the Government in the corridor is about \$50 000 000. It will be disposed of in stages over a number of years and funds from its sale will be used by the Highways Department for improvements to the present transport system under a list of new priorities. These include: the Emerson Crossing project—

That was already on the cards, so the Minister cannot take credit for that, the previous Liberal Government can take credit for that and not the Labor Government—

Widening South Road from Daws Road to Anzac Highway—

The Hon. Michael Wilson: That was ours.

Mr MATHWIN: Yes, another Liberal job. The list continues:

Construction of Reservoir Drive at Flagstaff Hill, duplication of Ocean Boulevard from Hallett Cove to Seaciff.

We all know the sad and sorry history of that: that was a sneaky little job by Mr Virgo that I discovered by accident about eight years ago. They had started a little bit of digging at the Lonsdale end. After making discreet inquiries, I found that it was intended to build a big freeway there to take the pressure off South Road, and pile it on to Brighton Road. What would have happened when they got to the bottleneck at Anzac Highway, assuming that they had managed to negotiate the Hove crossing? Eventually, when everything is going right, the train crossing will be closed for about 25 to 30 minutes per hour, due to the Government's piling more and more traffic on to Brighton Road. Yet it has the audacity to say that it is going to put a priority on the crossing in regard to the construction of a rail fly-over. For my constituents who have for many years lived along the Crescent and in other adjacent areas it would be a great prospect to have a structure 30 feet in the air, with trains flying over their houses. That is great stuff, but there has been not a word from some of the local members. The list of priorities continues:

Upgrading of Dyson Road from Christies Beach to Lonsdale, a Morphett Vale bypass and overpasses at Darlington, Oaklands and Hove.

If the Minister thinks he can do all these things with \$50 000 000, I think he is labouring under some misapprehension. It sounds a lot of money but when one is considering developments such as overpasses and new freeways,

\$50 000 000 does not go very far. It is time that the Minister woke up to that fact.

Mr Groom: Tell us about Brighton Road.

Mr MATHWIN: Yes, I intend to do that. Further, the Minister said nothing about opening up Morphett Road. The local paper contained statements from the Minister for Environment and Planning (the member for Baudin) and the Minister of Transport. I was not given an opportunity to provide a statement to the paper, although I have tried for six weeks since those statements were published to secure a statement in the local press. The paper has refused to put it in for me. There is a statement from the member for Mawson, but not from the member for Brighton—not a word.

Mr Klunder: Perhaps she has had the same trouble that you have had in getting a statement published in the paper.

Mr MATHWIN: I do not think so; she does pretty well out of the local press.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the honourable member will use the electorate titles of other members.

Mr Groom: Bring us up to date on Brighton Road!

Mr MATHWIN: If honourable members are not careful I will talk about the floodlights at Football Park! I refer to what the Southern Region of Councils said about the matter. It should not be forgotten that prior to the last election the Southern Region of Councils asked all members of Parliament to give them a talk about what was going to happen: they were good enough to give prepared questions to members of the Labor Party some two or three weeks prior to the meeting, although questions were given to Liberal Party members on the same day that they were to go down there with considered replies to the questions. However, that is now by the by. In relation to the north-south corridor decision the Southern Region of Councils said, in part:

The region fully accepts the down-turn in population growth and traffic volumes in the metropolitan area as a whole, but points out that the growth in the southern areas remains high. Based on the most recent Department of Environment and Planning estimates for population growth in the southern sector, a doubling of the population south of Darlington by the late 1990s seems likely, and given household formation rates, it seems likely that traffic volumes will more than double in the same period.

Yet the Minister saw fit to take no notice of that in his decision in regard to scrapping the north-south freeway. Therefore, the situation is that all the councils in that region (plus the Glenelg council, which is in the western region), without exception, had informed the Government that the north-south corridor should not be scrapped. However, the Government in its wisdom (and I say that as sarcastically as one is able to) has indicated that that opinion does not matter, that it has decided that the corridor will not proceed, and that it will put as much traffic as it possibly can on to other roads. It has also indicated that it will not open up Morphett Road from Majors Road to Seacombe Road. This is a political decision in order to protect the member for Brighton.

Mr Baker: She won't be there.

Mr MATHWIN: Of course, in a couple of years, she will not be here, although she will have had the experience of having been here. Nevertheless, the Government will protect her to the best of its ability. The member for Brighton has said nothing about the matter one way or the other. Councils are most irate about it. The problems that will exist in Brighton will become vastly greater than they are now and, indeed, the volume of traffic down Brighton Road will increase even more now from what it has been. Since the Lonsdale by-pass opened there have been 4 000 extra vehicles per day on Brighton Road.

Mr Groom: What's your policy?

Mr MATHWIN: My policy is to keep the honourable member's Party out of Government. In regard to the edu-

cation of children and the continuing education of citizens, I am very upset with the Minister of Education and the obvious victimisation of the schools and kindergartens within my electorate of Glenelg (which includes Brighton). In regard to Brighton High School, the first thing the Minister did when he came into office was to downgrade the Principal: he brought him down from grade A to class I at Brighton High School. Brighton High was the cheapest school that was ever built in this State by any Government. Indeed, it is one of the best schools in the State, yet the Minister downgraded the Principal of that school, and will not listen to reason. Brighton kindergarten was involved in another political decision to protect the member for Brighton.

The Minister has refused to allow the Brighton kindergarten to relocate on the eastern side of Brighton Road. The only improvement that he will allow is on the western side of Brighton Road, yet the Minister knows that there are no sites available there at all. The present conditions are pretty drastic. It is the feeder kindergarten for Brighton Primary School, which is about 50 yards away. Yet, either it stays where it is in the existing bad conditions, or it relocates elsewhere, further from the school for which it is a feeder. Again, that is a completely political decision.

Brighton adult education centre has had taken from it the responsibility of running its own show, and the Minister's action in having it organised and run from the O'Halloran Hill centre worried and upset hundreds of my constituents. Many of my people who attend this adult education centre are older people and were very concerned that, at one stage, they understood that the Brighton adult education centre was to be closed down. The Minister of Education attended at the centre along with the two candidates at that time, the candidates for the Districts of Brighton and Mawson, and the Minister, as shadow Minister, said at Brighton High School that he would do anything he could to help the Brighton High School, that he thought the school had a great case. It had a great case until the Minister took office and then he changed his mind completely. He completely reversed his feelings in relation to the needs of the school, and he has proved that by rubbing it in in relation to Brighton kindergarten and, again, by rubbing it in in relation to the Brighton adult education centre.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: What about Seacombe High School?

Mr MATHWIN: There was a meeting not so long ago at Seacombe High School which I was asked to attend and which I did attend. With my normal courtesy of informing the local member for the area, which practice is not always reversed incidentally (members do not always let you know when they come into your territory, but they always like to get the information that you are going into theirs), I did attend that meeting. It has always been laid down and recognised in this place that, if you attend a show in another member's district, you inform the member that you are going there.

I let the local member know that I had been invited and had accepted the invitation. The meeting at the Seacombe High School was in relation to the possible closing of either that school or Dover High School, and it was attended by the candidate for Brighton (Mr Glazbrook), the shadow Minister of Education (Mr Wilson) and me. It was a very good meeting: it went very well. We were received well at that very sensible and well organised meeting. I read the whole Speech, the 40 different paragraphs, searching for—

Mr Whitten: Didn't you listen to what he said?

Mr MATHWIN: Yes I did, but I do not remember everything that was said. I know that I might look as if I could remember all that, and I know that my friend from Price appreciates the help that I give him and his committee; indeed, I am his left-hand man on the Public Works Com-

mittee. However, I am not clever enough to take in 40 different paragraphs on 40 different subjects in the Governor's Speech. I thought I had missed something when the Governor presented his Speech and so I searched through it, but there was no mention at all of correctional services. Not one thing was said about prisons, even in the light of all the problems experienced in the correctional services area in this State. That did not even rate a mention in the Governor's Speech, and that is disgraceful. It was not worthy of a mention.

I refer to this matter that did not rate a mention, because the correctional services are important and should have been referred to in the Speech. The Chief Secretary indicated today that at last the message is getting across and that at last the pressure from this side of the House by me and my colleagues is taking effect. At last the Chief Secretary has been able to make up his mind to do something, not only to talk but also to get on with it. There was an announcement today that the Minister will submit plans to the Public Works Committee for the immediate building of a minimum security gaol near the women's prison, and no doubt that is welcome news to all members.

Mr Evans: Will you take an interest in that?

Mr MATHWIN: Indeed I will, because I am on the Public Works Committee. I want to know all about it. It is obvious at last that the message has got through to the Minister that he must do something about the shocking situation in South Australian prisons. Since the Minister took over we have had more fires in South Australia than since V.J. night, the night the war finished, when fires were lit all over the place. Everyone knew that these fires would be lit in the prison—everyone but the Minister. I was told that the big fire would occur.

Members interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: I would not be surprised. If members keep quiet, I will give them some good information. Let me say that the next place to go up at Yatala will be B division, and that is not far off: B division is next. A division has been lost, and the loss of B division is on the cards.

Ms Lenehan: Did you mastermind it?

Mr MATHWIN: No, I did not, and I did not put in the red phones. If the member for Mawson keeps her little ear to the phone she might get a call from the red phone at Yatala. Prisoners can talk to anyone now: they can telephone the Minister, the Minister's secretary, members of Parliament, or members of the press.

They are all dashing down there with a jingle in their pockets to use the red phone, which they can use at any time they wish. They will tell members opposite that the next part to go will be B division. I understand that the Minister is fond of classics. We all know that Nero played the harp when Rome burnt. We now know that the Chief Secretary fiddles: he has fiddled ever since he has been in office. He fiddled when Yatala was burning down, he fiddled when the next area was going, and he is still fiddling. He has fiddled with the remand centre. We all know the history of that exercise, except maybe the new members in this place. The member for Mawson may not know, and I will tell her because the information may be interesting for her.

Once upon a time, the Labor Government decided that it would do something about a remand centre. Against all public opinion it decided to purchase a block of land and build the remand centre at Regency Park, about 18 kilometres from the city. The usual place to put a remand centre, in modern-day thinking and in the thinking of anyone who knows anything about criminology and prisons, is as near as possible to the courts. That is the latest thinking. However, the previous Labor Government decided that it would place it at Regency Park, but it lost government. The new Gov-

ernment came in and said that it would place it nearer to the city. In that way it would not be too far away from the courts, as the most crucial area of security is in transporting prisoners from prison to the courts. That is when we get trouble from heavy prisoners. Therefore, the lesser the distance, the safer it is.

The Liberal Government decided to build the centre at Hindmarsh and the process went ahead. Plans were drawn up and negotiations went ahead for a centre at Hindmarsh. Local members kicked up a fuss, just as they ought to do on behalf of their constituents.

Mr Mayes interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: It was the local people—not others. We can imagine the antics of the member for Unley. If he were asked whether the remand centre should be in Hindmarsh or Unley, no doubt he would settle for Unley! He knows perfectly well that the members affected were the ones who stirred up the trouble, and the project was pulled out. Had they left the centre on an industrial site close to the city, it would have been built and completed by now. Instead, the Government messed around. When the Government changed hands, the Labor Government said that it would not have the remand centre at Hindmarsh and that it would look for a new spot. So, this Government decided that it would have the remand centre in Currie Street. I can only say that at least it is near the city—but I am glad that Cox-Foys has done its renovations, otherwise we would have had it in the middle of the mall. That is the history of the remand centre, and we are now in a situation where we have no remand centre.

We have the Adelaide Gaol, which is absolutely shocking. Any member of this House—whether male or female—should make it their business to visit (if they have not already been) Yatala and Adelaide gaols. They would be ashamed of the situation and the conditions that exist in those two prisons. I have been in many prisons in the world—as a visitor, I might add. I have been to some very old prisons; I have been to prisons in India, and they are pretty grim; but I can say that not one of them is worse than Yatala gaol: it is in a shocking condition.

Mr Groom: What pressure did you put on your Government to fix up Yatala?

Mr MATHWIN: I am glad that the member for Hartley has reminded me of that, because I have a list of about 55 things that we did. I will have to read them out later for his edification. The situation, as I said earlier, is that the Minister has fiddled with the remand centre; he has fiddled in relation to the Port Augusta Gaol. That was completed two years ago. There are 30 places available at Port Augusta in very good conditions, but until now—unless they have done it since last week—there is no-one there. The excuse is that there is no staff. I suppose that if one asks, 'Why don't you increase staff?', the excuse is, 'We haven't got the money.' Yet, the Government can afford to pay over \$1 000 000 a year in overtime. The policy of the Government is that it prefers to pay overtime at the rate of \$1 000 000 a year to providing more staff: that is what it boils down to. So, we have the people suffering—as they are—in these prisons and we have good accommodation at Port Augusta Gaol. As I say, the Government spends over \$1 000 000 a year on overtime.

Staff morale at Yatala is at its lowest. The Chief Secretary has spent much of his time until now concentrating on his other pleasant portfolio as Minister of Tourism, but he does not bother very much and has not spent much time at Yatala. I would like to know how many times he has visited Adelaide Gaol. From what I understand, the Minister, since he has been in office—and he has been in office 10 months—has visited the Adelaide Gaol once. He is the man who has to show some leadership for his men; he has to rally his

troops—and, my gosh, they need it. As I said, the morale is as low as it has ever been in the prisons at the present time.

There has been no training for the staff and, as I say, that applies in both the major prisons in South Australia. The staff need retraining all the time; it has to be an ongoing situation. Indeed, the whole staffing situation needs some serious investigation: the situation is desperate. As I said earlier, there is nothing at all in the Governor's Speech about prisons, correctional services or anything in that area: it did not even rate a mention in the Governor's Speech.

The new industries complex at Yatala has not been used for two years. The Government is gradually trying to start activity there, but it claims that either the staff or the prisoners do not want to use it. We see today, of course, the decision that the Government is going to do something at last in relation to low or minimum-security accommodation but, as I say, this industries complex has not been used at all. The high-security section should have high priority in relation to prisons. In fact, the Yatala hospital section should be moved out to another place, such as Hillcrest or the like, and that area should be made available for either the high-security prisoners or the semi-security prisoners, not minimum-security prisoners.

One can put them in three types, as the member for Hartley would well know. I think that that is what should happen: they should take over the hospital section of the prisons.

An honourable member: Which type does the member for Hartley come into?

Mr MATHWIN: I think that the member for Hartley protects these people and, of course, represents many of them at different times. The Government should get on with the remand centre with less talk. Action is needed and I have given the history of that. The inmates and staff at Yatala want accommodation and that is the first priority: they want decent and reasonable accommodation.

Let me remind the House and the new members that, when we are talking about accommodation, it was the Liberal Government that upgraded the sanitation at Yatala. In 10 years the Labor Government gave them nothing at all. Chief Secretary Simmons procrastinated, dithered and dallied for 10 years and did nothing at all to help the plight of the prisoners at Yatala. The only decision he made in this House was in relation to sanitation: he decided that some prisoners needed sanilavs that had to be emptied every day. That is the only improvement that the Labor Party made to the sanitation arrangements.

The Liberal Party provided \$4 000 000 to put toilets in the Yatala Labour Prison, so do not say that we did nothing during our time in Government. As I said earlier, all members should take the opportunity to visit Yatala and see for themselves what the conditions are: they are disgraceful. Every person who goes in there would be ashamed that they had anything at all to do with it. The ideal solution would be to demolish the lot, but that is pretty impossible. I would like to get in there with a platoon of engineers and we would fix it up with gun cotton, dynamite, gelignite, and a bit of cordite.

Until today, the Minister did nothing at all about it, but we forced him to make a decision. Of course, the Minister produced a model which was commissioned by the Liberal Party. The idea of producing a model is to keep them quiet: let them inform the committees, gather the evidence and it will take months to chew it over before they come to a decision about it. The Minister produced a model and said, 'This is it.' As I said, that model was commissioned by the Liberal Party. It is a 'hold-off' situation, a tactic to keep people quiet.

In that model we saw the same accommodation. There is accommodation only in the middle section, in the area where A and B blocks now are. That is not the correct way. One has to segregate the prisoners. One has to segregate the heavies, the high-security prisoners from the others. In the model itself (and I have seen the model and the plans) there are eight towers. The Government plans to upgrade four of them and, to me, that is ridiculous. If it wants proper security and surveillance in that place, it ought to build one security tower in the centre, as they have in Berrimah, in the Northern Territory. One needs a control tower in the centre which can overlook the whole prison, not eight towers like a battlement of some old-fashioned prison or castle. One needs a high control tower in the centre that commands the whole situation, and one does not have to man eight towers when the heat is on. The present Chief Secretary unmercifully castigated and attacked the former Chief Secretary, Mr Rodda, when all that was behind him was a couple of escapes from Yatala Labour Prison.

Mr Groom: You don't call Tognolini a couple of escapes?

Mr MATHWIN: The matters that arose during the time of the former Chief Secretary were nothing like the situations now occurring. If the member for Hartley doubts that, I am surprised. Nobody could criticise the record of the previous Chief Secretary.

Mr Groom: Your Government tried to withdraw staff from Yatala gaol.

Mr MATHWIN: The first fire during the present Chief Secretary's term occurred at Yatala in April. I was at the prison last week, and the cell block where the fire occurred had been left as it was after the fire. Why has no work been done there? It stinks. It is disgraceful that the prison should remain in this half burnt out state, with crumbled walls, cinders, and rubbish such as mattresses and God knows what else still lying there. There must be a lot of 'livestock' running around there, with all those filthy mattresses lying around and with the filthy sanitary conditions which have existed since the fire in April. Why has not this mess been cleaned up? Why cannot the prisoners do some work there? What is wrong with that? Why cannot the prisoners be made to do a bit of cleaning up at Yatala gaol? The situation at the site of the later fire is also the same as it was when that fire was extinguished. As I said earlier by way of interjection (which was out of order and about which you quite rightly rebuked me, Mr Speaker), Mr Easom says that, as far as he is concerned, the prisoners at Yatala run the gaol, and he is the boss (and he acts like it). I think that is correct, and I am sure that he has the Minister thinking along the same lines.

I believe that the Chief Secretary should show some leadership in this matter and not hide behind his Director and staff. He has been Minister for 10 months, yet he tries to blame anyone but himself for his mistakes. This Minister has been most successful with the media, particularly with the *Advertiser*, which has given him a very good press. He blames his staff and the parole system for causing all this trouble—anything to remove the blame from himself. This Minister has the advantage of having the best Director of Correctional Services that this State has ever had, Mr John Dawes. This Minister also has the most experienced press secretary in the Labor Party, a secretary who has done an amazing job of protecting his boss, thus enabling him to dodge and weave like a fly in a bottle. The *Advertiser* of 8 August, under the heading 'Stretching the art of the possible', which refers to the Chief Secretary, states:

Gavin Keneally takes his job seriously—so seriously he's been told several times to smile more in public.

In the position he is in, I would not think the Chief Secretary would want to smile, anyway. The article continues:

But in private Keneally is personable, articulate, courteous, clearly physically tough—

physically tough—he has been to Adelaide Gaol once—and intellectually shrewd—

I suppose we can agree with that, to a certain extent—

He gives the impression of knowing exactly what he wants to achieve and of being determined to stretch the political art of the possible to the limit of his capabilities and endurance.

I suppose that, to a certain extent, that is correct: he wants to perform the art of the impossible. The report states that he feels strongly that the courts should have a wider range of sentencing options and that he regrets that he does not have much time for reading any more. I would not think that he would have!

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

Mr MATHWIN: Prior to the dinner adjournment I was referring to the problems in our prisons and the inaction of the Chief Secretary. I mentioned how he breathed down the neck of the previous Chief Secretary, who did not have a record half as bad as the present Minister's record in this House over the past 10 months. I refer to the *Advertiser* of 24 March, which states:

Parliament was told yesterday that prisoner frustration over Parole Board activities had been the only reason given for the riot. The Chief Secretary, Mr Keneally, told Parliament that the South Australian Correctional Services Department planned to train an officer . . .

As far as I am aware, there has been no training of officers within our prison system. According to that report, the Chief Secretary mentioned frustration as the only cause of the Yatala riot, but he did not know what it was all about anyway. The cause goes far deeper than that.

As I have pointed out before, the conditions at Yatala and Adelaide Gaol are nothing short of shocking. The fire damage that occurred in April has not been cleaned up, and the affected area remains in the bad state it was in then. Apparently, prisoners at Yatala do not have any work to do—they should be made to clean up the mess, which is most unsanitary. In April, the Chief Secretary was reported in the *News*, as follows:

The Chief Secretary, Mr Keneally, yesterday demanded a seven-month breathing space to solve problems at the embattled Yatala Prison. In effect, Mr Keneally told the prisoners and the prison officers to get off his back.

Everyone has been off his back. The Chief Secretary has been protected in this House. He has not been taken to task in this House, although he should have been. Unfortunately for the Deputy Premier, members have been involved in another matter, which took the steam and the pressure off of the Chief Secretary. The report continues:

But yesterday, while addressing a seminar at Adelaide University, Mr Keneally criticised 'pressure groups' for standing in the way of reforms at Yatala.

Everyone tells the Chief Secretary what he should be doing. All of the great intellectuals tell us that we should be providing more alternatives to prison. They say that we should put prisoners back into the community: we should not put them into prison, but should put them to work in the community. Everyone tells us this, but anyone who knows anything about the problem—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There should not be discussions across the floor.

Mr MATHWIN: We all know about that advice. The intellectuals should be advising us about how to get the community service orders operating. How do we get prisoners working in the community without opposition from the unions? That is the problem. Community service orders have been working effectively in Germany for seven years, and in Britain and America for five years or more. They

have been working effectively and quite well overseas, but we cannot get them going in Australia, and certainly not in South Australia, because there is so much opposition from unions to prisoners working within the community and taking work away from workers. I believe that that is where the failure will occur. The unions will not recognise the need to get prisoners out of prisons into the community, to keep them out of the prisons and give them community service orders to work out. They should not be with the hard-core criminals in our prison system. Unfortunately, the unions will not agree to allow the scheme to proceed and that will foul it up. I have no doubt that the Minister knows that that is the problem facing him and his department.

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

Mrs APPLEBY (Brighton): I congratulate the member for Unley and the member for Henley Beach, as mover and seconder of this motion, and I indicate that I am pleased to contribute to the debate. On entering this House I had no illusion about what my responsibilities would be and about the fact that I had much to learn. Under your direction, Mr Speaker, and that of the member for Whyalla, as Chairman of Committees, I have found that I have been allowed to settle in to the every-day workings of this Chamber, representing my constituents and playing an informed role in decisions made here for the benefit of South Australia. I refer also to the help that I have received from my colleagues in this House. At no time when I have needed help has it not been available.

I take this opportunity to refer to the comments made by the member for Glenelg during his contribution to the debate before the dinner adjournment and his suggestion that the pre-school situation that affects our adjoining electorates is the result of a political decision. I find that quite unacceptable. The decision to ensure that the Brighton pre-school remained west of Brighton Road ensured that the Dover and Warradale pre-schools were not encroached upon and it also ensured that the children of those three pre-schools had the best available education.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs APPLEBY: This evening I want to point out one of the causes of a social problem faced within our community, and I refer to mature unemployed people. Discrimination and exploitation are two words that are readily used to explain many situations. I would like to relate these two words to a situation that is recognised only as a problem, namely, the unemployment problem affecting both youth and mature unemployed people and the families of those involved. Nothing that affects our lives is isolated to an individual.

Unemployed people suffer discrimination which occurs often to those who may already be part of disadvantaged groups, such as Aboriginal or ethnic communities, females, disabled, or inexperienced people. The general feeling amongst these groups is that they prefer to earn rather than be kept. All unemployed people should have equal work opportunities and should be given the opportunity to participate in schemes that offer an alternative to traditional work involvement. A common feeling amongst the unemployed is that there is always someone offering them a job that needs to be done but with rarely any suggestion of payment for service, the asker having charity in mind. A common complaint often heard goes something to the effect, 'Pour soul, I can get that person to do this little job because they are unemployed and have time on their hands.' I believe that if there is a job to be done it is worth being paid for.

The community has within it skills, resources and manpower that are not being shared equitably because there is not enough understanding of what it is like to be unemployed. There exists a need for co-operation within the community towards unemployed people, and a commitment is required to recognise the worth of people.

In itself unemployment is not a disease, but in many instances unemployed people develop health problems related to depression, isolation—even within one's own family unit—lack of self-esteem and a feeling of uselessness to themselves, their family, friends, and the community as a whole. Last, but by no means least, they feel that their skills and achievements do not count for anything, and thus they feel useless to the human race and finished as a person. We must create more awareness of the desperation experienced by the unemployed. We can overcome part of the problem only by ensuring that we provide within the community a better system of providing services that exist for the unemployed and by extending the resources for this into areas where they do not currently exist.

In regard to the mature-age unemployed, we find that those being retrenched come from areas of traditional employment, many of these people being made redundant after years of service, in some cases 10, 15 or 20 years service with one firm in the same field of work. They have usually been in what would be classed as full-time employment. They have seen themselves as having basic, secure employment. Each week the work they have performed through using their skills has been paid for in notes and coins in a wage packet which they take home, and the weekly ritual of opening the packet and making decisions on how it will be divided and spent between bills, food, clothes and social activities takes place.

Consider now the situation where a person goes off to work and during that day is told, 'Your services are no longer required.' That person now has no job and usually is paid off, not in notes and coins in the magic little wage packet so traditional over the years of service, but a cheque payable to the bank account. Thus begins the horrific experience of being unemployed. In those years of service in work the need to use the services of unemployed has not arisen, and those who have had to tackle youth unemployment within the family have done so with the added knowledge that they can provide for them if things get any tougher.

This leads me to what can be done to provide for less confusion and a more effective method of dealing with the unemployed in relation to services and support available to them. It appears the immediate situation to be tackled is the availability of the information and what services and support are available, where the availability exists, and how to use these services already provided.

What is lacking in services and support? With the services already provided, I believe there is a strong case for providing the community with centres that provide one-stop advice: registration of unemployment, opportunity advice, alternative skills, training support and counselling. Not just the individual but many families require counselling as to how to cope with things such as budgeting, entitlement to benefits, etc. There are many providers of services in the community, and many deal with the unemployed with sympathy and genuine concern to help, but it must really be remembered that the unemployed, particularly the mature unemployed, are totally confused when they are told, 'Now you go here, and then you go there, and if you can't get satisfaction, you can come back here.' Why is it not possible to co-ordinate services information at a central point in each community to ensure that the frustration of the unemployed is not extended beyond reason?

I would like at this stage to congratulate the Marion Community Forum on the excellent seminar held in June

this year. It was sponsored by a broad section of the community. The title of the seminar, 'Job creation and employment development', set out to identify the problems, and it came up with solutions that could be tackled with effective action. There were a number of issue groups formed and I would like to refer to a list, with your permission, Mr Speaker. The following are the groups that were tackled within that seminar: job creation and employment development, education and unemployment, 'attitude to work' ethic, expectations and attitudes towards unemployed, organisations of social action by and of the unemployed, effects of unemployment on individuals and families, community-sharing resources, commitment to action, recognising people's worth, equal opportunity and recognition of unemployed, recognition of need and information to unemployed, mature unemployed, and issues raised in other groups relating to students.

Although issue groups discussed different areas of concern, they are all linked under one umbrella, and I am sure much constructive action will flow from this fine example of a community working together to establish a solution to one of the community's most devastating concerns. As the resulting information and action emerges, other communities could take up this example and direct their efforts to looking at and acting upon the type of information that can be gathered in order to provide this valuable communication with all groups in a community. New Opportunities for Women (or NOW as it is known) was launched by the Premier, John Bannon, on 2 August this year. The NOW programme offers a specific aim of allowing women the opportunity to train for work in technical and scientific skills, the areas where jobs are most likely to be found. Unemployment in areas where the majority of women work, such as in clerical services and retail areas, has been drastically affected by technological change.

According to Australian Bureau of Statistics figures for November 1982, about 45 per cent of all women in South Australia are in the labour force: they represent about 38 per cent of the labour force. Of these women, 44 per cent are in the part-time work force, and 63 per cent are in clerical services and retail services where there is high unemployment. There has been a dramatic increase in the number of women working part time, particularly women over 35 years of age.

Courses to develop women's skills and confidence in technical areas introduce them to work and training in less traditional areas, and the NOW programme gives mature women an opportunity that they have not had previously. Mature-age unemployment figures for February 1983 show that about 2 000 mature-age women were registered as unemployed, which was about 2 per cent of the total mature-age unemployed registered, involving 5.3 per cent, or approximately 15 000. It must be remembered that in this age group there are as many unregistered who, for one reason or another, are not included in official statistics.

Also, it should not be presumed that women do not need to work. What about women who are responsible for their own income? Are they not entitled to earn and not be kept? Initially, the NOW programme will commence at two Technical and Further Education colleges, and I hope that the course will be available over an extended area by 1984. In the District of Brighton it is estimated that half of the unemployed are mature-age unemployed, and it is most disturbing for one to have persons in this dilemma, in tears, asking for help.

The Mature Unemployed Co-operative Help (or MUCH) group, which was formed in 1982 to service my electorate and the members of which support each other, has now received a grant to enable it to operate formally. This group has been most useful to my constituents in enabling them

to communicate with people in similar situations. The confidence replaced by this contact is a great help in settling them so that they can cope with the time between jobs. It helps them to find an alternative to tradition.

Since I became a member of this Parliament, I have had the privilege of being invited to sit on the DOME committee (Don't Overlook Mature Expertise) in an advisory role. Working with these groups and the unemployed who use these services, I have found that it is obvious that the recognition of the mature unemployed and the situation that these people face requires broader understanding. It is nice to know that, no matter how bad the situation is for people in these unemployed groups, they still have a sense of humour. A DOME newsletter that I received recently, entitled 'Gimme Werk', states:

The day dawned in the Land of Dole. And it came to pass in the dawn of the Day they did go forth into the Great City to worship at the Temple of Ces. And after much travelling on the silver beast of Sta and pacing of the sacred paves they did come unto the portal of the Temple of Ces. And therein was a great multitude assembled, of the high priests and priestesses, and the low priests and priestesses, and the scribes and the telephonists, yea, even unto the sacred tea makers were they all assembled.

And around and about in the Temple of Ces was a smaller multitude, and these were the worshippers of the Great God Ces and they did number as many as four or even five. And as they did stand and sit around and about in the Hall of Temple of Ces the low priests and priestesses did come forth and place upon the sacred wailing walls the Holy Cards of Jobs.

And as each worshipper was uplifted to the giddy heights of rapture by their contemplations of the mightiness of the Great God Ces they would rush upon the sacred wailing walls and beat their heads upon the little cards crying out in a loud voice 'Gimme Werk!' And after much wailing and gnashing of teeth they would pass away from the sacred walls chanting the ancient and forgotten words; 'pae-dae' and 'smo-ko' and 'noking-off thyme', yea, even unto the table of the last of the scribes who would make the ritual mark upon the record of their passing. And lo, they did pass out of the portal of the Temple of Ces into the wide and barren land of Dole, there, to beg for alms on the steps of the House of Dss until the coming of the time of darkness disperseth them.

I record at this time my sincere thanks to the community for the trust it has extended to me to take up its problems and ideas and to the groups who have asked me to give support and instigate action on their behalf. This has given me much work satisfaction. My commitment given to the electorate on my coming into this House still stands and I will continue to be available to people at all times in the electorate of Brighton.

I would like to add a special word of appreciation to the children in my electorate who have spent time at my electorate office learning what a State member's day is made up of, for the excellent questions they have asked me on Parliamentary procedure and for their letters containing so much detail. In conclusion, I would like to be assured that, in dealing with the matter of mature-aged unemployment, each and every member of the community who is employed practices empathy with those who do not. I suggest that 'empathy' is a word worth looking up in the library.

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): I support the motion. I offer my condolences, as have other members, to the family of the late John Coumbe. Also, I would like to thank our other constitutional part of Government in South Australia for performing his part in delivering for us the Government's view of its programme for the ensuing Parliamentary sitting. Of course, as everyone recognises, those views are literally the views of the Government and not necessarily the views of the constitutional Head of State. It is important to recognise that, since the time this Government presently in office sought that office, we have had a constant stream of dishonesty where promises made have been systematically broken, much to the despair of the gullible swinging voter, I am sure.

There is still probably worse to come. It is now a matter of public record, already included in *Hansard* in many places, that the Premier and other present Ministers have made statements which they have blatantly contradicted in their actions since making them at the time of the last election. That is disgusting: it brings this institution into increasing disrepute.

I would like to mention that, if members were to look at the records of the numbers of people enrolled to vote in each election since the Second World War, and graphed the number who have failed to present at the polling booth on election day for some reason or other, and also graphed the number of those who, upon presenting themselves to the poll clerk and having had their names struck off, have voted informally, they would find that both curves on the graph, plotted since that time until the present time, will indicate an increasing rate of civil disobedience in this duty that all citizens have.

I put that down, in the main, not to increasing illiteracy—as some people might—but to increasing indifference and increasing cynicism about politicians on the part of people in the community. I regard it as a most serious and disturbing trend, as something which must be rectified and which can be rectified only by the very people who, in the first instance, instigated that reaction—the politicians themselves. I make no apology for being one of them, but I make the point—though some people may consider it immodestly—that I have never given an undertaking or made a promise that I cannot and will not keep. If other members of Parliaments—both this Parliament and the national Parliament—do not take account of the way in which the people perceive them, judging them by the statements that they make about what they will or will not do, and then clearly, simply and systematically break those promises, we will find eventually that a majority of people in this community will no longer be interested in the affairs of Parliament. They will see it as a useless appendage of yesterday's society, as an anachronism, and they will rightly judge that it is an expensive piece of theatre.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: And society will be the poorer.

Mr LEWIS: And indeed society will be the poorer, and so will we all as members of it, since the people, whose lives are to be governed, presumably by the laws made by the institution of Parliament, will be so cynical of that institution and of the laws that it makes that those laws will be observed more in the breach than in the compliance (that is, the observance). Having made that point I want to leave it and make sure that honourable members consider it because I will refer to it again during the course of this Parliament, though not during the course of this speech in any direct way.

I want to relate my remarks now to the regrettable circumstances in which country people find themselves as a consequence of the present Government's attitude to revenue raising. The most recent increases in taxation which have been announced by the Premier and the Government and which were recently debated in this House quite clearly indicate that, whilst the Government recognises the need to raise revenue to meet the cost of providing the services that it wishes to provide, it fails miserably in its concern for the incidence, the impact and the way that those taxes fall on the respective communities that pay them.

I am referring particularly to the fuel tax. The Government has claimed that the problem it has regarding the deficit is in some part the result of the disastrous drought, bushfires, and the flood in the Barossa Valley. Yet, whilst it recognises—

An honourable member: Amongst other things.

Mr LEWIS: The honourable member may say 'amongst other things'. I do not deny that. However, those matters are a significant part of the reasons that the Premier has given for needing to raise more revenue. That cannot be denied: it is on the record.

Mr Ferguson: How would you raise the revenue?

Mr LEWIS: That is not the point that I am making and it is not the question that I am addressing. The important thing is to recognise that, whilst the Government rightfully considers that it has missed a measure of revenue because of the economic down-turn that has resulted from those natural disasters, it has failed to recognise that there are citizens who have been equally affected. Businesses that those citizens conduct have been equally adversely affected, and without any compassion whatever the Government has imposed the fuel tax levy, knowing full well that those people who have no alternative choice in transportation and will have to travel the longest distances will pay the greatest amount of taxation.

In that measure, taxation is levelled on volume consumption, and there is simply no choice available to people who live in country areas as to whether or not they will consume. These people do not have the public transport system at their disposal. They must rely on their own private vehicles and on private transport operators to bring goods to their communities and provide those same communities with the services that they enjoy. Those costs will rise. Indeed, all costs to people living in rural communities will rise proportionately to the cost of the fuel tax imposed by this Government as an increase on them. Yet, they will get nothing back.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Yet they create the wealth for the State.

Mr LEWIS: Indeed, they do more than create the wealth: they provide the secure base of South Australia's economy. If it were not so, the Government would not have to state quite honestly that it has lost revenue because of the economic down-turn which has resulted from the effects of those disasters. It is axiomatic that, whilst the Government is concerned about raising its revenue, it does not give a damn about the consequences of that tax on each individual living in the rural areas who has been even more devastatingly affected by those disasters than has the Government itself. I find that cruel, quite without compassion and, therefore, untenable.

Mr Groom: Tell us what your policy is, if you have got one.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! It is very difficult for the Chair to listen to the intelligent remarks of the member for Mallee when there are interjections.

Mr LEWIS: Thank you, Sir. As it is already on the record and acknowledged by this Government's advisers, it must be recognised that the majority of rural families with two or more children are receiving, or have received at least in the last financial year, much less money than they would have received had they been the same sized families on the dole. However, because they have been involved in an industry as either employees or small businessmen farmers and have been prepared to take those risks, they now find themselves paying for the consequences of the disaster on the public purse disproportionately to every other South Australian.

It is important that we recognise, in turning from the impact of what the Government has proposed to do and how it has sought to raise revenue to do it, the difference between the security that many people living in urban areas and experiencing urban life styles have when compared to the security of those people to whom I have just referred. These people have no long service leave or sick pay. If they take annual leave, they do so recognising that the work that

they leave behind will be waiting for them when they return. They also must invest an enormous amount of what they earn in servicing debts that they incur in order to establish their business and purchase their land.

Mr Ferguson: They could sell and retire.

Mr LEWIS: And, if they did, someone else would accept that debt burden. These people are literally paying for the privilege of working, yet members opposite, like the member for Henley Beach, think it funny that these people are prepared to make that commitment to the common welfare, even though they believe that they will be happier doing so. I do not think the—

Mr Ferguson: I am envious of them.

Mr LEWIS: I do not think that the member for Henley Beach would be the least bit envious of these people if he were to engage in the kind of weekly, monthly or yearly effort in which they engage.

I want now to consider where we are going in this world. I refer honourable members to the kinds of questions that are being asked about the philosophy presently underlying the economic order in this civilised society. That philosophy needs to recognise that capitalism has produced the wealth and capacity to enable this community to begin to address the major problems of world health and poverty in a way that has never before been possible in the history of mankind. There has never, at any point in man's history, been a civilisation which has been aware of the extent of the entire globe and the population of man. Therefore, it goes without saying that to this point we have been more successful.

It has been often asked in recent times (and more frequently) whether capitalism is in terminal decline. Is the system under which we have lived for so long rotten at the core and about to collapse, as did the Roman Empire, the Pharaohs' Egypt or the Aztec Empire? I believe that we can give a firm 'No' answer to that. The capitalist economy (and by that I mean the world series of interlocking free market economies of what we in Australia are a part), is in reasonably good shape with a long and indefinite future ahead of it, a future of growing prosperity if—and only if—we make ourselves and the communities in which we live aware of what we are doing and where we are in time by taking a backward glance at history and forward glance at our future direction and the values that should guide us.

That is the nature of politics. Our future rate of growth will be geographically uneven globally and uneven across the years (that is a little jerky, nonetheless it will be assured if we do that). The fact that the question 'Has capitalism a future?' can be and often is asked implies a certain failure of nerve on our part and a loss of historical perspective. It is useful to remind ourselves that for a long time throughout the 1930s there was a widespread belief, during those times when unemployment was as high as 30 per cent (and in some quarters that belief was expressed more as a hope by our political opponents, the Marxists), that capitalism was in its final crisis and would shortly perish from its own failures and the internal contradictions that people believed it contained.

All this occurred on the eve of the most sustained and spectacular phase of growth in the history of mankind. In those days, the 1930s, there was a lack of confidence which in retrospect looks incredibly small-minded and incredibly short-sighted. That sense of historical perspective is more dismissive of current alarmism and concern. By 'historical perspective' I mean an awareness and a grasp of, if you like, giant movements of history spread over decades and centuries as opposed to the short, sharp fluctuations which capture headlines and then subside into the slipstream of time almost without trace. If we look at history it will train our awareness of the time scale that I am referring to, just as the study of, say, astro-physics makes us appreciate the

physical scale of distance. In that time scale we can see the sharp valleys of the month-to-month and year-by-year existence become an almost imperceptible corrugation in the infinite mountain of massive centuries and millennia on that graph.

Once we get the historical perspective of what our species has been doing and put it into focus, our present troubles look rather insignificant, given our previous inability to even conceive of how we could find where the world population lived, let alone feed it and provide it with health care, reasonable welfare and security. I refer to the whole of the last three centuries from the time when our records first began in about the year 1700 up until the early 1970s, which is the most recent date on which we can obtain fairly substantial and complete world records. In that period of about 270 years we can gauge the quantity of industrial production in the world since the birth of capitalism and we find that it has increased by no less than 1 730 times. That is some achievement and it is the achievement of an economic system called capitalism.

During most of the 1700s the increase was comparatively slow and the average annual growth rate was about 1.5 per cent, which is fairly small. During the 1800s, it never averaged in any decade less than about 2.5 per cent per year. (During the last two decades of the 1950s and 1960s it accelerated to 3.7 per cent.) It is interesting that during the period of greatest stability in world politics, at about the turn of the century (the zenith of Victorian England) it reached 4.2 per cent. The low point came during the great slump, from 1929 to 1939, and even this period had an average growth rate of about 2 per cent in real terms. That is higher than at any point during the period from 1700 to 1800, the early years of capitalism.

It is much higher than anything hitherto accomplished in the whole of our history. Moreover, in the next decade following that of 1929 to 1939, that is, the decade 1939 to 1949, through the Second World War to the end of the 1940s, it leaped to over 4 per cent, and in the entire quarter century from 1948 to 1971 it reached a colossal average of 5.6 per cent. Most of us here can remember that period, having lived during it.

After this breath-taking and sustained effort of growth some deceleration was inevitable to enable the discarding of old technologies and the skills that related to them which had become irrelevant and inappropriate, and the adoption and rearrangement of the new technologies into the social structure of our lives. The deceleration has occurred in the 1970s, but nonetheless growth has continued, even if more slowly and patchily, world economic power has shifted from the West to the Middle East, and the Arab countries in their control of our energy sources and their own destiny.

On a world-wide basis it has worked out that during the last decade we have had a growth rate of somewhere around 3 per cent. It should be remembered that that is well above average if we take the whole history of capitalism into account. That figure implies a doubling of living standards every 25 years or so. Whilst it is no miracle, it is still pretty solid progress in economic terms, and there is certainly nothing terminal about that, so long as we remember our fundamental philosophy of this civilisation and ensure that it is applied and that we continue to apply it.

Let us look at the last three decades in a slightly different way, taking the non-economic factors: the analysis can be described as follows. The 1960s could be described the way that Paul Johnson has done it, as the decade of illusion—the illusion that the world economy would continue to expand rapidly, smoothly and indefinitely, that rising expectations were systematically matched by an evergrowing gross national product in the form of higher real wages and expanded social services. In addition, and by no means

insignificantly, it was expected that the cultural quality of life could be radically improved by public intervention, that is, by Government intervention, hence the spectacular and world-wide expansion of higher education, which was an even more characteristic feature of those years.

We can now refer to the next decade as the decade of disillusionment, and I refer to the 1970s, when we returned to the real world on the downward slide of the economic cycle when our accelerating economic growth rate declined. It was not deceleration, but our rate of growth slowed down which was when we lost confidence. We lost confidence in the idea of fast, indefinite growth, in the notion of cheap limitless energy, in the idea of the world being an inexhaustible mine of resources, in cheap credit.

We lost confidence in deficit financing, in printing money and throwing it around at social problems, and at the poor countries hoping that they would go away. They did not, and they will not. Money does not make anything better unless it is applied in an effective and responsible fashion to ensure that it retains its value. We also lost confidence in education as a cure-all in the social democratic state, and in the social democratic state as a repository, if you like, of benevolent omniscience. (That is tons of kindness for everything and everybody everywhere.) You just cannot do it.

In the process of discarding those illusions we have discovered rather old-fashioned truths. They are there and they always have been there, so it has been more a rediscovery than a discovery. We now understand that hard, honest money produced from hard, honest work is paramount; that balanced budgets have a distinct advantage over deficit budgets, especially in Governments, which is something which seems to have escaped the attention of Governments, particularly in this country, and I make no exceptions in putting that view. Even though Governments may have attempted it, it has barely ever been achieved. Further, we have discovered the need for discipline through competition, the virtue of the free market, and the evils of excessive Government size and over activity. We have learned to fear inflation as our ancestors feared the plague; and that price stability, that is, cost stable economics, is the only reliable basis on which to plan investment and restore full employment.

If we have not learnt that then we are compelled to the discomfort that we will suffer until we do, and the kinds of problems which the member for Brighton has referred to will not go away by simply pouring money over them. These painful lessons (if not already learnt, then yet to be learnt) have to be learnt the hard way and not the easy way, and they can be learnt by reflecting on history. Let us hope that now we are making this decade of the 1980s a decade of realism, as opposed to the decade to which I referred of the 1960s of illusion and the disillusionment that followed. It is only the old fashioned economic fundamentalism of Adam Smith, and I believe that many of us (and an increasing number of us) will begin to see the relevance of those views.

Fundamental prosperity will, I believe, continue, but only provided that we retain our confidence in economic freedom, and that is what it is all about. It is about freedom of the individual. All freedoms are encompassed in the freedom to choose for ourselves. The notion that we are endowed with free will and the right to choose resides with each individual and not with society and Government. Otherwise, we find that, if we seek to subvert that self-evident (to me at least) truth, we will invariably end up with a restriction of freedom. It is not to say—indeed, the individual cannot delegate his power to Parliaments—he can. He can delegate them to assemblies and congresses without losing his freedom.

One of the chief errors in modern times is the belief that we can separate political freedom from economic freedom;

that is the mistake that the socialists make. Some people think they are quite different things and that you can preserve one, and even enhance political freedom, while restricting the other, and restricting that economic freedom quite severely. I do not think that is true, and the record of history shows that it is not. I come to that conclusion simply by taking a look into history and by my own observations of what has actually happened in recent years all over Africa, over much of Asia, and parts of Europe. A particular example of that point, in recent times, is what has happened in Poland. It is clear to me that the destruction of economic freedom almost inevitably leads to the destruction of political freedom. Without sufficient economic freedom you cannot create wealth. When men and women become angry at this failure to create wealth, they are driven by their members of Parliament to also restrict their political freedom.

The opposite is also valid, that is, where political freedom no longer exists it is hard to maintain economic freedom very much longer (if it still exists at all). Lenin, who most of us know, I am sure, to do him justice, understood that. He was quite certain that kind of economic compulsion that he wished to impose would not freely be accepted by the people. However, once he seized power by force, the very next day the first thing that he did was to take over the newspapers. He then had armed sailors break up the Parliament on the first day it met. Within three months he had a large force of secret police at his command, and that was the end of the brief political freedom following the revolution in Russia.

Democratic socialists, by comparison with Lenin's model, think that they can muddle their way through to Utopia. I do not share that view. In their view, economic direction is enough. They believe it is not necessary to restrict political freedom when they start out, but they soon learn that things are different. Their initial plan does not work: on the contrary, they are driven to impose more economic controls. They impose exchange controls, prices and wages control, labour control, and rationing. None of these things do the trick for them: they will not do the trick for the Labor Party in this State or federally either, and I think that Hawke probably recognises that.

Mr Ferguson: You supported wage control.

Mr LEWIS: Certainly not. The shops gradually empty in countries that are subjected to that kind of regime, governments get angry, and then turn on their press critics. Governments become paranoid about what the press is saying of them, and they pass a great deal of penal legislation to punish what they term saboteurs of the economy. They lock up whole categories of people, and they use the Parliamentary guillotine more and more. They pass more enabling legislation, otherwise known as regulations, instead of detailed, constitutional Statutes.

However, the economy still gets worse. Some of the legislation is invariably invalidated by judges as being unconstitutional, and the governments turn on the courts. They replace the judges with their own nominees, and then they take control of newspapers under what they call 'responsible control' and start expelling irresponsible members of Parliament.

Mr Groom interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: One has only to consider Zimbabwe to see what is happening. The same kind of model applies to the thinking of many members opposite, if I am any judge of the direction in which they would permit themselves and their Government to go. Of course, they find a second Chamber of Parliament, in which the views they are expressing are reviewed, an embarrassment.

Mr Groom: What about Bjelke-Petersen?

Mr LEWIS: I make no exceptions. The Queensland Upper House was abolished by the Labor Party, which plans to

also abolish the second House of all Parliaments to which I elect members.

Mr Groom: Why don't they bring it back in Queensland?

Mr LEWIS: I hope they do. Finally, in desperation, these governments declare a state of emergency and they extend the life of Parliament indefinitely. Even Hitler did that: he abolished Parliament finally without its ever meeting. Then begins rule by decree with special powers of search and arrest and detention without trial. (Members would do well to recall that Hitler was a national socialist.) Of course, all these moves are temporary, only for the duration of the crisis, they say, but the crisis, of course, never comes to an end. In due course, the Parliament, as it is still called, adopts a new Constitution that regularises the whole thing so that people can vote once more, but this time there is only one Party, and we all know what that Party is.

Members interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: That is the pattern, as I have seen it, of what happens. All one has to do to find many examples is to look around. Some people believe that this sort of thing nearly happened in Australia in 1975. This sad process springs from the refusal to admit that the free market, with all its faults, is still the best way of producing wealth. All so-called freedoms are aspects of one fundamental freedom which is based on the proposition that the individual is a better judge of his interests than is any collective, and that includes Governments.

We can illustrate this by looking at two aspects of freedom—the freedom of marketing goods and the freedom of the movement of people. These two aspects are closely connected since neither can function effectively without the other. The social benefit of the free market is often denied, and it is denied especially by many intellectuals and academics throughout the West where we and they enjoy freedom of speech. Those people, of course—

An honourable member: No more drought relief!

Mr LEWIS: Well, that would not be so bad if the Government did not impose its rotten taxes to finance grandiose socialist schemes for urban situations.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: How many things have you asked Ministers for?

Mr LEWIS: Only those things that are regarded as improving the common welfare of the people in material form, institutions such as schools. There is a fundamental difference between that and some of the other programmes on which the Government chooses to spend money. Of course, the people to whom I was referring would go to the stake on behalf of freedom to seek to acquire knowledge, yet they would, and do, advocate severely restricting the operation of the free market, denouncing it as the law of the jungle.

Mr Groom: Tell us exactly what the free market is.

Mr LEWIS: Given time, I will. The honourable member will not have to listen for too much longer. In fact, the market is not the law of the jungle at all. In essence, it is as highly sophisticated as a system of knowledge. One of the most important and common fallacies is the assumption often made by agrarian socialists (as well as trade unions and other socialists) that goods have a fixed or absolute value and that those who make or grow those goods have a unique entitlement to that value. They have in their mind the notion that the value of the goods is related to the cost of producing them. This assumption has been termed the physical fallacy by economists, especially those of the same school of thought to which I belong. This fallacy treats any kind of middle man or non-producer as a sort of parasite. This underlying assumption is basic. It underlines the Marxist 'Labour Theory of Value' and, indeed, his whole detestation of the bourgeoisie (that is, those people who choose to make their living by the judgments they exercise, the risks they

take and energy they exert). Such people do what they can do best and obtain a reward from their fellow man for providing goods and services which their fellow man requires. They do it in competition with anyone else who wishes to do likewise. Marx detests these people as opposed to the proletariat (that is, the great mass of the indifferent people unaware or unwilling to make themselves aware), because he regarded the proletariat as the only genuine producers of value who produced such value by virtue of their constant 'work'.

I have heard it said by the member for Henley Beach that he has worked. However, I bet that in recent years the definition he would apply to work would not be the definition that Marx applied to that work. The lessons of history show that the physical fallacy is shared by most crude economic thinkers, such as the old fashioned moralists who preached the doctrine of the just price and who condemned usury; that is, lending money at interest (for the member for Henley Beach or anyone else who does not understand what it means). It refers to any other kind of finance provided at risk for reward. It is someone who has saved what money he has earned and has decided to lend it to someone else at a rate which he believes is adequate to compensate himself for the risk he is taking. The borrower decides that he can afford to borrow that money at that price, knowing that he can invest it in economic activity and, by so doing, he believes he can obtain a yield of interest greater than what he is paying for the money. That in turn produces goods, and, so long as they are relevant to the marketplace, they will have some worth. The worth of labour must be related to the worth of the goods which are produced by it—so long as one gives the definition of worth the same meaning as I have given it in the course of my explanation.

The moralists anticipated the Marxist view and probably led him to develop his theories by condemning the so-called bourgeois middle man as anti-social. They sought to relegate the Jews who were already condemned. To that extent they were racist. Marx and still more so, Lenin, broadened the category of condemnation to the entire middle class. It was not merely the Jews who were to blame for the economic ills of society, they said, but all of us who share these same so-called bourgeoisie values. Hence the dictum which Lenin loved to quote: 'anti-Semitism is the socialism of fools'.

I want to give an illustration by referring to some personal knowledge that I have through some personal contact with the obnoxious Sukarno regime of Indonesia, who was not only a socialist but also a racist. He persecuted the minority Chinese business community and dispossessed them of their citizenship and their assets, to the point where they were no longer able to function as businessmen. This resulted in Djakarta being left with virtually nothing to eat during the last months of his regime. This was in spite of the fact that less than 100 miles away, as I saw for myself at that time, villages were producing fruit, vegetables and meat in abundance and it was rotting unsold. No Chinese traders were able to run their trucks or carry their goods and get the food from the villages to the capital city where it was needed. They had all been hounded off the scene and no-one had been able to take their place; no-one had the skill to do so. So the market system did not function. It was not there.

Members may recall that this is exactly what happened in Cuba, Vietnam, Uganda and Kampuchea, to name just a few of the countries which have fallen into this trap in very recent times. Of course, we all know that there is no such thing as an absolute value in goods. I have explained how that cannot be so. It all depends on where and when those goods can be found. Refrigerators in the Arctic are worthless if there is no electricity to drive them, and they serve no useful purpose there. So, whilst they cost somebody

some effort to manufacture, they have nonetheless no value there, as no-one is interested to procure them.

Goods in the wrong place at the wrong time or even in the wrong place at the right time have a diminished value, if any at all. If they are perishable goods they have no value, and all goods are perishable to some degree over some time span. Therefore, we can see that the essential function of the market is to change the location of goods geographically and within an appropriate time interval so that we get the timing and the place just right to give them a value and therefore a price which enables them to be produced and then delivered with benefits to all involved.

Mr Ferguson: Does that apply to wages, also?

Mr LEWIS: Yes, indeed it does. We ought not to be subsidising the cost of wages unrealistically in the belief that by doing so we are really being compassionate; all that we are doing is putting off the evil day of reckoning. Getting the location and the timing right is a highly professional business in which the natural penalties for misjudgment or incompetence are at least as severe as they are in running a factory or a farm which produces those goods. The middle man and the management class are therefore no more parasites on the actual factor of cost-input to price than the physical producer of those goods.

Mr Ferguson: So you agree that the oil workers should get a higher wage?

Mr LEWIS: I have no time for cartels. I have always advocated free markets.

Mr Groom: What is a free market?

Mr LEWIS: If the honourable member wants a definition, why does he not read what Harcourt wrote about it in his book *Economic Activity*? It is not central to the theme of my argument at the present time. It is a matter of common observation to me, at least, that the free market system is more effective at getting the location and the timing right and therefore delivering the goods than are the collectivist systems. They do not get things quite right. There are plenty of examples of that in this country at the present time and even more of them in those countries to which I referred a few minutes ago, such as Vietnam.

Mr Ferguson: So you would apply free markets to wages as well?

Mr LEWIS: Yes. Why is this, you may well ask? Why is it that over the 65 years or so after the collectivist revolution of Russia the Soviet citizens, with more land under cultivation than any other nation on earth, still experience chronic food shortages during which the Soviet Union is forced to take advantage of the services produced by the market economies of, say, the United States, ourselves, Canada, and Western Europe?

Why is the Soviet Union and other non-market economies still forced to employ rationing of most consumer foods and other goods? Rationing can take many forms: either by requiring people to queue for it (so that one will get fed up if one does not want the goods so desperately and leave the queue), or by rationing occupations (saying where one can work and what one can do), so that shops selling scarce goods are open only to Party officials or those who have access to foreign currencies.

Why is this? The explanation all boils down to the same thing in my view. Economic efficiency is the consequence of taking the right decision and doing it at the right time. This means that we must have access to accurate knowledge, and that is exactly what the free market provides. The free market is a natural device for the speedy conveyance of cheap, accurate, objective information.

Mr Ferguson: That costs money.

Mr LEWIS: However, it is still cheaper than information obtained by any other means.

Mr Ferguson: It has a market value, though.

Mr LEWIS: But no cost. That is why it is good to keep in mind: just let it operate. The more we interfere with it, the less it is so. Since there is no absolute value in goods, the free market will tell us the exact going price and the level of demand of anything in any place at any time is in the area where that free market is allowed to function. It is speedy, because it is functioning right around the clock, day in, day out, all over the world. Its information is cheap because it is a free by-product of the buying and selling. The information is accurate because it is based upon an endless multiplicity of real transactions where people agree—one has the goods to sell and the other buys them at that price. It is objective because the market is not an institution with a purpose and an ideology: it is a simple mirror of human desires standing, demanding and supplying in all their nakedness.

We can all see and hear what is going on in the market place if we bother to look and listen. The freer the market, the more accurate the information which comes from it, the greater will be the improvement in our decision-making because the more accurate will be the material upon which we make our judgments. That will be reflected in our economic performance, and so on, into our social benefits. The market is a knowledge system: the knowledge is free, unbiased and uncensored. The moment Governments start to intervene, knowledge is censored. Regardless of the reason for their intervention (and there may, indeed, be what are thought to be very good reasons often enough), the volume and the quality of the information coming from that market in which intervention takes place necessarily declines. The information ceases to be wholly objective and accurate because it tends to reflect the views of the interventionist. The person wanted something to happen. The market, therefore, begins to give out false or misleading signals to the observer and listener. Indeed, beyond a certain point of intervention, it does not give out any signals at all, and a great silence descends. One only has to look at Poland during recent times or the Stalinist period of the 60s in Russia to see that. In the very long term, success or failure of the entire system which has imposed censorship of information on the free market will manifest itself even in a totally controlled economy because it will collapse (and the long term will be many decades if not centuries). This failure or sickness first shows itself in the form of queues, then in the form of riots of the kind we have seen in the countries to which I have referred.

The free market, on the other hand, is accurate not only in the information that it provides for decision making but it also gives instant feedback. One does not end up growing grapes which no-one wants for two decades, as we have seen happen in South Australia, by allowing false trade-offs between different varieties, to give an example of the kind of black market practice that subverts these things. Some of these varieties are needed and some are not, so the man who has the unwanted variety in great volume decides to hand over an additional quantity to that shown by the weighbridge tickets for which he is paid, or he gives some other concession on the desired variety of grape, which he has in a smaller quantity, in the vain hope that he will be able to dispose of all his unwanted grapes.

Government restrictions on the market are a form of censorship, and there is no doubt about that. The truth of the information obtained from Governments is suppressed in some part and, if you like, the well from which we regularly draw our bucket of fresh knowledge soon becomes poisoned by that Government intervention—it gives people the wrong idea. It is also a form of rigging-Government intervention. It attempts to bias the market in favour of some groups or purpose, which may of course be admirable in the opinion of many at the time it occurs, but to the

disadvantaged, at the same time, of some honest citizen (and to most citizens, before very long, including the people it set out to benefit in the first instance). One has only to look at what has happened to egg producers in this State to see what can arise when Governments intervene in markets. This can be seen where it has intervened in a good many other marketing authorities.

When private individuals capture and rig a market we recognise that happening as the process of evil that it is. I refer honourable members to the experience of the Hunt brothers in Texas who tried, if you like, to control the silver market. They intended to establish a cartel. There was a storm of anger, dismay and disgust about that episode. It was a case of so-called 'moral outrage'. When it collapsed, their failure was hailed as a great moral victory and example to us all and proof that there was still some justice in this world. However, what the Hunts attempted once in a lifetime, Governments do every day. Where the Hunts ignominiously failed, Governments succeed because they possess something that the Hunts never had (and I hope that they never will have) in spite of their vast resources—the statutory power to make laws. Therefore, Government rigging and Government suppression of market freedom (and therefore truth) is made legal, which is regrettable.

When one looks at what the Hunts did and one imagines that they succeeded, one can see that the most important effect would have been that they would have cast an impenetrable veil over the truth of the real market price of silver. In our disgust at their unprincipled, selfish and immoral behaviour, we say, 'Good riddance, they got their just deserts. Monopolies and cartels are wrong.' One may think that that bit of information is unimportant, yet contrast it with the situation with Governments, which we allow (as we allow the trade union movement in this country and elsewhere) to do exactly that, to put impenetrable veils over the truth and to mask the real truth of the real value of labour and goods, not the assumed or presumed value, and services which those trade unions and Government departments, agencies, authorities or whatever provide. We do not know what the best mode of communication is in Australia, or what is the best mix of modes. We do not know what mail, radio, telex, satellite communications or other alternatives cost purely because Telecom and Australia Post, as Government monopolies, have decided what the mix will be and what we will pay for each item within their services. That is regrettable.

Because they are monopolies, they are an easy mark for the monopoly or closed shop trade unions which supply them with their labour. It is really the union movement within Australia's communication system which now calls the shots. The people who suffer most live in the types of community that I represent. Therefore, it is really the trade union movement that is responsible for providing us with misinformation. The union leaders provide their members and the rest of us with misinformation about what they are setting out to achieve. I dare say that they have questionable motives with the intention of setting up an alternative society perhaps, by setting up prices for the resources that are essential to the survival of sophisticated civilisation that is by some measure free, along with an alternative political system. Nonetheless, they use the position of power that they hold to dictate to us how, what and when and at what cost we can say things to each other by any means other than by conversation.

From this point, my remarks could go in either of two directions. I could continue and make a case by examining the record of history for less Government interference and greater freedom—not only economic freedom, but also freedom of movement and freedom of speech. And the Government's role in determining how to avoid the establishment

of monopolies within and outside the public sector—or I could examine the dilemma which confronts the existing structure of the private sector of the economy (the capitalist part of our economy), why it is under threat, and how we might solve that problem. I believe we should do that. We should examine why it is under threat.

Up to this point in man's history (that is, until the last 50 or so years) there has never been a labour monopoly, but in recent times (the last 50 or so years) we are now confronted with that phenomenon for the first time in our history. This is especially true here in Australia, and has also been true for the past 20 years or so since the Second World War in the U.K. I believe Margaret Thatcher, in winning the recent election in the U.K., has the responsibility and the opportunity to do what Fraser did not do in Australia, that is, put an end to it. That is no reflection on Malcolm Fraser himself, but rather on the weak kneed, lily livered, mealy mouthed, members of his Cabinet and back bench who feared what they saw, or believed they saw, as an electoral backlash if they did what they were elected to do at that time in 1975. I think Australia has missed the opportunity, at least for the foreseeable future, to do something about this awesome problem of the monopoly of the labour market by the trade union movement.

Because of that point, I believe that this Parliament has a responsibility to address itself to the consequences of that problem. If we do not do that, I believe a wiser man than I who said, 'Evil will prosper.' It only needs good men to do nothing for that to occur. A further decline in the levels of information about the best direction to go will otherwise continue—

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

Mr GROOM (Hartley): From the outset, I indicate my support for the motion and I congratulate the honourable members for Unley and Henley Beach for their contributions, and I refer also to the high standard of debate that has emanated from this side of the House. However, I have been very disappointed in the standard of debate from honourable members opposite.

They have gone on with their usual unintelligible, carping criticism. I was particularly disappointed with the speeches of the honourable members for Todd, Bragg and, of course, the honourable member who has just resumed his seat. I was particularly disturbed to find that the centrepiece of a contribution by the honourable member for Todd last week (regrettably in reply to an interjection from me) was as follows:

I am very happy to answer that interjection. For one, I would not have employed an additional 2 000 public servants which this State cannot afford.

By implication, the member for Todd must mean that he would sack 2 000 South Australians from their employment. That is the type of solution that honourable members opposite parade about, as if there is some virtue in standing up and saying that we should put 2 000 people out of a job tomorrow.

I find it disgusting and disgraceful that any member of Parliament would get up in this House and suggest that 2 000 people should lose their jobs—because that would be the effect of it. I thought that the member for Bragg, with his background, would have made a more positive contribution in relation to small business, and I was very disappointed with the contribution that he made in relation to that topic. The honourable member went on with the usual rhetoric and the usual platitudes without coming to grips with the real problems facing small business.

If the member for Bragg is genuine in relation to his support for small business, I hope that in regard to shop

leases, for example, he will stand up on such an issue. However, there was no mention of that in his contribution. The exploitation that small businesses are facing at the hands of some very capricious landlords is one of the biggest problems facing small business in this State.

The speaker who has just resumed his seat commenced his speech by saying that some actions in this place were leading to Parliament's being brought into disrepute. I draw the honourable member's attention to what is happening in Queensland where there is a Government of his political persuasion.

Mr Lewis: It is not true.

Mr GROOM: It is a Government of the honourable member's own political persuasion, one which he must be taken to support, because, with respect to the honourable member, he is a member of the Federal organisation as well, and he supports the type of philosophy that is being perpetrated on the people in Queensland.

I heard Joh Bjelke-Petersen saying on television quite openly that he does not need Parliament, that he needs it only once or twice a year for the passage of financial measures. Also, he has said that he does not need committees; 'What good is a committee?', he said.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Ashenden: Do you realise I haven't made my Address in Reply speech yet? You said I had.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GROOM: I apologise to the member for Todd. It was just as disgraceful to have heard it in the grievance debate. I am quite happy to admit that error, if indeed I have made an error.

Mr Ashenden: I haven't had a grievance yet, either.

Mr GROOM: I think that the member for Todd ought to read his remarks on 10 August. Whatever the niceties of how he made that speech, the fact is that it was made, and, with respect to the honourable member, he wants something like 2 000 people put out of work in South Australia.

In regard to the member for Mallee, the fact of the matter is that it is a Party of his political persuasion that is bringing Parliament into disrepute in this country, and that is in the State of Queensland. One of the divine inspirations of the Premier of that State is in regard to the fact that he says he does not need Parliament or committees. That is the type of behaviour in Queensland of a member of the Party to which the honourable member belongs and which is bringing Parliament in that State into disrepute. That is what the honourable member should be concerned about. Never mind the honourable member's waffle about Nazi Germany, and so on—we ended up in Zimbabwe or Jakarta! Let us talk just about Australia and look at the actions of the Party to which the honourable member belongs and the coalition in Queensland that the honourable member supports.

Mr Lewis: No he doesn't.

Mr GROOM: I am pleased to hear that: I do not mind being corrected. However, I am sure that there is a vast majority of honourable members opposite who would not agree with the honourable member.

The matter that I really want to tackle in this debate concerns the very good steps that the State Government has taken since coming to office, and I want to congratulate the Government for its efforts.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Whitten): Order! I want to listen to the member for Hartley, even if Opposition members do not.

Mr GROOM: I want to congratulate the Government on its efforts since coming into office and its seeking to stabilise South Australia's financial plight.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GROOM: I can see that honourable members opposite find South Australia's financial plight amusing, judging from their reaction and their laughter. It is a situation in which the Government of the political persuasion of members opposite put this State, and it is a matter of record that, when members opposite took office in 1979, there was a surplus in the Treasury. What emerged after three years of rule by members opposite (I presume in a coalition with the member for Flinders) was a budgetary deficit that the incoming Government faced of about \$55 000 000. We all know that members opposite, because they were getting into an election period in the past 12 months, allowed the State's financial position to run down to a very severe extent, to such a severe extent that it placed this State in jeopardy.

We all know what members opposite would have done had they been re-elected. They would have massively increased taxation within weeks of the election; that was their tactic, that was their plan. They allowed the State's finances to run down to its most dangerous level so that the incoming Government (fortunately, it was from this side of the House) faced a budgetary deficit of about \$55 000 000. To see this State come from a Treasury surplus to a massive deficit in three years is a disgrace to members opposite, and it is something that will linger in the public's mind. There is no doubt that the South Australian Government came to office at a very difficult time in the State's history.

Mr Lewis: Why?

Mr GROOM: In many ways South Australia has borne the brunt of the economic problems facing Australia. Despite the things the member for Mallee goes on with from time to time, there is a thread of sense in some of the things that I have heard him say, and I think that he will appreciate that the severity of this State's economic difficulties is linked to its high reliance upon manufacturing. This sector of the Australian economy has experienced the greatest pressure, as I suspect the honourable member well knows. The industrial structure, as all members should know, is very heavily dependent upon motor vehicle manufacture, steel manufacture and the whitegoods industry.

The problems that those industries have faced are very evident and have been reflected in a significant number of retrenchments. It is well to recall, for the benefit of members opposite if their memories are dimming, that for almost every month in recent years South Australia has had the highest or second to highest unemployment rate of any mainland State. For some 23 consecutive months in 1980 and 1981, under the administration of the members opposite, South Australia had the highest jobless rate. Added to this, of course, was the financial incompetence of the previous Liberal Government which the current Government has had to face on coming to office.

The present Government has steadily, as the record shows, been developing policies and strategies designed not only to boost employment in this State but to alter its traditional dependence upon the manufacturing industry. The economic policies are quite clearly orientated towards creating a climate for private investment and employment, the productive expansion of public sector activity, and direct job creation, something about which presumably the member for Todd has reservations.

I wish to list some of the major initiatives undertaken by the Labor Government since coming to office designed to create employment and to change our traditional reliance upon the manufacturing and the whitegoods industries. I do not wish it to be thought that this is an exhaustive list; quite clearly it is not. In relation to pay-roll tax concessions, in December 1982 the Government honoured its election

promise. The exemption level of pay-roll tax was raised in stages from \$125 000 to \$140 000. In May this year the exemption level was raised to \$160 000. This means that small businesses with pay-rolls totalling \$160 000 or less will not have to pay pay-roll tax. The effect of this measure is to give significant tax relief to small businesses and, in so doing, provide employment incentives. In Australia, small business provides employment for an estimated 40 per cent of the work force, and it is a vital part of the economy.

Plans, as members opposite know, already have been approved and are well under way for the establishment of a building development at Technology Park, costing between \$2 000 000 and \$3 000 000, to accommodate small research and development organisations. I understand that it will be based on designs of successful overseas centres, and this flagship building will provide rental accommodation for small start-up ventures in high technology, applied research, and development. Quite clearly—

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr GROOM: I was in the process of enumerating the achievements of the Labor Government (and the list was not necessarily exhaustive), and I was dealing with Technology Park. Clearly, the intention of this initiative is to establish South Australia as the high technology centre of Australia, and in so doing to attract new business and create new employment opportunities. A third major Government initiative is the merger of operations of the State Bank and the Savings Bank. The combined group will become the largest bank in the State, with assets of more than \$2 200 000 000, deposit balances of \$1 500 000 000, and about 700 000 depositors. The benefits of merging the assets and operations of the two banks are quite obvious in that the combined resources will be used to generate more funds for economic growth and business opportunities, with consequent job creation.

Regarding apprenticeships, it was announced some time ago by the Minister of Labour that some \$2 000 000 is being spent to take on apprentices in the public sector. In education, as a consequence of firm action by the incoming Minister of Education, 231 teaching positions which were to have been axed by the previous Government were preserved as a result of deliberate Government intervention. Of course, we all know that those jobs would have been lost under a Liberal Government. In community welfare, spending was increased by some \$700 000 to ensure that 35 positions were preserved (and those positions would have gone if the previous community welfare budget had been adhered to) and to employ an extra 25 staff in that department.

The racing industry provides employment for about 11 000 people in South Australia, both full time and part time. It provides benefits by way of investment, purchase of equipment, and so on. It is a very essential part of our economic base, and, as a consequence of deliberate action by this Government, \$1 100 000 has recently been injected into the racing industry as a result of legislation that was passed in this House under which fractions on dividends and unclaimed dividends in relation to T.A.B. betting are now equally shared between the Hospitals Fund and the three racing codes. By making the legislation retrospective to 1 August 1982, about \$800 000 was immediately available as a consequence of the new formula for dividing unclaimed dividends and fractions of dividends. In addition, the turnover tax was reduced by .23 per cent, saving the industry \$393 000 per annum. The new formula undoubtedly means a substantial form of annual Government assistance to the racing industry. The future employment opportunities to be created in the industry are inherent in the Government's proposals.

Although the Casino Bill was a private member's Bill, nevertheless it has a role to play in the future economic development and direction of this State. Tourism, as we all know, has a key role to play in attracting new business and creating job opportunities. Obviously, a vigorous partnership between private enterprise and government is crucial to the continued growth of this industry. I understand that estimates of tourist expenditure that were released in April by the Bureau of Industry Economics and the Australian Tourist Commission show that in 1981-82 tourism brought \$720 000 000 to South Australia.

Of this sum, \$647 000 000 derived from domestic visitors and \$73 000 000 from overseas visitors. The passage of the Casino Bill means that we have the opportunity of having a casino operating in South Australia within a year. No doubt exists that the establishment of a casino will mean significant expansion of jobs in the tourist industry. The entertainment industry is very labour intensive and it can be reasonably expected that several hundred staff will be employed in a casino complex. I understand from the 1982 select committee's report that the Wrest Point Casino, in Tasmania, employs about 600 people. From material available, I believe the smaller Alice Springs casino employs about 200 people.

By way of illustration, the Wrest Point Casino purchased some \$24 000 000-worth of goods and services in the first seven years of its operation. No doubt exists in my mind that the establishment of a casino in this State will provide a boost to the tourist industry. It will provide a boost to small businesses, and to employment.

Mr Oswald: To the racing industry.

Mr GROOM: And to the racing industry. The very substantial initiatives undertaken by the Government in the racing industry will secure its future. I also draw honourable members' attention to job creation schemes. As honourable members know, a job creation scheme was established by the current Labor Administration following a successful approach to the Commonwealth Government for \$17 400 000 funding for direct job creation schemes. Local councils will receive grants to enable direct job creation schemes in local areas. Quite clearly, this is designed to boost the number of employed persons in South Australia. A further \$21 700 000 was announced at the end of July this year. It is estimated that the money being made available to South Australia is the result of the deliberate job creation scheme which will provide over 3 000 jobs in South Australia.

Yet, at the same time that these announcements are going on, honourable members opposite (in particular, the member for Todd who I thought had spoken in this debate but who apparently has not) have seen fit to suggest (and I hope it is not the view of all honourable members opposite) that some 2 000 people should be put out of work in the public sector. I hope that that matter is advertised throughout the Public Service. If it is the view of honourable members opposite, that should be made known to the public. That policy would have the effect of reducing the number of people in employment. Yet, we see honourable members opposite getting up in this House time and again asking why we are not reducing the number of jobless. Here they are saying that 2 000 people should be axed from employment.

Members interjecting:

Mr GROOM: I know that this is painful to members opposite. If they look at *Hansard* (page 137), they will see that the member for Todd has quite clearly stated that 2 000 jobs should be axed. I will quote his exact words so that all members are aware of them. He stated:

For one, I would not have employed 2 000 additional public servants which this State cannot afford, as this Government has done.

The natural implication from that is that if we are not going to employ 2 000 people, we are going to put them out of work—it must follow. There must be 2 000 people floating around looking for jobs. I can see that the member for Todd has not got the support of all members opposite but I hope they disown themselves from remarks of that nature, otherwise they totally deny themselves the right to get up in this House and criticise the Government, asking why we are not getting the jobless rate down. It is an example of the Opposition's policy. This is the first time since this Parliament has sat that we have been able to get any inkling of their policy on any matter. Here it is: put 2 000 people out of work. It is very sad to see honourable members opposite supporting that line.

Mr MEIER: I rise on a point of order, Sir. I believe the member for Hartley is misrepresenting what the member for Todd stated.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order.

Mr GROOM: I know that this is very painful to members opposite, because here it is in black and white and on the record, and it will go on the member for Todd's political tombstone. Yet by way of contrast, we have a State and a Federal Labor Government working hand in hand, creating jobs in this State. As a consequence of deliberate action in the area of job creation, thousands of jobs will be created—some 3 065 estimated in South Australia as a consequence of the latest grant.

Mr Oswald: Was that Malcolm Fraser's wage pause money?

Mr GROOM: If the honourable member reads the *Advertiser* of 28 July 1983 he will find that that is not the case. Here we are constantly being criticised by members opposite, and here we have deliberate job creation proposals. In addition to that, in housing, as a consequence of deliberate action, it is estimated that some 4 000 jobs will be created in South Australia as a consequence of the new housing agreement between the Commonwealth and the State Governments. That will be boosted by some \$223 200 000 in 1983-84: the Federal Government will contribute some \$169 100 000, with the State Government contributing \$54 100 000. Home building will consequently increase by more than 10 per cent, or roughly 1 000 homes. That prophecy came from a report in the *News* of 12 July 1983, in which the Housing Industry Association predicted some 4 000 jobs for South Australia in homes funding and that something like an extra 1 000 homes would be built. These are major initiatives.

I have not sought to list all the initiatives of the State Government. There is the recent announcement of the establishment of a new merchant bank, but it is quite clear that it can be anticipated that all these initiatives that I have outlined, together with others—most of them taken within six months of coming to office—will provide a sound basis for future economic growth, expansion and consequent job opportunities in our State. Overall, the State Government strategies recognise the partnership which exists between private enterprise and the Government. Nevertheless, there is strong governmental involvement in bringing about the conditions necessary for economic growth and job creation. I believe that the initiatives taken in the State Government's first year of office and the continuing economic strategies of the Premier will prove to have provided a sound financial base for future economic expansion and job creation in our State, and I commend the State Government for its initiatives during its first year of office.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray): I support the motion before the House. Before I get on to matters which I believe to be very important—and I do not want to waste a lot of

time on what we have just heard from the member for Hartley—I must say that if ever I have heard an attempt to justify as to why his Government needs to be continually breaking promises I have heard it in the last 15 minutes or so. When the member for Hartley asked me if I would mind if he had 10 minutes before I had the opportunity to speak in this debate, he said that he wanted to talk about the initiatives of the Government. He has spent, I imagine, about eight minutes talking about other things, which suggests that there are very few initiatives and achievements of the present Government. I need to remind the House once again of the 27 increases in State charges and taxation experienced in the first eight or nine months of the Bannon Labor Government. I would not suggest that that could be referred to as an achievement or an initiative as far as the people of South Australia are concerned.

I refer, first, to a couple of matters that were mentioned in the Governor's Speech in opening Parliament some week or so ago. First, I want to pay my respects to the family of Mr John Coumbe, A.M., who served in this House for 21 years between 1956 and 1977. When I first came into this House, I had the pleasure of sharing an office with John Coumbe. He was regarded by many new members as a fatherly figure, and one who was always prepared and had the time to offer advice and assistance. I owe a lot to Mr Coumbe and the way that he was able to help me as a new member. I pass on my respect to his family.

As the tragedies of Ash Wednesday were referred to in the Governor's Speech, I also want to take this opportunity to say once again (because I have done so in this House before) how magnificently those people who were affected by the fire have coped. I have had the opportunity of working very closely with a number of those people in my own district. A large number of people were burnt out on Ash Wednesday. Since that time, I have had a close association with many of those who lost their homes and possessions. The courage and the strength that they have shown are quite remarkable, and they are to be commended for the way they have rallied around. It was rather interesting to read an article in the *News* tonight indicating how many of those people have been able to make a new start. I commend those people.

I was rather interested to see a few references in the Governor's Speech to the environment and planning portfolio, because tonight I intend to refer to matters that relate to the portfolios for which I am responsible for the Liberal Party. I shall refer to environment and planning and, secondly, to correctional services, prisons and police, coming under the Chief Secretary's portfolio, of course.

I was interested to see a reference in the Governor's Speech to initiatives of the Government in regard to the environment and planning portfolio, but absolutely nothing at all in regard to correctional services, prisons or police, or any other matter that comes under that portfolio. I will say more about that a little later.

At this stage, I also want to say that I am very pleased that we have been able to welcome the new member for Bragg into this Parliament. I have known the member for Bragg for some time now, including during his campaign. I am particularly pleased that he has been able to join us and I want to congratulate him on the contribution he made in his maiden speech. I look forward to working with the member for Bragg for many years to come, because I know that he will represent his electorate very well indeed. The people in Bragg can be very pleased with the representation that they will have in the House of Assembly. I also want to put on record my appreciation to the previous member for Bragg, the previous Leader of the Liberal Party in South Australia and the previous Premier, Dr David Tonkin. I want to say that I enjoyed working with Dr Tonkin in his

Cabinet. It was a very great honour to serve under him, as Premier, and to know both him and Mrs Tonkin privately as well.

Mr Whitten: Why did you knock him off?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: There was great harmony in the Tonkin Cabinet and much of that was a direct result of the leadership of David Tonkin. He did a great deal for South Australia. He has been referred to on many occasions since his retirement, and it is not my intention to go into great detail at this time. I want to place on record my appreciation for what David Tonkin has done for South Australia and for his capable leadership. I will now say a few things about the correctional services portfolio. However, it is difficult to know where to start. First, it is obvious that the present Chief Secretary (and we are honoured to have him in the Chamber tonight)—

Mr Becker: He's not here often.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Not often, but he is here tonight. It is obvious that the present Chief Secretary is finding the going difficult with his two portfolios, those of Chief Secretary and Minister of Tourism. I was interested to read a newspaper article recently which suggested that one of his portfolios should be moved to another Minister or to the Premier. I believe that that would be a sensible thing to do because it is obvious that he is having difficulty in handling both. The Chief Secretary has obviously been going overboard to prove that his portfolio of Chief Secretary does not take him away from his other portfolio of Tourism. In fact, I was disappointed to learn that he had to miss the Police Ministers, Council meeting in Darwin early this year and the Crimes Commission Conference a week or so ago because he was attending functions involving tourism. I consider it important that that portfolio receive appropriate attention from the Minister, but it is a great pity that a situation has arisen where he is unable to attend such important conferences relating to his responsibilities as Chief Secretary.

We have seen an incredible situation in regard to the correctional services part of the Chief Secretary's portfolio during the past eight months, particularly in relation to the Yatala Labour Prison. Reference has been made to this institution by previous speakers in this debate. However, I wish to say something about it as well, because there has been more trouble at Yatala in that eight months than has been experienced there in the past 80 years. I will say a little more about that later. As I reported to the House the other day, the sickening part of this matter is that the present Chief Secretary, when in Opposition, had all the answers to all these problems—he knew how to remedy the situation at Yatala. He knew how, when and if the Labor Party came to Government, he would overcome all of the problems there, so the Chief Secretary's lack of action in this area since coming to office is quite incredible. As I said earlier, he has been plagued by problems which have come about, to a large extent, because of his mishandling of his portfolio during the past eight months.

I have looked at some of the statements about prison issues made by the Chief Secretary when in Opposition. I have looked at similar statements made by the then Leader of the Opposition, the present Premier, who had much to say about the Chief Secretary's portfolio as well, particularly regarding Yatala and its prisoners. I was interested to read that the present Premier, on 17 October 1980, in an announcement following the royal commission into prisons, described that move as a 'pretty cynical exercise'. That is a statement I will remind the Premier and the present Government about constantly, that in 1980 they regarded the setting up of a royal commission into prisons as a 'pretty cynical exercise'. They were of the opinion that our motives

were political and, of course, they made that clear at the time. Following the release of the royal commission report, the present Chief Secretary said:

It does show that there is a very serious situation applying in South Australia's prisons. We will be seeking some action from the Government to remedy this situation.

That statement was made on 18 December 1981. As I said earlier, when in Opposition the present Chief Secretary had all the answers. We are waiting for him to put some of those answers into action. A number of serious incidents have occurred since the election when the Bannon Government came to office, and I will refer to some of them.

On 9 November, soon after the election, there were three escapes from Yatala. One escapee was serving 10 years for rape and another was serving four years for an armed hold-up. On 15 November, Stephen Wayne McBride, described as dangerous and being held for a series of offences, also escaped from Yatala. On 10 January, three prison officers were admitted to hospital after violence in Yatala's maximum security B division. On 16 January another prisoner described as dangerous and serving 10 years for manslaughter escaped from Yatala. On 8 February there were two escapes from Yatala, one of whom was serving a life sentence for murder.

I could continue, but I pause to remind the House that, when the Chief Secretary was in Opposition, he made great play about the difficulties that were being experienced by the then Chief Secretary, the member for Victoria, who served this State very well in that portfolio. The present Chief Secretary particularly referred to the number of escapes that were occurring at that time. I have just mentioned a series of five escapes between November and February, which indicates that that serious situation continues. Putting those five serious incidents in the first four months to one side, I want to look at some of the other happenings at Yatala since the change of Government in November last year.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Do you think that 46 minutes is long enough?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I doubt that I will have time to run through all of them and also refer to the other matters that I wanted to raise tonight, but I can assure the House that on another occasion I will seek the opportunity to complete my remarks if I run out of time tonight. I refer to December last year, one month after the Government came to office. At that time we were told about a top-level committee working on a master plan to restructure the Yatala Labour Prison. Of course, that committee has now reported and the plan has been released. In December we were also told that the advance plans for the construction of a remand centre were 'well and truly buried'. The previous Government had gone a long way down the track towards building a remand centre. If it had not been for the delaying tactics of the then Opposition that structure would now be nearing completion.

In January this year three prison officers were admitted to hospital as a result of violence in B division. As a result, 120 prison officers held a stop work meeting and demanded a tightening of discipline and security at Yatala. Also in January we learnt that the American prison expert, Mr Hugh Swinke, would review Yatala operations, its organisation and staff structure. In February, about 100 prisoners held a mass meeting and demonstration and another prison officer was bashed.

We were told that apparently prisoners were unhappy about returning to their cells because of high temperatures, which led to that demonstration. Also, in February, we were told that Crown Law was to investigate the escape of two prisoners, one of whom was on a life sentence for the

murder of two hitch-hikers at Tenant Creek in 1974. Those two prisoners went out in containers from the canteen. This resulted, quite rightly, in much concern being expressed by nearby residents regarding the frequency of escapes from Yatala Labour Prison.

In March, a large hunt was under way for a prisoner, described by police as being dangerous, who had escaped from Port Augusta Gaol. Also in March, some 70 prisoners refused to return to their cells at Yatala until answers were given to a number of demands concerning conditions at the gaol. Subsequently, we saw a sit-in of some 66 prisoners overnight in the exercise yard. At about that time the Chief Secretary gave permission for a woman to proceed with an application to be artificially inseminated by her husband, a prisoner at Yatala. This was regarded by many people in this State as being a quite incredible situation.

Also, in March, we saw the media carrying an angry but understandable attack by the Police Association on the penal system, which accused some prisoners of holding the public to ransom. In March, we saw another media story that had the member for Elizabeth urging the Government to scrap Yatala and to use the land for housing purposes. Again in March, the riot and fire occurred where the maximum security A division was left a smouldering shell after about 60 rioting prisoners went on a rampage during which they took three hostages.

Of course, this was all part of the very sorry state of affairs at Yatala that we had seen during recent months, and it was the culmination of previous unrest and outbursts of violence at the gaol. The Chief Secretary had been warned, prior to the riot and fire, that a major disturbance was planned to take place at Yatala, but he took no action, and much has been said about that situation since that time. The Chief Secretary was warned by respectable people in the community; he was warned by the Ombudsman, by his own prison officers and by this Parliament, yet he refused to act. We then learnt that there was to be an inquiry into the alleged bashing of some 10 prisoners by prison officers following the riot and the fire.

In April, we learnt that it was likely that Mr Robin Maslen, Supervisor, South Australian Youth Training Centre, would get the top job at Yatala. In April, the Government was urged to reduce Yatala union control. We also saw another 60 prisoners sitting in at the Adelaide Gaol (for a change it was at another gaol). This involved another list of demands. Also, in April, Mr Maslen was appointed as the Manager at Yatala Labour Prison and we learnt that his first priority as Manager would be to make it a 'stable, secure and safe place for both staff and prisoners'. At that time the Chief Secretary demanded a seven-month breathing space to solve the problems at Yatala.

In May, problems occurred concerning an attempt to move alleged ringleaders in the riot and fire to the gaol's punishment section, which decision had to be reversed as a result of a Supreme Court ruling that a prisoner had been held there illegally. This resulted in yet another threat by prison officers that they would sue the Government if any officer suffered injury arising from the effect of that ruling. We also saw a petition containing some 130 signatures in regard to the riot that had occurred. In June, we saw the announcement that a temporary gaol might be built at Northfield. Not very much detail was given at that time. I am wondering whether the announcement made by the Chief Secretary today might be an updated version of the announcement made in June. We saw at that stage another escape of a prisoner who was serving a sentence for burglary and associated offences. Fortunately, he was captured the following day after threatening a woman with a knife.

In July, Robin Maslen quit the position of Manager of the Yatala Labour Prison after only one month. Also in

July, I was invited, along with the Chief Secretary, the Premier, the then Commonwealth Special Minister of State (Mr Young), union officials and other representatives to look at Yatala. We saw then the incredible situation where I was told that I would not be allowed to go to Yatala. The Chief Secretary informed the media that I could not go because he thought that, if I went, I would make the whole matter political. I could say a lot about what he did to the portfolio while in Opposition, but I will not do so at this time.

Mr Becker: Are you subject to discrimination?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I was very disappointed by the Chief Secretary's attitude, because I had received an invitation as a result of a call by prison officers for me to be present and as a result of a resolution passed by officers at a meeting, I insisted that I should be given the opportunity to go on that inspection, and I did so, and I am very pleased that I did. On that occasion three fires were lit during that inspection, which followed a call by prison officers for a major rebuilding programme to lead to relieving deplorable working and living conditions at Yatala.

Following that inspection, I warned the Chief Secretary that it was clear that, unless urgent action was taken immediately, there would be more trouble at Yatala, and, of course, there was. Only last month an explosion in the Yatala Labour Prison's C Division started a fire which destroyed a dormitory for up to 40 prisoners. This was followed by a walk-out of Yatala prison staff, who claimed that the fire was started by a small device; prisoners were locked in their cells; and the gaol was manned by police.

I suggest that a new dimension was added when the Manager refused at that time to continue to work for the Correctional Services Department. Yet another list of demands was presented to the Chief Secretary, and so one could go on. We had a statement by maximum security prisoners refusing to take orders from prison officers in response to what they called deliberate provocation by officers.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Didn't someone find some kerosene as well?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: That matter was brought up last week in the House. I asked the Chief Secretary whether he could give me information regarding the matter of some six gallons of kerosene being found in the Adelaide Gaol. I have not received a response from the Minister to that question, and I am looking forward to doing so, along with replies to many of the other questions that have not been answered by the Chief Secretary at this stage.

I have attempted to give something of a rundown of the serious situation which has been recognised at Yatala over the last eight or nine months. Another matter that has concerned me greatly is the comments made by the former Manager of the Yatala prison, Mr Robin Maslen, at the time of his resignation.

On *Nationwide* a few nights ago, Mr Maslen gave an interview about his eight weeks as Manager at Yatala. Honourable members will recall that at the time of his appointment Mr Maslen was described by the Chief Secretary (to use the Minister's words from the *Advertiser* of 20 April) as 'the sort of person that the United States expert, Hugh Swink, said was badly needed at Yatala'. In the course of Mr Maslen's interview on *Nationwide*, he made some rather startling statements for a man with that reputation. He said that the prisoners ran the gaol. We have been trying to tell the Chief Secretary that for some time, but Mr Maslen, as a previous Manager who had served at Yatala for some time, confirmed that view. Mr Maslen also suggested that the possibility of another fire which would cause loss of life at Yatala must be taken seriously. During the interview, Mr Maslen stated:

The thing that really concerns me is that it only takes one or two prisoners who really don't care and really have no feeling for their [fellow] prisoners or get involved in alcohol in some way. And they set fire to the prison in some way when it is locked up, when 150 prisoners are locked up in the B division, and then we might have a large number of deaths on our hands, not through flame but through smoke.

Mr Mathwin: How do they get alcohol in there?

The SPEAKER: Order! I have already called the member for Glenelg to order and, if I have not, I do so now.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The questioner on that programme then asked Mr Maslen how likely it was that that would happen, and Mr Maslen replied:

Well, if I was a prisoner living in Yatala, I wouldn't feel very comfortable about it. I would feel there was a 50:50 chance that that could happen.

Taking into account the opinion of Mr Maslen as a previous Manager of the Yatala Labour Prison, we must ask whether the Chief Secretary is taking those comments seriously. I sincerely believe that he should be doing just that. More recently, we learnt of the introduction of the nine-year master plan for Yatala. I said at the time, and I repeat, that we would welcome any forward planning that would overcome the current problems at Yatala. We learn that it is proposed that \$4 270 000 will be spent this financial year and that the overall cost of the plan will be about \$13 200 000, to be spent over nine years.

We also learn that none of those proposals has been to Cabinet. There is no commitment whatsoever on the part of the Government, and I suggest that, if the Chief Secretary is using this action as a way to overcome the problems that are being experienced at present, he should think differently. Of course, this certainly does not alleviate the need for many of the other actions that we have been suggesting for some time, in particular the introduction of regulations and the implementation of the Correctional Services Act that was introduced in this place 18 months ago. I ask the Chief Secretary again what reason, other than a deliberate attempt to delay the introduction and implementation of the legislation, has he for not introducing regulations and proclaiming the Correctional Services Act.

Only yesterday we learnt of the discussion paper in regard to the Government's attitude on parole. The Government may have some different ideas: I certainly do not agree with what the Government is suggesting, and I would like to say more about that at a later stage. I certainly do not agree with what the Government is proposing in that discussion paper.

If the Chief Secretary has had problems (and he obviously has) in getting his Cabinet to determine what is happening concerning parole, nothing is stopping him from introducing regulations that relate to the other important parts of that legislation and from proclaiming those measures. I suggest again that it can only be a deliberate attempt to delay the implementation of that legislation, as we have not seen any action on the part of the Chief Secretary.

That legislation was introduced and passed with the full support of the then Opposition and, indeed, the full support of this Parliament last year. I am informed on good authority that the completed regulations were handed to the Government very soon after the previous Liberal Government left office. Some eight or nine months later we have still not seen the regulations come before Parliament. It would appear that, even within the Department of Correctional Services, the whole thing has been something of a mystery. I have repeatedly called for the proclamation of the legislation. Prison officers and officers of the unions likewise have called for the proclamation of the legislation. The Chief Secretary was reported recently as saying that the regulations

are undergoing an immense amount of scrutiny. I suggest that that is hardly an excuse for the deplorable lack of action on behalf of the Government in regard to this legislation.

It has been quite incredible that, after only eight months, under the responsibility of the present Chief Secretary (who said he would be seeking some action from the previous Government to remedy the situation at Yatala) and also under the responsibility of the Premier (who described the announcement of a royal commission as a cynical exercise), we are now in the current situation. I could go on about many of the problems being experienced at Yatala, including the lack of staff training, the lack of facilities for staff, the total lack of programmes for prisoners, the medical conditions, the standard of accommodation for prisoners, and so on. It is all very well for the Chief Secretary to smile and to say, as he will on some future occasion, that the Government has introduced a magnificent nine-year plan to overcome all the problems. Let us see some commitment from the Chief Secretary and the Premier, as Treasurer, and let us see some action. It is quite time that we saw something positive take place in regard to that institution.

Finally, as far as Yatala is concerned, it is important to note that the industrial complex, completed during our term in office (looking back at a completion date of 18 months ago) and costing some \$7 000 000 of taxpayers' money to construct, is still not being used. Last week my colleague the member for Morphett asked the Chief Secretary why the complex was not being used. In fact, he asked whether it had anything to do with the manager at that time, Mr Maslen, taking members of the Prisoners Representative Committee to look at that complex to ascertain their views on working conditions. Mr Maslen was told that the prisoners did not want to work in that complex because of the surveillance cameras that had been installed and because of the lack of greenery. I find that quite an incredible situation. (One wonders what the prisoners will be requesting as a result of what we have been learning in recent days.) The Chief Secretary indicated to this House that he would be bringing down a report, and we will be waiting with much interest to see whether that is why the prisoners are refusing to work in that facility.

If that is the case, I suggest that that is a gross waste of taxpayers' money and that certainly some action needs to be taken in that regard. Much has also been said in recent times, particularly in the discussion paper relating to parole, about the need for alternatives to prison systems. I wish to say much more on that subject when I have the opportunity at a later stage, because the community order scheme was an important scheme that was introduced as an alternative to the prison system by the former Liberal Government only last year. It is a scheme that I understand is working very well indeed. It has been introduced in only two areas of the State, and I strongly suggest that if the Government is determined to look at alternatives to the prison system, and I agree with the need to do so, it should first expand that scheme or programme because of the success that it is obviously enjoying.

Mr Mathwin: That is if the unions allow them to do it, of course.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: That, of course, is always the problem that we face. There are always problems as to whether unionists will permit these programmes to continue or to expand, but I sincerely hope that the Government will take that action and expand that programme. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier): I move:
That the House do now adjourn.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): Earlier this afternoon I mentioned the problem that can sometimes occur with bureaucracy, indicating that I would get back to it in a general sense.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: You would be an expert on it. I will be interested to hear the pearls of wisdom.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I may be able to surprise the member for Elizabeth. I had indicated that I would get back to it during the course of the Address in Reply debate, but the opportunity did not permit. I would like to share with members the major content of an editorial which was prepared by Peter L. Lyons, Editor of the *Management Bulletin*, in the April 1983 edition of that publication, under the heading of 'The bloated bureaucrat is a malady of business'. Here, let me quickly say that the Editor was looking not only at Government business but at private business, because as one has bureaucracy in Government circles one can also have it more specifically in the larger private organisations; nobody can dispute that. Members opposite have noted it, and it is a problem that even a small business person, as the business starts to grow, has to come face to face with in reality. This article states:

There is a story, reputed to be true, of a huge chemical company located in Germany during the Second World War. The company's factories were bombed out of existence by Allied air raids during the final months of the war. Its chemical stockpiles were destroyed, and its huge and complex transport facility was levelled. However, the headquarters building remained intact.

When the Allied forces swept into Germany at the end of the fighting, this headquarters building was spotted as a likely occupation command centre. The Allied commanders entered the building and were astonished to discover the company's staff still functioning at top speed.

Despite the fact that the company's production had ceased, despite its factories and stockpiles being destroyed, the managers and staff were hard at work, writing letters, circulating memos, issuing directives. There was even a meeting in progress to review the company's performance for the preceding three months.

However much this story has been embellished in the years since 1945, it still makes an important point for all managers and executives: bureaucracies emerge and develop lives of their own.

Indeed, there has been ample evidence over recent years, initiated by Governments of both persuasions, assisted in some instances by the activities of the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee, and more recently highlighted in a number of reports of the Public Works Standing Committee of this difficulty in Government activities. Certainly, it was possible, for example, for my colleague the member for Alexandra to bring a measure into this House during the last session to remove more than 50 Qangos, or statutory authorities which had not functioned for years but which were still on the Statute Book and still had to provide an annual report, albeit an update of the previous non action of their existence.

Mr Becker: There are 260 to go.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: As my colleague the member for Hanson says, there are 260 to go. I ask whether he is aware, by virtue of an answer to a question, that that is the final figure, or whether the position arises, as in some of the Eastern States, where it was thought that they had about 280 but they have passed the 500 mark and are still going, still finding a series of these organisations which exist within the various departments, all being serviced by people who have had the responsibility passed on to them by their predecessor. The editorial continues:

Whatever the economic climate, bureaucratic 'bloat' has become a debilitating malady of the Australian business and Government scenery. In today's climate of restriction, it threatens the very existence of commerce and industry simply by the in-built sabotage

mechanism which prevents management from making an extra effort to improve productive performance.

A number of statements have been made in debate in reference to recent economic factors associated with legislation before this House, the impact of compulsory unionism, and the effect of workers compensation. I am not denying the right of the union movement to exist. I merely point out that criticism has been levelled at a number of these areas of activities. It does not hurt us to stand up and take note that there is often another factor, and that factor can be the business acumen of the people involved in management.

Quite recently, in one of the radio talks given by members from academic organisations, I heard a person who is particularly associated with business management making the point that, regrettably in this day and age, we in Australia have a five day a week attitude or approach to a seven day a week society. Certainly, this is a problem which has been very much to the fore, and one with which we should take issue, not only because of the business decline in the manufacturing sense which has been highlighted here previously.

I alluded to this matter this afternoon, having indicated that I have found some comfort in the recognition by the member for Henley Beach that the factors mentioned in respect of a certain furniture manufacturing business were a real problem with which we have to exist. I believe that one other vital issue, if we are genuinely interested and concerned about making progress and bringing Australia and its manufacturing industry back to a more competitive situation, is that we make sure that we start to approach a seven day a week attitude in what we acknowledge is a seven day a week society. A great deal of difficulty exists in our attitude in service industries, such as transport, catering, hospitals and similar industries where we believe that, because working hours are outside those considered to be normal working hours, or are worked on holidays or weekends, there ought automatically to be a major increase in the remuneration paid.

It is nice to have achieved this so-called advance of a greater return for people, but if in every other sense we are trading on a seven day a week basis (most shopping centres have a seven days a week shopping opportunity for practically every item normally traded, with minor variations), and if we accept that situation, then we ought to consider very seriously its other implications. I believe that, along with the proposition I put about the need for business to look to the very important aspects of its internal management, the one further comment made in this editorial that is worthy of note, one which has been most responsive and effective, is the clear indication that there is at least one car-hire firm in Australia which, by virtue of its advertising, points out that it is important that its executives go down to the front desk to work at least once a month. While I accept that that might be a sales pitch, at least it recognises the importance of management being close to the reality of the market place rather than being in an ivory tower.

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

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I will refer to a matter I raised with the former Minister of Transport on 20 September 1982. It relates to a situation considered by my constituents and me to be a dangerous one. I refer to the number of accidents that have occurred on West Lakes Boulevard in which vehicles have gone out of control, mounted the footpath, smashed fences, and entered properties on the northern side of the boulevard. In my correspondence of 20 September 1982, I pointed out these dangers to the then Minister of Transport and suggested that, according to what was said by numerous residents in the

area, the boulevard was being used by some motorists for drag racing. I pointed out further the dangers involved to my constituents, who considered that this hazard endangered the lives of their children playing in the backyards of these properties. On page 2 of the correspondence, I said:

It is quite obvious to me that similar incidents as described above will continue to happen unless some measures are taken immediately.

Finally, I pointed out the need for a steel safety fence to be erected on the northern side of West Lakes Boulevard. Regrettably, my prediction has come true. A serious accident occurred last Friday at approximately 11 p.m., resulting in a number of my constituents, angry and irate, ringing me early on Saturday morning and asking me to come around and inspect the damage caused by that accident. I refer to the correspondence, as follows:

Sir,

We the undersigned residents of Marinna Court and homes in the immediate vicinity thereof, submit to you this petition requesting you take immediate action, as detailed later in this petition, to protect us and our children from possible future injury or death and also prevent future additional damage to certain of our properties. Such action would further serve to halt the shocking injuries and tragic loss of life which has occurred and still is occurring to motorists and their passengers in this area.

As you are aware, a section of West Lakes Boulevard runs at the rear of homes sited on the south side of Marinna Court, West Lakes, with the rear fences of these homes, and in some cases the houses also, only a few metres from the Boulevard and eastward bound traffic. During the past two years several car accidents have occurred on this section of the Boulevard when, for various reasons, vehicles have veered from the road out of control. Injuries to date have been confined to the car occupants, two dead and a number sustaining serious to minor injuries. In the course of three such accidents the rear fences of certain homes in Marinna Court have been demolished and the vehicle involved has, in each case, come to rest either partially or wholly within the back yard of the house. Such an accident to 9 Marinna Court was reported to your department last year but no remedial action resulted.

The latest of these accidents occurred shortly after 11 p.m. last Friday 12 August. An east-bound car veered from the Boulevard, passed over the footpath and through the rear fence of 10 Marinna Court. The car, when fully inside the garden, was halted by a large brick barbecue which it struck and completely demolished. The three occupants of the vehicle, two male and one female, were later removed to hospital by ambulance, all three being injured, the female and one male quite seriously.

At the time of this accident the occupants of 10 Marinna Court (whom we will not name), were sitting chatting in their home with a visiting friend; the car halted some four metres from them. Fortunately they were not barbecuing in the garden at that moment.

The Woodville council is shortly to erect playground equipment on an existing child's play area adjacent to these homes and adjacent to the Boulevard; the play area is subject to the same hazards as the homes. We, the local residents, fear for the safety of the children.

The letter concludes:

With the advent of floodlights at Football Park, night traffic along West Lakes Boulevard on each sporting occasion that the ground is in use will increase tenfold. The accident potential for local residents and their properties will increase accordingly. It is urgent that safety barrier rails be erected now, before and not after, a major tragedy occurs involving both motorists and residents.

Mr Becker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must be heard during the grievance debate.

Mr HAMILTON: The residents are justified and I support them in their concern for the safety of not only themselves but specifically of their children. Anyone who would care to look at this situation can see the potential for serious injury, as has been demonstrated in the correspondence that I have read out. Regrettably, in correspondence I received from the Minister of Transport, on 3 December 1982, he declined to provide the safety fence along this strip of roadway.

I appeal to the Minister to reconsider his decision and to meet with my constituents, who quite clearly are justified

in the concern for their children. I have watched this area over a period of years and I have seen many people use it as a speedway. Despite the good offices of the local constabulary to try to contain this practice, they cannot be in the area 24 hours a day.

They could be there for 23½ hours of a day, but the intervening half an hour could be the time when the incidents occur. I believe that the best way to safeguard residents living adjacent to those areas would be to provide the fence which, in my view, they have so justifiably sought to have erected there. More specifically, when the proposed new playground is constructed by the Woodville council, there will be more and more young children playing in the area. Many young families live in the West Lakes area, and specifically at Marina Court, many of whom have young children who play in the area.

Today there were a number of telephone calls to my electorate office which were conveyed to me by my secretary, expressing concern about the fact that the Hendon works of Carr Fasteners might be closed down at short notice. This caused considerable agitation among local business people and employees at Carr Fasteners. The matter has been the subject of rumour over the past three or four months. I asked my secretary to check on this matter for me and an assurance was received from the management of Carr Fasteners that it is not intended to close down the Hendon works. When we were in Opposition the present Deputy Premier and I had discussions with the manager about the problems of the car component industry and at that time we found the manager to be honest. Therefore I would believe the statement that was made by the management. I hope that it will allay the fears of many people who are concerned, particularly the small business people in the Royal Park area and those employed at Carr Fasteners, so that they can be assured of their future.

Finally, in the minute that I have left to me I want to compliment the Woodville council for the amount of money (\$54 000) that it has allocated for use on the erection of traffic lights at the intersection of Trimmer Parade and Frederick Road, Seaton. This matter has been under discussion for well over five years. I noticed the other night that the Highways Department had done some work at that intersection. This matter has concerned not only my constituents but those living in the Henley Beach electorate.

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

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I want to take this opportunity of saying a couple of things that I was precluded from saying during my personal explanation this afternoon.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I thought you were given a pretty good go.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I understand that I will be given a little more latitude in regard to my remarks during this grievance debate.

The SPEAKER: Indeed, the honourable member will be heard in silence during this grievance debate.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you, Sir. I want to say a few words, particularly about the Minister for Environment and Planning, because it was that Minister who promulgated the untruths in relation to the operations of the select committee into the Roxby Downs indenture. As I said, contemporaneously with his statements were some convenient leaks from his department, I suspect, in relation to, first, a letter sent by the then Premier Tonkin to Western Mining Corporation and, secondly, a Cabinet submission quite unrelated to that. They were handed on to some of the media representatives to cause discomfiture to the now

Opposition and to try to take some of the heat off the Minister, having done nothing to solve the problems that exist at Canegrass Swamp. I thought it was a very grubby exercise by the Minister and, quite frankly, I thought better of him. The Minister has failed to impress at all since his reaccession to the Ministry. As Minister of Education he was fairly passive but, nonetheless, in a sense, effective. But since he has returned to the Ministry, the Minister for Environment and Planning has been most unimpressive. He has been even more sluggish than is his normal wont, and he is now stooping to very grubby politics indeed when he promulgates untruths to try to take the heat off him in his present difficulties.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: That surprised me. It is not normally his style. I told him that he had surprised me, and I did not think that he would get that low but, in fact, if he has got that low publicly, I take the opportunity of pointing out the facts to the House and pointing out the depths to which he has sunk in his present difficulties.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The select committee was a harmonious duty, and I was paid a compliment by the Minister for the way in which I conducted the select committee and for my courtesy. The problem was that the now Ministers and their Party had turned their face strongly against any uranium mining and particularly strongly against the Roxby Downs project. They were in considerable difficulty during the whole period of the select committee hearing. Their discomfiture has not ceased with the abrupt and sudden change of policy (an incredible policy, I might say, of the Labor Party in relation to uranium, whereby the Roxby Indenture has now become their baby): other uranium mines of lesser significance cannot proceed.

We can understand the problem that they have at the moment, because elements within the Labor Party are hell bent on stopping Roxby; that is a fact of life. The Campaign Against Nuclear Energy is a former ally of the Labor Opposition (including former Leader of the Opposition Bannon, who fronted up at its rallies, and also a frequent visitor and long-term supporter, the member for Elizabeth). There is a strong element within the Labor Party who are anti-uranium, and this nonsense about copper being found with it does not alter the situation one iota; they are in the business now of uranium mining, and significant elements in the Labor Party do not like it. Therefore, they are quite happy with the delay at Canegrass Swamp.

I have been told (and I shall check it out) that an advertisement appeared in either February or March this year by the Friends of the Earth Society (*Earth Watch*, I think it is called) where that organisation was advertising for funds to help the Kokatha. Friends of the Earth gave evidence to the select committee opposing the Roxby Downs project. It was one of the groups dead set against the project, along with the A.L.P. It was advertising earlier this year for funds to assist the Kokatha.

Why would the Campaign against Nuclear Energy be wanting to assist the Kokatha? For one reason only—to stop the project. I can understand the discomfiture of the Ministers: both Ministers who served on that committee have been significant by their absence of any leadership at all in relation to this disputed Canegrass Swamp. Where have they been giving a lead in relation to solving this dispute? They sent a couple of people up from the Department of the Environment to have a look. That has been their contribution thus far during the weeks of this dispute.

I take a very poor view indeed of this diversionary tactic—such grubby politics—where suddenly a couple of leaked

documents appear and are completely misrepresented, and the Minister suddenly complains about the conduct of the select committee, when he was full of praise at the time. As I said, I thought better of the Minister for Environment. He has been pretty low key since he got back into the Ministry, but he has not stooped to that sort of dirty politics previously. He really must be getting desperate, or else he is listening to the wrong advisers. One thing this Government has had—some pretty crummy advisers over the years. One of the jobs that made my job as Minister of Mines and Energy rather easier in answering questions in this place was that all that I had to do was to stick to the facts and one could knock out the arguments being trotted up by the Opposition in relation to the uranium question. The then Opposition was not prepared to deal in the facts. Now they have had a change of heart in relation to Roxby, they can accept, as the now Premier said at the Hiroshima rally, 'Of course, we know that our uranium will go overseas for peaceful purposes.'

What about the uranium from Honeymoon and Beverley? That will not go overseas for peaceful purposes, but we know that uranium from Roxby mines will be used in that way. I am very disappointed indeed in the Minister for Environment and Planning and his approach to his current difficulties. Significant sections of the Labor Party want to see the project stopped. Blind Freddy could see that. Just ask the member for Elizabeth and other members of the Labor Party who spewed at the decision (to use his words) when the policy was changed! We know that they want to stop it. I am told that CANE is campaigning in *Earth Watch* for funds to help the Kokatha. Why would they be campaigning for the Kokatha? Is it because they are suddenly campaigning for their black brothers? Of course it is not. It is because they are members of the Campaign Against Nuclear Energy. That is what it is all about. Another area in which the Minister has been and continues to be sadly lacking is in regard to deputations and the people who have come to see him—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members must be heard in silence.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:—in regard to steps that his department should be taking about bush fire protection. I have taken a couple of deputations to the Minister. After talking to my constituents in the past day or two who have had several sessions with the Minister, I have learnt that the Minister does not really know what happens in the real world in fire-prone areas. The best education that the Minister could have is to be in such an area when there is a bush fire, or to be one of those dwellers who experienced the bush fire. The Minister would be well educated, and he would come to the conclusion that something has to be done in relation to the hills face zone. That is something that both we and those people who went through the bush fire cannot impress on the Minister. I pointed that out in the Address in Reply debate, and I repeat it now because someone on this side has to energise the sluggish Minister into doing something about the reserves and parks in the hills face zone which are and which will continue to be a fire risk until steps are taken to minimise that risk. Heaven knows what will occur next time around. A holocaust could start which will make the last bush fire look like a picnic. A fire has only to start in the right place to create carnage that one would expect only if a bomb hit that section of the metropolis.

Mr Ferguson: What sort of bomb?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: An atomic bomb—perhaps made from Roxby uranium. The fact is that it is essential that prevention measures be taken in relation to

reserves and parks in the hills face zone or there will be a repeat of Ash Wednesday, and it could be infinitely worse.

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

Motion carried.

At 10.28 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 17 August at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 16 August 1983

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

MILK VENDORS

2. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Agriculture: Will the Government review legislation (or regulations) to allow milk vendors to start delivering milk in the metropolitan area from 5 p.m. onwards, and, if not, why not?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Joint studies by the Metropolitan Milk Board and the Master Retail Milk Vendors Association of the afternoon delivery systems in Sydney and Brisbane indicate that these offer no advantages over early morning deliveries. It is understood that, as a result, Adelaide milk vendors in general see no reason to press for legislation allowing deliveries from 5 p.m. onwards.

SPORTS FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

8. **The Hon. B.C. EASTICK** (on notice) asked the Minister of Recreation and Sport:

I. What programmes of financial assistance are currently available in the sphere of recreation and sport and what are the details of each?

II. Are any of the programmes under review and, if so, why and when are announcements relative to the future of any such programme expected?

III. What have been the individual amounts allocated in each programme in each financial year since 1 July 1978, and what amounts are still to be allocated in the current financial year?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The replies are as follows:

I. (1) Recreation Development Grant Schemes:

(a) Recreation Equipment Subsidy Scheme—up to 50 per cent subsidy for the purchase of equipment by non-profit recreation organisations.

(b) Recreation Programme Development Grants—up to 50 per cent subsidy for the conduct of recreation programmes (courses) by non-profit recreation organisations.

(c) Recreation Administrators Grant Scheme—up to 50 per cent subsidy for the salaries of State recreation administrators for up to 3 years.

(2) Sports Development Grant Schemes:

(a) Participation

(i) Junior Sports Coaching Scheme—assistance towards the implementation of specific junior coaching programmes.

(ii) Equipment Subsidy Programme—up to 50 per cent subsidy for the purchase of equipment by sporting organisations.

(iii) Junior Country Development Grants—for young country sports people to seek additional coaching or competition in South Australia, and cover travelling and accommodation expenses incurred in seeking sporting improvement.

(b) Competition Assistance

(i) Travel to National Events—restricted to travel costs associated with selected competitors and approved officials attending approved national sporting events.

(ii) Conduct of Sporting Championships in South Australia—defray administrative costs involved with the holding of championships.

(c) Coaches Development—Assistance for—coaches to attend national conferences/seminars and coaching courses; coaches to attend international conferences/seminars and coaching courses; interstate and international coaches to train South Australian coaches; hosting national coaching seminars.

(d) Administration

(i) Administrator Training Courses—assistance to conduct Level I and II courses.

(ii) Administrator Development Scheme—assistance to improve the level of sporting administration in South Australia.

(iii) Sports Administrators Salary Subsidy Scheme—grants towards the salaries of sporting administrators or coaching directors of State sporting bodies.

(e) Umpire/Referee—assistance for training and development.

(f) Sports Injury Courses—assistance for the conduct of Level I and II courses.

(3) Facility Development Scheme—This scheme provides financial assistance to local authorities, community groups and sporting organisations for the development of recreation and sports facilities.

II. All programmes are under review and information will be available during the Budget session of Parliament.

III. Grant Scheme	1978/79	1979/80	1980/81	1981/82	1982/83+
Equipment Subsidy (Recreation and Sport)	62 500	91 924	134 908	133 206	100 000#
Recreation Programme Development	18 482	19 941	24 000	28 144	29 000
Recreation Administrators Grants	10 000	15 800	Nil	20 000	47 000
Sporting Coaching*	89 942	103 931	99 948	172 000	137 000#
Travel to National Events	73 948	76 855	77 499	102 976	81 000#
Conduct of Sporting Championships	30 000	36 000	30 000	28 855	36 000
Facility Development	1 275 000	1 470 000	1 162 000	1 128 000	1 130 000

+ Appropriation

* Includes Junior Sports Coaching, Junior Country Development, Coaches Development Administrator Training Courses, Administrator Development Scheme, Sports Administrators Salary Grant, Umpire/Referee Training, Sports Injury Course.

Amount reduced due to creation of the South Australian Sports Institute, some schemes transferred.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BOARDS

9. **The Hon. B.C. EASTICK** (on notice) asked the Minister of Local Government:

1. What initiatives, if any, has the Government taken to expand community development boards and what are the relevant details?

2. By what means does the Government intend to 'support the further development of a close and co-operative relationship between councils and boards' and what is the schedule of implementation?

3. What funds did the Government make available in 1982-83 for community development boards (via councils) and what were the individual allotments?

4. What amount of funds will be available for 1983-84 and will there be any significant variation in the method of allotment?

5. By what means does the Government intend to 'encourage a greater number of councils to become involved in the establishment of community development boards' and what are the details?

6. Is it intended that State-wide meetings of community development board representatives will be financed by Government and, if so, what are the details?

7. Under what terms and conditions has the Local Government Department provided a grant to SACOSS to compile a 'Hand Book of Funding Sources' for use by boards, what are the details, when will it be available and how is it intended that it will be distributed?

8. By what means is it intended to allow boards to 'gradually develop a more significant role in grant allocation, in conjunction with local government and the Local Government Department' as foreshadowed at the representatives meeting on Friday 18 March and what are the details?

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

1. None. The Government is in the process of consulting with community development boards and councils. After three years of inactivity, the Government's first step is to re-establish contact with community development boards and their respective councils.

2. The precise nature of support for boards has yet to be determined. Questionnaires have been circulated to all boards and all councils seeking their views and a State-wide meeting of board and council representatives was convened on Friday 3 June 1983 to explore the type of support arrangements that might be made. The results of these two exercises are still being considered.

3. In 1982-83 no specific funds were made available to community development boards or councils. There were no specific individual allotments.

4. This information is not known until the State Budget is brought down and no decisions have been taken in respect to the funding of community development boards. However, no arrangements are contemplated that would not involve local councils as having primary responsibility for the management and accountability of funds.

5. The precise nature of encouragement has yet to be determined pending further consultation with the Local Government Association, councils, community development boards and the South Australian Council of Social Service.

6. State-wide meetings of community development boards and local government representatives will be encouraged, but no decision has been taken as to whether any financial provision will be made.

7. A grant of \$5 000 was made to SACOSS in 1982-83 and a further grant of \$2 000 will be made in 1983-84 from the Local Government Assistance Fund to assist in the production of the funding booklet. The terms and conditions of the grant are that SACOSS produce a booklet with clear

and accurate information about potential sources of funding. The booklet will be available to community service organisations, community development boards, councils and any other interested community organisations seeking funding information. The first edition will consist of 1 000 copies and should be available to the public later this year.

8. The Department of Local Government is currently exploring the possibility of an advisory committee consisting of board and council representatives to assist departmental officers in developing guidelines and preparing grant recommendations for the Local Government Assistance Fund.

CROWN LAND EXEMPTIONS

10. **The Hon. B.C. EASTICK** (on notice) asked the Minister of Local Government:

1. Is the Government actively pursuing a review of appropriate legislation in the fields of local government, planning and building with a view to removing the exemptions currently applying to the Crown and, if so, what are the details?

2. Did the Minister give an undertaking to the Eyre Peninsula Local Government Association annual conference on 7 March 1983 to follow this subject up and, if so, what action has been taken and what are the details?

3. When can it be expected that legislation to remove the Crown's exemption will be placed before the House?

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

1. At this stage no major review of legislation has been established with a view to removing exemptions currently applying to the Crown.

2. At the Eyre Peninsula Local Government Association meeting, the Minister of Local Government undertook to examine the question of rating exemptions applying to the Crown in line with the policy undertaking of the Government. The review of rate exemptions will be conducted as part of the second Local Government Act Amendment Bill.

3. There is no commitment to legislation relating to the entire issue of the binding of the Crown. Consequently, no legislation is proposed for introduction. The present timetable for the second part of the Local Government Act review is mid-1984.

MILK

22. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Agriculture: Is the milk augmentation scheme between the South Australian Dairymen's Association and South Eastern Dairymen's Association working in accordance with the dairy industry agreement and, if so, will it be necessary to amend the Metropolitan Milk Supply Act to ensure adequate funding is available to honour that agreement after 1984 and, if not, will the Government guarantee the South Eastern dairymen their entitlements under the agreement in 1984 and thereafter and, if not, why not?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The milk price augmentation scheme is operating in accordance with the agreement between the South Eastern and South Australian Dairymen's Associations. As previously indicated, legislation giving effect to the industry's wishes will be brought into operation at the appropriate time.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE PLAN

23. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Agri-

culture: Will the Minister adopt the 1982 corporate plan of the Department of Agriculture in its entirety and, if not, which part or parts does he intend to amend and/or delete and why?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Since the 1983-84 corporate plan of the Department of Agriculture is nearing completion the adoption or otherwise of the 1982 plan would be pointless.

COUNTRY FIRE SERVICES

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

1. What was the outcome of the series of meetings between Mr Curtis and the Country Fire Services Board regarding the implementation of the 1982 Curtis Report?

2. Is it Government policy to encourage Country Fire Services headquarters to allocate a greater share of its total funding to subsidising local councils and brigades than has been the case in recent years and, if not, why not?

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

1. The overall management of the Country Fire Services Board is now under joint investigation by the Public Service Board and private management consultants. Mr Curtis is a member of the steering committee which determines the course taken by the joint investigation. The Public Accounts Committee also is inquiring into the financial procedures of the Country Fire Services Board. Both lines of investigation should help resolve problems of the type outlined in the 1982 Curtis Report and raised by the honourable member.

2. See above.

VERTEBRATE PESTS

26. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Agriculture: Will the recommendation of the United Farmers and Stockowners Association, Riverland Vertebrate Pest Board and Vertebrate Pest Commission of South Australia be upheld in having the Berri dingo-cross dog relocated in accordance with the Vertebrate Pests Act and, if so, when, and, if not, what action has been taken to uphold or change the law?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Minister of Agriculture has determined that the dingo management policy which took effect in July 1977 shall remain in operation. With regard to the keeping of dingoes by the public, this means that, apart from dingoes acquired before July 1977 and kept in accordance with conditions imposed by the authority, dingoes will only be allowed to be kept by specially authorised zoos, circuses and research institutes. This is in keeping with the policy that no dingoes will be allowed south of the dog fence.

STATUTORY BOARDS

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

1. Is it intended to dispense with any of the current statutory boards associated with the Minister's portfolios and, if so, which?

2. Is it intended to introduce any new boards and, if so, for what purpose?

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

1. Not at this stage.

2. As above.

POTATO BOARD

28. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Agriculture: Will the Minister conduct another poll by the State Electoral Office of potato growers to ascertain whether the Potato Board should remain the managing authority of the State potato industry and, if not, why not?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Under the provisions of section 25 of the Potato Marketing Act, 1948-1974, only registered potato growers may seek such a poll and then at a frequency of once every three years. Meanwhile, certain policies of the Potato Board still are under investigation by the Ombudsman as previously advised.

PORT LINCOLN MEAT WORKS

31. **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 kept under review on a cost and benefit basis.

ADELAIDE FESTIVAL CENTRE TRUST

34. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister for the Arts: Has the dispute between the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust and the construction builder been resolved and, if so, what was the date of final settlement?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The dispute has not been resolved, and was the subject of an appeal by the builder on Tuesday, 14 June, before the Full Court. The Full Court has reserved its decision without any indication of when this is likely to be delivered.

FESTIVAL THEATRE CARPET

35. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister for the Arts: When is the carpet to be replaced in the Festival Theatre; how much has been ordered; what will the total cost be, and what colour and design has been selected?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Carpet in the Piano Bar and Brasserie adjacent to the theatre foyers has already been replaced. This is in a green tone similar to the carpet in all catering/function areas. The main foyer carpet has been ordered, and will be laid as soon as scheduled bookings permit, after delivery in September/October. This carpet is to be replaced with the same red colour and design as the existing carpet. It is estimated that this area will take 1 935 lineal metres at a cost of \$61 418 laid.

DAIRY LICENCES

38. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Agriculture: Does the Minister propose to extend the present dairy licence freeze in the Metropolitan Milk Board area to the southern and northern dairy regions of the State and, if not, why not?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Minister has no power under the Dairy Industry Act to restrict the issue of licences. If a dairy is sub-standard, a licence is not issued, otherwise any applicant who meets the health requirements receives a licence. South-Eastern factories have reached a voluntary agreement not to collect milk from new entrants and the Mid-North is not in a position to want to restrict milk supply.

ROAD WIDENING

46. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: In view of the decision taken by the Glenelg council on 12 July 1983 and reported in the *Guardian* newspaper on 27 July 1983 not to support the widening of Tapleys Hill Road, Glenelg North, and the support of council for the creation of a new road link to be constructed between Tapleys Hill Road and Morphett Road via James Melrose Drive, will the Minister—

- (a) open negotiations with the Commonwealth Government for the purchase of land currently held by the Commonwealth Department of Transport for future airport development;

- (b) commence forward planning for a road link as proposed by the Glenelg council and, if not, why not;
- (c) instruct Department of Transport officers to cease planning for any future road widening of Tapleys Hill Road at Glenelg North and, if not, why not;
- (d) reject council's resolution and instruct the department to implement the plan put forward by the Tapleys Hill Road Widening Action Committee and, if not, why not;
- (e) instruct the department to implement the plan known as 'Highways Department Plan Option 3C' and, if not, why not;
- (f) instruct the department to implement another option and, if so, what is that option;
- (g) instruct the department to cease any future purchase of properties along Tapleys Hill Road, Glenelg North, and, if not, why not; and
- (h) instruct the department to commence disposal of parcels of land already purchased as part of the current road widening plans and, if not, why not?

The Hon R.K. ABBOTT: The Government will make a decision on this matter once it has had the opportunity to consider a comprehensive report presently being prepared by the Highways Department.