

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 21 August 1984

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

PETITION: TEACHERS

A petition signed by 13 members of the Kilparrin school community praying that the House urge the Government to convert all contract teaching positions to permanent positions, establish a permanent pool of relieving staff, improve the conditions of contract teachers, and improve the rights and conditions of permanent teachers placed in temporary vacancies was presented by Mrs Appleby.

Petition received.

PETITION: HENS

A petition signed by 19 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to prohibit battery egg production and de-beaking of hens and provide for the labelling of free range eggs was presented by Mrs Appleby.

Petition received.

PETITION: EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

A petition signed by 57 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to ensure that the course in early childhood education at Magill campus of the South Australian College of Advanced Education be retained in its present form was presented by Mr Mathwin.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the following written answers to questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 8 to 12, 15, 19, 24, 27, 35, 48, 52, 60, and 63; and I direct that the following answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

GROUND WATER INTERCEPTION SCHEME

In reply to **Hon. P.B. ARNOLD** (9 August).

The **Hon. J.W. SLATER**: Cabinet approval was given in September 1983 for the expenditure of \$1.56 million for the preliminary stage, which is expected to take until 1987 to complete. To date five selected locations have been core drilled to provide the first reliable samples of the aquifer through which the ground water in the area drains towards the river. Preliminary site investigations have been undertaken in the search for the required evaporation area for the scheme. The alluvial flood plain adjacent to the Yarra Reach has been drilled, sampled and pump tested with a view to further understanding the mechanisms of ground water movement in the study area. Arrangements are in hand for additional salinity sampling between Lock 3 and Lock 2.

If the investigations being carried out by the Engineering and Water Supply Department prove the proposed works to be feasible and economically sound, a submission will be made for the scheme to proceed.

STRATA TITLES COMMISSIONER

In reply to **Mr FERGUSON** (9 August).

The **Hon. G.J. CRAFTER**: The Government is aware of the difficulties of protecting rights and enforcing obligations between participants in a strata scheme. Generally, civil proceedings must be taken in the Supreme Court in the ordinary way to restrain breaches of the articles of association or to enforce the provisions laid down in the Act. It is acknowledged that there is a need for a simple procedure for the resolution of disputes in a strata scheme.

Cabinet has approved the drafting of legislation to amend the Real Property Act, strata titles provisions, and these proposed amendments include provision for a Strata Titles Commissioner. The creation of the position is subject to reports being obtained from Treasury and the Public Service Board concerning financial and staffing matters.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Superannuation Act, 1974—Regulations—Membership of Part-time Employees.

By the Chief Secretary (Hon. J.D. Wright)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Friendly Societies Act, 1919—Amendment to General Laws—

- i. National Health Services Association of South Australia.
- ii. Hibernian Friendly Society.
- iii. Manchester Unity-Hibernian Friendly Society.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

Planning Act, 1982—Crown Development Reports by South Australian Planning Commission on proposed—

- i. Land Division at Sellicks Beach.
- ii. Electricity Supply—Willunga to Aldinga.
- iii. Erection of Activity Hall and Squash Courts at Maitland Area School.
- iv. Development at Cape Jervis and Penneshaw.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Motor Vehicles Act, 1959—Regulations—Moped Licences.
- ii. Road Traffic Act, 1961—Regulations—Stop Lamps.

By the Minister of Tourism (Hon. G.F. Keneally)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Medical Practitioners Act, 1983—Regulations—Fees.

By the Minister of Local Government (Hon. G.F. Keneally)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. District Council of Mount Remarkable—By-law No. 17—Non-resident Traders.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Adoption of Children Act, 1966—Regulations—Requirements for Documents, etc.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Waterworks Act, 1932—Regulations—Service Rent.

QUESTION TIME

MEMBER'S OVERSEAS TRAVEL

Mr OLSEN: Will the Premier state when he was first made aware of the possibility that funding of the recent

visit to Japan by the member for Mawson might have breached the members of Parliament travel entitlement rules and the member's travel declaration, when did he first raise the matter with the honourable member, and when did she agree to repay the cost of her companion's travel?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: At last, after fomenting in a cowardly way media speculation and innuendo about this, raising all sorts of questions of scandal and issues of that kind, the Leader of the Opposition now actually puts the question here before us in Parliament. I find what has happened here extraordinary. I hear mutterings: 'Just be careful.' I know who must be careful, especially in the light of my discussions with this Leader of the Opposition: it is people whose word cannot be trusted and who cannot display proper integrity in the dealings of Parliament. How many members behind the Leader fully support the despicable behaviour in which he has indulged over the past few days? If all of them do, then my belief in some of them, and in human nature generally, is shattered. I cannot believe, however, that there are not people over there who have severe doubts and misgivings about the appalling standard of ethics and political principle that is being displayed by the Leader recently.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have been asked a precise question: when did I become aware that a member on this side of the House was in breach of the rules? To the best of my recollection, I first became aware of the possibility of such a breach on Wednesday afternoon of last week. Detailed research into this matter was necessary in terms of checking the rules. Like the Leader of the Opposition, who displayed his ignorance supposedly of certain aspects of the rules, I was not completely cognisant of the precise requirements of the travel allowance rules in this respect, because I had not taken advantage of this specific aspect of them. I was required to check that out and, having done so, I spoke to the honourable member about the matter. From the Speaker I got material which I showed to the Leader, who was satisfied when he left my office. However, that is another matter.

So, in the course of Thursday it became apparent that, contrary to the honourable member's understanding and belief, she had made an error about the entitlement of her spouse. Incidentally, those travel arrangements had been approved in the normal course of events. On the error being pointed out to the honourable member, she undertook immediately to repay the money that had been paid in error, and that was done the next day. At all times we behaved properly in this matter. We did not try to put scuttlebut into the press and arrange background briefings. These were the concerns of the Opposition that had been going on for some weeks before on a whole range of matters. I have said before in this place that we are really going to get into a murky area indeed if we are going to play this sort of game with the total lack of ethics being displayed opposite. I suppose that these are the tactics of desperation. That is the best way of describing them.

However, regarding this issue the Leader and I had agreed, when certain other allegations were raised and the whole process of Parliament was in some jeopardy at the end of the session that has just closed, that we should discuss the ground rules that should be involved in this type of exercise. At the meeting that we held he reminded me of this, and I undertook to have such a discussion this week. Now, I am not so inclined to do so in the light of what has transpired: first, the Leader made a false statement in the *Advertiser* that morning and, secondly, compounded it with an extraordinarily alarmist and sensational press conference that called for police inquiries and dealt with other such matters. It is

time that this matter was dropped. The mistake made by the honourable member has been rectified. I believe that this is a warning to all other members of this place to carefully study these rules, to look at their past practice and to consider how they intend to act in future. If we can leave it at that, the matter is well and truly disposed of. It is up to the Opposition.

ROXBY DOWNS BLOCKADE

Mr KLUNDER: Will the Premier inform the House of the cost to the State of the proposal by the Leader of the Opposition to prevent people from demonstrating at the Roxby Downs site? It was reported in today's *Advertiser* that the Leader of the Opposition told a group of business men at Port Pirie yesterday that the Roxby Downs protesters were freaks, that they would be seen overseas as yobs and yahoos, and that this must be the last blockade that we are prepared to tolerate.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I did see the report mentioned by the honourable member. We really do have a spectacle of the Leader of the Opposition lurching around flailing the air like some punch drunk fighter. It is not the sort of behaviour or attitude that we should expect from a responsible Opposition, or one that fits into our constitutional framework. It seems that, by making that statement, the Leader of the Opposition was either proposing that the Government embark upon massive expenditure to repress people whose views oppose Government policy (and the implications of not tolerating this sort of demonstration again in the future do involve massive changes to our whole social structure and, indeed, to the expenses of the State) or his inflammatory language and those sorts of statement are aimed at sabotaging the Roxby Downs project itself. That would be the effect.

It has been interesting to observe that we have had, over the past few weeks, a large number of questions generated around this issue—quite irrelevant and trivial questions, and questions which affected matters within the proper purview of the police in this State who are in charge of the demonstration. What was the purpose of it? The purpose was to try to alarm people in the community and make the demonstration the sort of confrontation and donnybrook that those in the Opposition would like to see. It is interesting that the Leader's latest outbursts on this matter came after the media was reporting that, first, there were fewer protesters than expected and, secondly, the police were handling the demonstration quietly and there was good humour and a reasonable atmosphere up there. Indeed, I heard a number of reporters again this morning on the ABC, for instance, saying how boring it was up there.

In that situation what does the Leader of the Opposition do? He wants to try to make it interesting, and try to inflame emotions on all sides, within the mine site and amongst demonstrators, because that is the only impact that his statements can have. The publicity he gives to the demonstration in that way can only encourage more people to participate. If he wants an all out confrontation, perhaps he ought to state it clearly. I suggest that that is not in the interests of South Australia or of the project itself.

When we talk about the costs of the Leader's extraordinary suggestion, we have to remember that that goes not only to the dollars and cents spent on such an operation, but also to the damage that would be done to this State's standing and the damage that would be done to the State in terms of investment confidence in it. Not to tolerate this demonstration presumably means, perhaps, preventing it from happening by assembling road blocks outside Port Augusta and searching each and every vehicle that goes through, by

instituting some kind of pass system in the area, or by declaring a state of emergency. What precisely is envisaged in terms of not tolerating such a demonstration? If this sort of action took place, not only would the costs be horrendously higher than they are for the sort of limited operation that needs to be carried out now—a peace keeping operation—but they would also fundamentally affect the rights and freedoms that this community treasures—I hope treasures dearly indeed.

If the Government took the extraordinary step of deciding to prevent people travelling in the Roxby Downs area, suspended all the laws, and prevented people from expressing their views, we would certainly need a mighty Police Force and mighty resources indeed. We would have more than a Police Force: we would have a police state, and the social cost of that would be horrific.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

The SPEAKER: Is leave granted? Leave is not granted. The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr OLSEN: Mr Speaker, I thank you for granting me leave to make—

The SPEAKER: No, I have not granted leave. The Leader sought leave to make a personal explanation: that was denied by the House. In order to maintain—

Mr Ashenden: Who denied it?

The SPEAKER: It was denied by the House.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I have the authority vested in me by the House to decide on the proceedings. The Leader sought leave to make a personal explanation: that was denied by the House. I am now calling on the honourable Leader of the Opposition, based on the call list, to see whether he wishes to press a question. The honourable Leader of the Opposition. The honourable Deputy Leader.

PALM VALLEY GAS

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Mr Speaker—

An honourable member: Gagged!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, gagged. Question Time has normally been—

The SPEAKER: I ask the Deputy Leader to ask his question.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: In view of reports of a dramatic increase in natural gas reserves in the Palm Valley field in the Northern Territory, will the Minister of Mines and Energy say whether the Government will re-open discussions with the Northern Territory on the possibility of South Australia's gaining access to those gas reserves? The former Government, of which I was a part, had some reasonably detailed negotiations with the Northern Territory in relation to securing gas supplies from the Palm Valley region of the Northern Territory. Under a by-line 'Dramatic increase in Northern Territory gas reserves', a report in today's *Advertiser* states that there appears to be a considerable quantity of gas in that part of the Northern Territory. In view of the continuing problems that the Government is having in seeking to secure further gas reserves for the State, I ask the Minister whether the Government has done, or intends to do, anything about the matter.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Yes, I saw the reference that 'there appears to be a considerable increase in the reserves in that area'. Certainly, I am interested in that, as he would expect, and I will examine the question asked by the hon-

ourable member. I simply point out that the thing that has continually bedevilled this whole matter during the past 10 or 15 years (during which Governments of both persuasions have been in office) has been the problem of whether estimated reserves actually exist. That has been the situation all along.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: It wouldn't have been a problem if you had written decent contracts.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: If ever honorary awards were given in professorships for hindsight, for example, the honourable member would easily be the main contender and would automatically receive that accolade. This matter has been discussed in the House on previous occasions. The Deputy Leader has taken the view that contracts written previously should reflect what we now know. How one is able to achieve that, I do not know.

The Deputy Leader ought to stick to the rather sensible approach that he took for a change in raising this question with me. He asked whether I was aware of these supposedly additional reserves; whether I was interested; and whether I would take any action. The answer to those questions is 'Yes'.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: You should have done it when you came into Government.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I understand that the practice in this House during Question Time, when a member requires to make—

An honourable member: There is no point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will decide that. The Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The practice, as I understand it—

Mr Ashenden: Which Standing Order?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: If the honourable member will be quiet, we might clear up this matter. As I understand, during the time of the Speakership of the member for Light, and also under your Speakership, Sir, the practice in this House has been to allow personal explanations to be made after Question Time so that it does—

Mr Ashenden: There is no point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I ask you, Sir, whether that practice is the correct one to follow in this House.

The SPEAKER: I am ruling on the point of order and not on the approximately last two sentences. Indeed, it was a practice followed by my predecessor and continued by me; it is not a practice of the House. Therefore, there is no point of order.

GROUP APPRENTICESHIP SCHEMES

Ms LENEHAN: Can the Minister of Labour outline to the House any initiatives which the Government will introduce to establish regionally based industrial group apprenticeship schemes? I ask this question for two reasons: first, my electorate has a high proportion of unemployed youth, and in discussions with local youth workers, other community service providers and local trades people, concern has been expressed about extending the range of training options for these young people. Secondly, I am aware of the model for regionally based industrial group apprenticeship schemes which exists in Victoria.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The honourable member was good enough to inform me of her interest in this matter last week. I have been able to obtain an up-to-date report for her, and I will provide it to the House as well. There are now four group apprenticeship schemes in operation in South Australia in the private sector. The four schemes are

respectively operated by the Master Builders Association, the Metal Industries Association of South Australia, the South Australian Automobile Chamber of Commerce and the Australian Hotels Association. Between them they employ some 200 apprentices at any one point in time. Financial assistance is provided on a \$1 for \$1 basis by the Commonwealth and South Australian Governments. This assists the operators of the schemes with a range of administrative and other on-costs associated with recruitment, induction training and ongoing employment and skills training of young persons. The terms and conditions under which this assistance is provided are the subject of a policy agreed between the Commonwealth and all States.

A pilot group apprenticeship scheme is also now in operation in the public sector. The Department of Labour holds the indentures of 15 apprentices who are learning their trades as they move from one host training department to another. Officers of the Department of Labour are currently working with the Local Government Industry Training Committee to develop a proposal for a group apprenticeship scheme to operate within the local government sector in South Australia. In the first instance, each new group apprenticeship scheme concentrated its recruitment and training in the Adelaide area, because of the availability of a sufficient number of host employers. However, schemes have progressively extended operations into other areas as demands and opportunities for placements with host employers have arisen.

In Victoria, group apprenticeship schemes developed in a broadly similar fashion, but with the addition of regional schemes. In these regional cases, local council groups were very much to the fore in proposing mixed trades schemes, which now operate in such areas as the Inner North, Geelong, Albury-Wodonga, Western Region, and Goulburn Valley. The councils have also undertaken to provide back-up in the event of a shortage of host employers. Although South Australia is in a somewhat different situation, I anticipate that the proposed local government scheme will proceed and will in turn open up opportunities for regional schemes in this State.

STA FARES

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Will the Minister of Transport confirm that the State Transport Authority's bus fares will increase by an average of 11 per cent on 23 September, and will he advise the Parliament what action he has taken to reduce STA operating costs rather than force up fares? I understand that STA fares will escalate by 11 per cent on 23 September this year. My understanding of that matter has been further confirmed by the 5DN 2 o'clock news bulletin, which also made a similar sort of prediction. That rise will represent an average increase in STA fares of about 60 per cent over the past 15 months under the Bannon Government. The Premier has already indicated that the State Transport Authority's deficit last year was over \$80 million.

The Minister agreed to shorter working weeks for STA drivers, and at that time he acknowledged that costs would be forced up as a result. It is therefore important that this House knows what action the Minister is taking to make sure that STA operating costs are reduced, rather than constantly forcing up STA fares, as he and the Bannon Government have done for the past 15 months.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I now understand why the member for Davenport comes into the House late at the start of Question Time. He is very busy listening to the 2 o'clock news! It seems that a fresh batch of rumours has been spread in relation to fares. So, to save any further

embarrassment or confusion, I confirm that STA fares will rise on 23 September 1984. The increases are minimal and will average only 9 per cent.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The fares will rise by approximately 9 per cent. Hopefully, the release of details of the new fares will prevent further rumours of massive increases. Opposition members have made outrageous claims in past months of massive fare increases. They have mounted an unjustified and cynical scare campaign that has caused distress to many poorer sections of the community, especially the elderly and pensioners. The member for Davenport especially has trumpeted around that there will be a 34 per cent increase; but, as I said, it will only be 9 per cent. He has used real scare tactics. Even with the honourable member's handful of leaked documents, he has managed to get it wrong. He could not even interpret those properly. I would have preferred to leave this announcement until the Budget, as I indicated earlier.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: That was my intention, but Opposition members are feeding the rumours. So, to put the public mind at rest, I confirm today the increase of 9 per cent. Some incomplete details of the new fares have become known to the press, and these were fuelling further damaging speculation. I decided that it would be better to release the details now, rather than allow the Opposition to indulge in any further scare-mongering.

I consider the rises to be reasonable and in line with cost increases. In fact, the new fares will increase the STA fare revenue by only 7.5 per cent. Both the Leader of the Opposition and the shadow Minister of Transport have called on the Government to wipe out the STA deficit. They have some extraordinary belief that the 'user pays' principle should be applied to public transport and that the STA should run at a break even level.

This is absolute nonsense, and it would require fare increases of 200 per cent, which is quite unacceptable. It is no wonder that Opposition members are willing to promote huge fare increases if that is their philosophy. It is a pity that they did not do that while they were in office. However, they chose not to increase fares in their final term of office. Consequently, we had to face the situation of fairly large increases last year.

This Government is conscious of the need to contain deficits in public transport, and prudent fare rises on a regular basis to keep pace with cost increases are part of this policy. However, the Government also believes that subsidies to public transport will always be necessary to maintain a level of service which benefits not only the user but also the broad community, especially the private motorist, and commercial and retail development. I quote the new fares: the second section 2 zone inter-peak, 2 zone and 3 zone inter-peak, and 3 zone will all rise by 10 cents. The adult weekly tickets for two sections, 2 zones and 3 zones will increase correspondingly.

There will be no change in the weekly and monthly concession ticket prices. There will be no change in the pensioner concession fare during week days inter-peak period, and there will be no change in the day trip fare. I am happy to provide details of the new fares which I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

NEW FARES

	Exist	New	% Increase
2 sections	0.60	0.70	16.7
2 zone inter-peak	0.60	0.70	16.7
2 zone	0.90	1.00	11.1
3 zone inter-peak	0.90	1.00	11.1
3 zone	1.30	1.40	7.7
Adult Weekly			
2 sections	4.80	5.60	16.7
2 zone	7.20	8.00	11.1
3 zone	10.40	11.20	7.7
Concession			
Cash	0.30	0.30	—
Weekly	2.40	2.40	—
Monthly	9.00	9.00	—
Pensioner			
During Weekdays Inter-peak	Free	Free	—
Day Trip	4.00	4.00	—

TOURISM COMMISSION

Mr FERGUSON: Will the Minister of Tourism reconsider the Government's decision not to create a Tourism Commission? I ask this question because of the existence in all other mainland States of a Tourism Commission. The policy of this Government as stated by the Premier before the last election left the matter open. In a document headed 'Tourism—New Directions for South Australia', the Premier said:

Following discussions with the industry, a Bannon Labor Government will consider the establishment of a South Australian Tourism Commission to co-ordinate and plan the future of tourism in this State, and market out attractions locally, interstate and overseas.

I know fresh consideration has been given to the desirability of switching to a commission structure and would welcome any developments in this area.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Immediately upon becoming Minister of Tourism I commissioned a report on whether or not the Department of Tourism in South Australia should be changed to a Commission, the result of that study showing that the Department was working efficiently, and at that stage at least we thought there was no need to create a Commission. That decision was made in co-operation with the industry itself. In fact, to have created a Commission would have given the semblance of doing something without really doing anything at all, so we thought at the time that that was the appropriate decision to make.

Since then all mainland States (more recently New South Wales and Western Australia) have created Commissions, Queensland, the Northern Territory and Victoria having previously established Commissions. I do not believe that they have done so because there is some perceived benefit. I am certain it was because there is a real benefit to be gained from establishing a Commission. As a result of the point made by the honourable member that we are now the only mainland State without a Commission, I have asked the Department to once again look at the benefits or otherwise of having a Commission in South Australia. We will go through the same procedure again, and we will talk with the industry.

I take up the point raised by the honourable member that there is discussion and interest within the industry that a Commission should be established in South Australia: I am aware of that. I am also aware that a Commission does give the Government a greater influence, if you wish, in supporting tourism within an individual State, and that is certainly happening elsewhere. I am enthused by some of the things that State Governments elsewhere have been able to do in support of the industry generally. That will be one of the prime considerations that we will look at in examining

whether or not South Australia should now establish a Commission in line with all other mainland States.

Mr BECKER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Why did you not pull up the member for Henley Beach for commenting during the question he asked of the Minister of Tourism, in view of the ruling you made last week when I asked a question?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! First of all, there is no point of order, because it has been a consistent practice in the time that I have been in the Chair that members can slip comments in. Sometimes I am fast enough to pick them up, and other times I am not. What disturbs me more, though, is that one member of this House, whom I could not identify, has said that there is one rule for one side and another rule for the other. Let me assure the House that if I did identify that member I would name him forthwith. There is no point of order. The honourable member for Eyre.

PETROL SNIFFING

Mr GUNN: Will the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs state what action the Government intends taking following reports of widespread petrol sniffing among Aboriginal children in the North-West of South Australia? On Channel 10 news last evening further information was revealed about this mounting problem. I understand that two children have died this year as a result of petrol sniffing and another 10 have been treated at the Alice Springs Hospital. I understand also that the Government has received a report from the committee of review which recommends that the problem must be tackled from more than just the health angle of the Department and that the Departments of Education and Community Welfare, as well as the Health Commission, must take a co-ordinated approach. I therefore ask the Minister what action will be taken following these incidents to which I have referred and in light of the recommendations of the committee. Having personally been aware of the problem for some time, I have made representations and raised the matter at the end of last session in debate in this House.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question. I am well aware of his interest in the matter, which cannot be resolved easily. Indeed, many attempts have been made over the years to curb the problem of petrol sniffing within remote Aboriginal communities not only in this State but around Australia. Much action is being taken at governmental level with as much local community involvement as possible, because a crucial factor is an acceptance by such communities that this is a problem, and they must accept responsibility themselves for the care and conduct of their children. It is difficult for the Government to intervene in those situations and to take some of the actions that have been suggested. Methods such as putting additives in petrol have been tried and found wanting. There are, I am told, greater risks to health in doing that than in not doing it. During the period of the previous Administration in this State and Federal Administration, a successful programme of Aboriginal youth activities in this State, which afforded one way of significantly curbing petrol sniffing, was restricted because of a severe cut in funding. However, that is only one way of dealing with the problem.

I have had correspondence on this matter with the Federal Minister as recently as the past few weeks. Provision has been made in the forthcoming State Budget for additional assistance to deal with it. The Department of Community Welfare has assigned officers to undertake programmes of assistance to communities to tackle this problem. Some

outstations have been developed in conjunction with the courts so that young offenders can be given the chance to take up residence for a period in a more traditional lifestyle to see whether this can modify behaviour. This has had varying success. A Senate committee that is currently considering this issue recently advertised for submissions, and obviously the Government will make a submission on behalf of the State. I have promised the Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs that we will work in close co-operation with his Government in tackling this very real problem.

RAIL CROSSING ACCIDENTS

Mr WHITTEN: Has the Minister of Transport details of pedestrian accidents at metropolitan rail crossings? I understand that he called for a report from the State Transport Authority in June when there was a spate of accidents at pedestrian crossings, and I would appreciate any information he can provide.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I thank the honourable member for his question. On the information available, there was no apparent link between the fatal accidents involving pedestrians hit during the month of June. Most of the accidents that occurred involved Australian National trains, although one or two STA trains were involved. I received an interim report to the one for which I called from STA. Until the inquests have been completed, the circumstances of the accidents cannot be confirmed. I am willing to make available the interim report I received to any member who wishes to see it, although much of it is confidential. It is normal practice, wherever there is an accident at any crossing, that all safety equipment is checked immediately by the signal inspector, and his report is retained for possible use at any subsequent inquiry or litigation. In addition, all level crossing equipment is checked frequently to ensure that failures cannot occur. Examinations are carried out rigidly and pedestrian crossings are normally provided with maze fencing to force pedestrians to look both ways before crossing. This has not always been the case, and crossings not so equipped are being progressively upgraded with these facilities to improve safety. New warning signs of a more visible type are progressively being erected at all pedestrian crossings.

All STA crossings where accidents occurred are equipped with maze fencing, and all signs, except one, were of the new type. The exception, however, was still quite legible. The Authority is continuing with that safety measure in upgrading all pedestrian crossings throughout the metropolitan system. The signs being erected are much brighter, and where there is any damage to maze fencing it is being replaced with new fencing to ensure the highest possible safety. I am having the information on all these reports emanating during the month of June made available if any member wishes to see the details, but they cannot be confirmed until such time as the Coroner has examined them.

E & WS LAND

Mr ASHENDEN: Will the Minister of Water Resources advise whether the Government intends to dispose of any land presently owned by the E & WS Department adjacent to Awoonga or Lower North-East Roads in the suburbs of Highbury or Hope Valley? Local residents are concerned at the possibility of E & WS land being sold for development. The reasons for this involve recent actions taken by the Government. First, the Government has advised the Tea Tree Gully council that the land is surplus to its requirements and has asked the council whether it can utilise that land. The council has advised the Government that it does not

wish to take over the land owing to the cost involved. Secondly, workmen who have been clearing the land have indicated to local residents that it is the Government's intention to sell the land for development. Thirdly, a constituent employed by the South Australian Housing Trust has indicated to me that the land is subject to negotiations between the E & WS Department and the South Australian Housing Trust. To remove the concern, will the Minister indicate his Government's intention? I would hope that it is the Government's intention to retain this beautiful land—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order, and leave is withdrawn.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The land referred to by the member for Todd is surplus to requirements as regards buffer zones for the E & WS Department. The land was offered to the Tea Tree Gully council. I am not aware of its response, but presently there is no intention to sell the land for development. The matter is certainly under consideration as far as open space is concerned. We made the first offer to the Tea Tree Gully council. I am unaware of its response, but I will check that aspect of the question for the member for Todd.

The matter of tree clearing referred to the honourable member by his constituents involves a number of trees which had white ants and which were removed to protect the rest of the area from white ant infestation. I will investigate the matters contained in the reply from the Tea Tree Gully council.

Mr Ashenden interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The honourable member asked several questions, and I am attempting to give a reply. I am unaware of an offer having been made to the South Australian Housing Trust for development of that land. I will check out the matter and advise the honourable member accordingly.

INTAKES AND STORAGES

Mr MAX BROWN: I have an important question to ask the Minister of Water Resources.

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

Mr MAX BROWN: It is still important.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MAX BROWN: Will the Minister of Water Resources outline the effects of the recent rains on metropolitan Adelaide reservoir storages? I would have thought the Deputy Leader would ask this question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MAX BROWN: Recently the Minister was quoted in the press as saying that water storages in metropolitan reservoirs were low because of disappointing rainfalls. If so, we have plenty of water at Whyalla that I could get down here at some cost. Will the Minister inform the House whether any change to the situation has occurred and, if so, to what extent pumping of water from the Murray River will be required in the current financial year?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: This question does not always meet with the approval of members opposite, but it is important to convey to the public the position regarding water supplies to metropolitan and country areas during the forthcoming summer. I am pleased to inform the House and the public that in the past 12 days metropolitan reservoir storages have been boosted substantially, from about 40 per cent of capacity to 58 per cent, which compares favourably with 60 per cent at this time last year.

The Hon. D.C. Brown interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: It has often been said to me that the member for Davenport sits on the right hand side of God—but I do not claim that privilege. South Australia is subject to seasonal fluctuations, and I do not think any of us can claim any credit or debit for those. The rains in the past 12 days have substantially altered the situation for the farming community and in regard to potential costs involved with pumping water from the Murray River to metropolitan storages. That is important from an economic point of view. We must ensure that there is sufficient water in metropolitan storages to avoid the imposition of restrictions during the summer months: that has not happened since the 1950s. I am pleased to be able to inform members of the House that the position in regard to metropolitan storage is very satisfactory. Indeed, substantial rains in New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland have boosted resources in the River Murray Commission storage, which currently stand at 70 per cent.

APPRENTICES

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I direct my question to the Deputy Premier, but it could equally be asked of the Minister of Education to explain—

The Hon. D.C. Brown interjecting:

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Perhaps I had better not comment.

The SPEAKER: Precisely. The honourable member will ask his question.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: It is an important one, too, Mr Speaker. Will the Deputy Premier explain the Government's policy in the employment of apprentices in the Government service? I understand that the Government has decided that in future it will employ only apprentices who have completed TAFE courses, and I have been informed that people are required to undertake before employment a prevocational course at TAFE that in some cases can last as long as 30 weeks. I have also been informed that people in the country are disturbed that their students may not have accessibility to TAFE colleges to be able to do these courses. I understand that in advertisements that have appeared in the press recently advertising for apprentices in the Government service the TAFE requirement has been spelt out.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Apprenticeship programmes in many ways are a shared responsibility between myself and the Minister of Education. The Government wants to work towards a prevocational system—

The Hon. Michael Wilson: There is nothing wrong with that, as long as they get access.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I am pleased the honourable member agrees that there is nothing wrong with that. However, a report which Cabinet looked at yesterday, and which I will be releasing in the next few days, considers all of those matters, and I am sure that the honourable member will be interested in it. The Minister of Education and I have already had a meeting to determine ways and means by which country people will be able to gain admittance, and the honourable member will be pleased with what we were able to achieve. The intention of the Government is to work towards prevocational apprenticeships for many reasons which are advocated in the report and with which I will not delay Parliament at the moment.

CO-OPERATIVE SUPERMARKETS

Mr HAMILTON: Is the Minister of Community Welfare aware of the latest type of supermarket in operation in

Western Australia that has been established to help ease the burden faced by low income earners, and what similarities are there to the co-operatives that operate in this State? An article brought to my attention in a Western Australian paper dated 16 March 1984 states:

Midland's newest supermarket is quickly proving to be a bargain-hunter's mecca. The shop opened last week and already big crowds are flocking through its doors in search of cheap food and groceries. But the customers represent an exclusive clientele—most of them are pensioners or single parents. All must produce their social security health cards before reaping the benefits of cut-price household items.

The article continues, in part:

It is manned by a staff of more than 60 volunteers and employs three full-time workers whose wages are funded with grants from the Commonwealth Employment Programme . . . Government and community welfare groups and churches in the Midland area assist the project.

The important aspect is this:

The 11 shops worked together through a combined warehouse and buying system and offered damaged goods from suppliers as well as a range of essential products which carried only a marginal retail mark-up.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question. It is a most interesting exercise that he has explained to the House, and I am impressed that it is a self help organisation that is providing an important service to those most in need. A number of individual food co-operatives have been established in this State as a result of CEP programmes and other initiatives taken by many social security recipients in the community. We in this State may well be able to learn from the Western Australian experience. I will certainly have officers of my Department follow up this matter. Indeed, many programmes have been established under CEP funding that will, in turn, see the establishment of organisations which will not require ongoing funding (or, if they do, it will be minimal funding) but which are providing very worthwhile services to various sections of the community.

This programme has proved a great fillip to the many people who are experiencing unemployment and who do want to contribute to community life in a meaningful way. This is obviously one example where it has been achieved in Western Australia. Hopefully, we can share such experiences around Australia in order to enable those programmes to continue to flourish.

TREE LOPPING

Mr EVANS: Is the Minister of Mines and Energy aware of the research that some Hills residents have carried out in relation to the legislative authority of ETSA to lop or remove trees from private or public property? Can the Minister advise the House of the facts in relation to this matter? A public meeting which was held in the Hills was attended by several community groups whose research tends to show that ETSA may have some difficulty in justifying its position with respect to the lopping or removal of trees and to its use of certain noisy equipment in carrying out that work. I ask the question because of the importance to the Hills area in particular.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I thank the honourable member for the sensible way in which he has raised this rather important matter. In answer to the first part of his question, I am aware that a Hills resident (as I understand it) contends that there are some queries, at least, in regard to the legality of ETSA's carrying out tree cutting and pruning in relation to overhead wires, for example. I think it is a pity that in the last month or two we seem to have entered into an adversarial scene which is really not warranted.

Every member of this House would agree that it is really absurd to suggest that ETSA, for purposes of its own, just goes out and cuts down trees or tree limbs. I have never heard anyone who is taking that line, as some people are doing outside, being able to put forward any motive for such behaviour. I think that people would be hard put to do so. As most people in South Australia well know, we had a very serious fire on a certain Ash Wednesday which resulted in a great deal of property loss, and a loss of lives and injury to people.

All inquiries that have been conducted into that whole area and previous inquiries in Victoria (I think one was the Barber inquiry) point to the fact that certain action should be taken to prevent interference with overhead wires. I am quite certain that ETSA regards the programme that it is currently employing as strictly necessary in the circumstances. Also, there is liaison between the Department of Environment and Planning officers and ETSA officers. I also understand that technical advice in relation to the effects on trees of these special pruning or trimming activities is available from certain qualified people at the Botanic Gardens.

I think that ETSA is trying its best to do that which is necessary in the circumstances. However, I think the honourable member also asked me whether I would have a look at the position that has been put forward by his constituent. I undertake to do that and to give a more considered reply on the points to which he referred.

WHEELCHAIRS

Mr PETERSON: Will the Minister of Tourism ask the Minister of Health whether the State Health Services can provide non-standard wheelchairs for nursing home patients? I have been approached by a constituent whose mother is a patient in a nursing home. She is a diabetic, blind and recently had one leg amputated. Because of her size, this woman is not able to use a standard size wheelchair. Until she had the leg amputated, my constituent's mother was mobile and able to attend the Blind Institute establishment at Blacks Road, and could be taken out by the family on outings.

She has now been told that she will have to purchase her own specially-built wheelchair out of her own meagre finances, which is an impossible task as the wheelchair will cost between \$800 and \$900. It has been put to me that surely somewhere in the health system there is a chair to suit this person which will enable her to become mobile again.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question. I appreciate the concern for his constituent and his desire to be able to obtain for her a wheelchair that meets her needs. I will take up the matter with my colleague, the Minister of Health, in another place as a matter of urgency and get a reply for the honourable member.

TOURISM GRANTS

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Will the Minister of Tourism say whether he was consulted regarding the \$193 000 CEP grant to the Storemen and Packers Union and, if so, why did he or officers of his Department agree to the payment of this sum knowing that the facility is primarily intended to benefit union members, and that in receiving such a grant the union was receiving Government assistance ahead of a significant number of local government projects some of which have been approved by the Department of Tourism for a period of two years or more?

In a report in the *Advertiser* of 26 June the Regional Director of the Federal Department of Employment and Industrial Relations was quoted as saying that the Department of Tourism had been consulted and had raised no objection to the grant to the Storemen and Packers Union. At the same time, I have been assured by members of the South Australian Association of Regional Tourism Organisations that they had checked with the Department of Tourism as to whether the Department had acquiesced or would acquiesce in the proposal and had been told that no such grant had been or would be approved. The Minister's role in this matter therefore needs to be clarified.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The matter of the caravan park was certainly raised with me and my Department. The originators of that request were told that if they were looking for CEP funds it was a matter to be taken up with the appropriate authorities. I should point out to the honourable member (and I am sure she well knows) that no State funds are involved in the CEP programme to which she referred. I think she does an injustice to the work that we are doing through local government to try to compare the CEP programmes that are the result of a direct application with the work that the Department of Tourism through local government is trying to do in terms of the CEP programmes. The funding has not affected any of the programmes that have been approved by the Department of Tourism for funding.

I can tell the honourable member where the difficulty lies. There was a subsidy line for the Department of Tourism to assist local government in the provision of tourist facilities such as caravan parks and barbeque areas, and under the previous Government that particular line deteriorated from \$500 000 down to \$329 000, which involved a decrease in money terms and a decrease in real terms even more severe than that. Last year there was only a marginal increase, and I hope to be somewhat more successful this year.

In terms of this Government supporting local government in the provision of tourist facilities, I think that we can stand any criticism. Further to that, we are trying through the Department of Tourism to have CEP money directed through local government projects for those projects which have our priorities. The particular example that the honourable member mentioned is not a matter for the Department of Tourism or our priorities at all because it is not on our list. Our priorities continue and, hopefully, with the support—

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: In our tourism priorities we do, but the example quoted by the honourable member is not a priority for the Department of Tourism. The applications that come to the Department of Tourism are dealt with by it within a week or two, and the honourable member can ask questions about them. The direct answer to her question is that no project has been disadvantaged at all by the funding to which she referred.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS: ALLEGED MISREPRESENTATION

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr OLSEN: I claim to have been misrepresented by the Premier in his remarks to the House today and in television and radio interviews last Friday. The Premier said, *inter alia*, first, that I had approved the Government's new travel rules which allow *de facto* spouses to travel at public expense; secondly, that I had been satisfied with the information that he provided to me at a meeting last Thursday evening to

discuss the travel arrangements of the member for Mawson; and, thirdly, that I had promoted speculation about a scandal with the media.

In relation to the new travel rules, they were discussed in general terms with the Opposition; however, the specific question of *de facto* spouses was never raised with us for our approval. The Opposition did not become aware of the fact that *de facto* spouses had been included until the new rules were circulated to all members as a Cabinet decision—in other words, as a *fait accompli*.

In relation to my meeting with the Premier last Thursday evening, I gave the Premier no indication that I was satisfied with his explanation of the funding of the honourable member's travel to Japan. I utterly refute his contrary advice to this House today, and I was neither asked by the Premier for an undertaking nor did I give a specific undertaking.

Regarding the promotion of speculation of scandal by the Opposition, I respond by advising that it was a Minister of the Government who advised a member of the Opposition last Thursday that a member of the ALP had misused funds. In fact, it was a Government press secretary who had raised last Monday week with members of the media the subject of a scandal. On questions being asked of my office, we denied any knowledge of such a scandal, as the media representatives who are in the gallery today and who asked the questions well know. The fact is that the response by the Premier on Friday and in the House today has been a total misrepresentation of a discussion that I had with him last Thursday. I do not condone actions such as that. I will neither tolerate it nor accept from the Premier of the State misrepresentation of that nature.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must consider first whether one can make a personal explanation in relation to a preceding personal explanation. I will have to ponder that for a moment. I call on the Premier, but I ask him to bear in mind the Standing Order and, in so far as it is possible, to keep this to strict lines of fact without entering into debate.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I thank you, Mr Speaker. I claim to have been misrepresented in the statement that has been made, and I certainly do not intend to enter into debate. There should perhaps be a correction regarding the acceptance as to the travel scheme by the Leader of the Opposition. As I understand it, the response from the Liberal Party room was that one of the points of disagreement concerned the fact that the Leader's own travel arrangements were not satisfactorily catered for. I understand that that was subsequently corrected. That was the only query that I recall having been raised on this matter.

Secondly, as to what took place in discussion between the Leader and me, clearly that is not something that can be debated. I can only stand by what I have said about that conversation: that the Leader assured me that he would be making no comment on the matter to the press. He rang me subsequently to say that he had been approached by the press and that he would make a general comment. He left my office saying he would make no comment if approached. In fact, he went on to say, in terms of continuing on this sort of comment, that he could not speak for all his members because some of his back-benchers might jump up and say things and he could not control them. However, to the extent that he could, he would do so. That is enough of the conversation that needs to be canvassed, but I am happy to continue that debate if the Leader wants to. Really, however, there is no way in which either of us can prove anything. I can only say that my belief in the integrity of the Leader has been severely shaken by my experience. In

relation to the question of promoting speculation, that is absolute nonsense.

Mr Olsen: That was comment.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader gratuitously said, 'That was comment', referring to the last sentence of the Premier's explanation. I will check it afterwards, but I did not think that it was 'comment' at the time. I thought that I was generous in allowing both the Leader and the Premier to say what they said. Most certainly, we cannot have an exchange of personal explanations that become a substitute for a debate of substance. I understand that the Deputy Leader has risen on a point of order.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: No, Mr Speaker. I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I seek leave to make a personal explanation because it bears on the matters that have been canvassed by the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition. In relation to the first point, there was, as the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, a discussion between the Deputy Premier and me, as well as our respective Parties, regarding the proposed scheme for travel rules. However, at no time was the possibility of *de facto* spouses travelling canvassed in those discussions, nor is it referred to in the preliminary documents that were made available. The rules are somewhat complicated. In fact, the *Advertiser* got them wrong when it suggested that the rules entitled members to \$4 000 a year plus \$143 a day. That was wrong, and there has been adverse comment among the public in relation to that statement. In fact, the \$143 per day is subtracted from the all-up total of \$4 000.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a good example of a comment of which the whole House is in favour, yet strictly speaking under Standing Orders I should have sat the Deputy Leader of the Opposition down immediately and dealt with it. The House cannot have it both ways. I have been asked to be strict, and I give notice that from this point I shall be. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: In relation to the second point raised by the Leader of the Opposition, which bears on the briefing that he had from the Premier, I was in the Leader's office when the call came through saying that the Premier wished to talk to him. We had become aware of some of the facts in relation to this precisely in the way that the Leader indicated (a call from a Government Minister to one of the Opposition). The Opposition for some time had been pondering about the scandal of which the media seemed to have got hold. When the Leader returned from that discussion with the Premier, I asked him, 'Did you give any undertakings to him?' The Leader replied, 'No, of course I did not.' It was suggested in conversation between the Leader and me that he had not given any undertakings. Of course, it was obvious—

The SPEAKER: Order! The matter is now being debated.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: —that the Premier wanted to take the heat out of the situation.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Deputy Leader to desist.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Well, I am simply giving an account of the facts in relation to those three matters.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier): On a point of order, Mr Speaker. This was a personal explanation for which the Deputy Leader sought and obtained leave. I suggest that he has gone far beyond a personal explanation. A personal explanation is all right in itself, but at the moment the Deputy Leader is trying to tell the House what took place between the Premier and the Leader of the

Opposition. However, I do not think that he is competent to do that because he was not there.

The SPEAKER: We now have a further problem, because the Standing Orders which the House has seen fit to place on my shoulders are very complex and difficult. They are worse than the Rules of Court. They permit, in certain circumstances, hearsay, irrelevant matter, and all sorts of things that would not be allowed in the courts.

Returning to the Deputy Premier's point of order: at one stage of the Deputy Leader's explanation, I said that I would be strict, and I intend to be strict with both sides now that I have been asked to be strict. I took it that the Deputy Leader was not going to venture on any more comment or debate. The mere fact that hearsay has been referred to does not make it out of order. Provided that the Deputy Leader does that, I will allow him to continue; otherwise, I will take the appropriate action.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I have dealt with the three facts and have corroborated precisely what the Leader said. I have finished.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Deputy Leader to order and warn him, because that was said in the face of continued warnings from the Chair. I will bear that sort of behaviour in mind for the rest of the session. Call on the business of the day!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I rise on a point of order. How on earth my indicating to the House that I have finished when you asked me to speak again can be construed as defiance of the Chair, I cannot understand.

The SPEAKER: Because of the arrogant way in which you acted towards me. The honourable member acted toward the Chair in an arrogant and churlish fashion, and that will not be tolerated.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Mr Speaker, I seek a clarification of your ruling. Does it mean that the Deputy Leader is warned for the remainder of the session as applying every sitting day?

The SPEAKER: Yes, it does—for behaviour of that kind.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GUNN: Mr Speaker, on a point of order, will you advise the House clearly and precisely under which Standing Order you have made the ruling in relation to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition? Will you please give the number of the Standing Order so that we can all be aware of it? In the 14 years that I have been a member of this Chamber, I have never had that Standing Order explained to me. As someone who studied Standing Orders and Erskine May for three years, I point out that it is new to me. I am sure that the House and the community of South Australia would be most interested to know where you got that ruling.

The SPEAKER: The power is inherent, and the whole incident arose from a personal explanation by the Deputy Leader in which, time and again, points of order and counter points of order were taken. The final remarks that the Deputy Leader made were, in my view, completely flouting every single word that I had said, and were directed at me in an arrogant and churlish fashion. That is why I have warned the Deputy Leader. If the Deputy Leader is prepared to withdraw on his side—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Todd to come to order. If the Deputy Leader is prepared to ask that his remarks be reconsidered, I am prepared to do that, but I will not tolerate this behaviour.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am supposed to change the tone of my voice, I take it. I made the point that I had finished. When I was called to continue with my personal explanation and said that I had finished anyway—I had refuted the three points made by the Premier and had

collaborated, from my own knowledge, what the Leader of the Opposition said—I cannot, for the life of me, see that I was flouting the authority of the Chair. If it will help the situation, however, I am perfectly happy to withdraw whatever it is that has offended you, Mr Speaker. I cannot see what it is but I will withdraw it, because the threat of my being suspended at the drop of a hat for the rest of the session is something that I find quite intolerable.

The SPEAKER: Do I take it that the honourable member withdraws his last remarks?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I thought it was the tone of my voice, Sir, when I said, 'I have finished.' I withdraw 'I have finished' and just say, 'I do not wish to continue.'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! In those circumstances I withdraw the warning.

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 16 August. Page 373.)

Mr RODDA (Victoria): I join with other members in supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, and I also express my condolences on the death of former members of this House, namely, Harold Welbourn King, a former member for Chaffey, and Howard O'Neill, the former member for Florey. I refer also to the late Ernest Claude Allen, who was the member for Burra, and the late Charles John Wells, also a former member for Florey. I have paid my condolences to those four gentlemen, all of whom were people who left their mark on this Chamber. I am sure that we all regret their passing and hope that their families will be uplifted by the tributes that have been paid to them.

In supporting the motion, I commend the Government, in particular the Minister who is leaving the Chamber, for the decision giving members the opportunity to travel to foreign countries and to visit and see at first hand those places carrying out major developments. In this way, members are able to be brought up to date with world affairs. Recently, in the company of the Deputy Leader, the Hon. Roger Goldsworthy and our wives, I had the pleasure of making one of these visits. It was an educative process to meet the Minister with departmental leaders and their ministerial officers working in power generating plants in Greece, a country which like everywhere else has problems in meeting the needs for power generation.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Do you notice that we have a new Minister?

Mr RODDA: Yes, he is adorning the place as to the manor born. I welcome him as being in charge of the House and invite him to listen to what I have to say. I am sure it will be communicated to the Minister to whom my remarks are particularly directed. In Greece it was interesting to hear the approach of the Government and the people in charge of power generation. Whilst it was not my forte, I found this interesting, and I am sure that our Shadow Minister of Mines and Energy would have gained much from it.

Likewise, on a visit to Vienna we were able to meet and talk with the Chairman of the Royal Authority on Atomic Energy, Dr Hans Blix. Whilst much of his conversation was over my head, he did have some practical and worthwhile views to put forward. Indeed, I was particularly interested

in his comments on the acid rains falling in that country and on problems being experienced in the northern hemisphere with young people who had to be removed from towns in which they lived because of the hazard resulting from such rains.

Mr Lewis: We could have that at Kingston.

Mr RODDA: I did venture a comment on that, and Dr Blix said we were fortunate in the southern hemisphere as regards our isolation and the beneficial effects of the roaring 40s, blowing away much of the hazard. I take up the comment of the member for Mallee and have some feeling for the concerns he expresses about Kingston. In discussion with people on the world scene, one soon learns of the scientific advances and discoveries that have been made. Tangible evidence exists of the expansion in mining enterprises in countries other than our own.

In Paris we met an old friend of South Australia—indeed, someone with whom I was pleased to work—Mr Louis Cochet. He was a strong supporter of the introduction of Port Adelaide as a direct port of call for north-bound shipping lines, and he expressed his great pleasure at the manner in which the service is being extended. That gentleman has since retired from his lifelong vocation. He assured us that the sheep skin trade between Australia and France had greatly benefited by the service coming directly from Port Adelaide. Mr Cochet treated us to a very fine dinner, and our evening was a most happy one.

Part of my travel study concerned my interest in the wool industry and the matter of additional measurements for wool in the general overview of the wool market in the United Kingdom and its impact on the world market. I was grateful for the opportunity before leaving Australia to have briefing discussions with Dr Pat Harvey, Acting Director of Agriculture, Mr Brian Jeffries, Principal Officer of Sheep and Wool in the Department of Agriculture and Mr Hayden Hanna, an officer in the Livestock Division of the Department of Agriculture. I was also most grateful to those officers for their co-operation, advice and assistance.

On my arrival in London I found that John Rundle, assisted by Mr W. Edkins, of South Australia House, had worked out an itinerary for me, enabling me with little bother to meet the people whom I wished to meet. Mr Goldsworthy accompanied me when we had our first discussions with Mr Peter Bell, Director of the Australian Wool Corporation (Europe), stationed at Wool House, London, and Mr Jacques Vander-Hagen, the Australian Wool Corporation's Wool Liaison Officer, also stationed in London. Over a very fine luncheon at the Landsdowne Club we had a discussion and talks on the subject of additional measurement of wool and general selling and marketing of wool in the northern hemisphere. It was obvious to me (and this echoed my pre-embarkation talks with Dr Harvey and Brian Jeffries in Adelaide) that a campaign was obviously required in relation to quality control in the wool growing countries in the world, in the area of animal husbandry and, indeed, in the harvesting of wool (in other words, what we call shearing). This must be commenced if we are to enjoy cost savings with sale by description of wool. For me it was an enlightening and challenging discussion, and those to whom we were talking realised that besides being a member of Parliament I was also a wool grower.

Arrangements were made for me to go to the International Wool Secretariat's headquarters and development centre in Ilkley, Yorkshire. Further, it had been arranged that I would spend a day at the wool combing mill of W.J. Whitehead at Bradford. It was a very pleasant three-hour train trip to Leeds and thence to Ilkley by car. The English countryside is in wonderful heart, with excellent crops, and fat livestock were grazing on pastures all the way to Ilkley. At Ilkley I was met by the public relations officer, Mr Phillip Marshall,

whom I had met 10 years ago. Over lunch with Phillip Marshall and the centre's new director, Mr Ian Graham, I was given a general briefing on the current work being carried out at the Ilkley Research Centre. In the afternoon I spent some time talking to Bill Ainsworth, an Australian who is the technical manager at Ilkley, about the additional measurement of wool and its relation to the top maker and the wool comb. Mr Ainsworth stressed the need for the top maker and wool comb to have confidence in the data supplied on the labels describing wool bought for a line of production.

Knowledge of the requirements and procedures of measurements and the method of testing and the practice of ultimate diligence on the preparation of the clip in the shearing shed must be understood by the woolgrower. Indeed, today this extends to the day-to-day husbandry of the sheep flock for 365 days of the year. It is pleasing that currently a series of meetings and seminars is being called in this and other States and wool growing centres by the Australian Wool Corporation to discuss matters pertaining to the additional measurement for wool and the decisions that will have to be made about matters confronting woolgrowers in Australia and indeed in all wool producing countries. There are big dividends for those who carry out quality control and who recognise the need for sound animal husbandry practices in their grazing management. Mr Ainsworth further raised the matter of dark fibres, hair, hemp shanks, crutchings, stains, care in skirting, and the removal of stained wool at the wool table at shearing time. The classer can supervise this in the shed. However, it is excessively costly to the grower if these impediments and contaminants find their way into skirted class wool and when it is at the mill, giving the lie to the label that is borne on the bale.

In essence, the additional measurements relate to three factors, namely, strength, length and colour, which are related to the aforementioned points that I have made. Mr P. Bell, who was also at Ilkley, joined in our discussions with Mr Ainsworth late in the afternoon. They apprised me of the well attended seminar of the wool industry that they had both attended on 29 May this year at Ichinnowa, in Japan. Also at that meeting was Mr. R.J. Quirk of the Australian Wool Corporation, who lectured on the matter of 'From sale by sample to sale by additional measurements'.

Also at that meeting, Dr D.J. Ward, from the Australian Wool Testing Authority, spoke on 'Sampling and measuring techniques for additional measurements'. Dr M.W. Andrews of the CSIRO spoke on 'The TEAM (Trial Evaluating Additional Measurement) trials', which have been in progress for some three years. Also, Dr Ken Baird (whom I understand spoke about the subject in the South-East recently) spoke at that meeting on 'Beyond sale with additional measurement'. Mr Bell gave to top makers and wool combers a paper on the benefits of additional measurements. I have a report of the speeches of these five gentlemen, all of whom are experts in their field, and I will report fully on their remarks and observations when I prepare my report for the Parliamentary Library and the Parliament.

The ultimate sale of wool described, and indeed prescribed, by the additional measurements will mean great benefits for the woolgrower and, of course, for the woollen mills. It will be of immense benefit to the economy providing a spin-off to everyone associated with the wool industry. The actual testing print-outs jargon and vernacular are of a technical nature, but I believe that the Australian woolgrower is sufficiently familiar with the subject matter and ingenious enough to gain an understanding of the area of electronics and to make use of the new components that he will be expected to follow in the directions of wool marketing with these techniques.

Perhaps I would do well to take some hints from my colleague the member for Mallee in regard to the formulas put to me. I am most grateful to Peter Bell, Ian Graham, Bill Ainsworth and Phillip Marshall for the hospitality that was accorded to me at Ilkley, and, of course, for the very pleasant evening at Peter Bell's delightful home which is set in a nice glade in Yorkshire, on which occasion he entertained some of his friends with dinner at Kildwick Hall.

My second day in Yorkshire was spent with Richard Brownness of the Australian Wool Corporation. We drove through what my host described as the country of *All Creatures Great and Small*, and it was delightful countryside. We made our way to the wool city of Bradford and to the wool mills of W. & J. Whitehead Limited, where we were met by the wool director, Mr Malcolm Fletcher, who proved to be a delightful host. We were taken to the boardroom for morning coffee where we had an in-shop talk, as he described it, on the wool industry concerning the 1984 climate facing the wool processor. One soon begins to understand why Bradford is called the world wool city. Mr Fletcher stated that increased costs had given rise for a close analysis to improve efficiency across the board in that industry. New and additional measurements were being implemented. He said that the mill was expecting to find wool to be of the quality shown on its label, but in some cases this was not so. It was setting the scene for a need for quality control starting in the growers' shearing sheds and in the husbandry attached to the growing of wool.

Malcolm Fletcher had a wide knowledge of the Australian wool scene, and was mindful of the droughts that affect this country. He said that the outside wool in the good season looks after itself but on the inside country, heavy stocking rates are practised: indeed, they have to be. In a tight situation as we are experiencing at the moment it is possible that sheep, undergoing wet conditions caused by winter rains, cannot get supplementary feed, resulting in problems with the wool having a 'break' in the staple. This is a matter of concern to the industry, and the subject of investigation in relation to measurement.

Mr Fletcher also recognised that the relativity of currency exchange rates was having a strong bearing on the profits of wool processors. Time and time again he said that without profits one would not stay in business. The Australian Wool Corporation and the International Wool Secretariat are making commendable moves, in his opinion, to make every component and sector of the wool industry aware of and familiar with the additional measurements of wool and the practice of clip preparation to deliver wool to the point of manufacture, classed and devoid of vegetable matter, not having stains, dags or coloured wool mixed with it. In other words, sale by description was the ultimate aim of the industry and, indeed, the mills wanted it and had to have confidence in the description on the article that they were buying.

High costs have forced mills to improve their methods of production. Machinery has been updated or upgraded and improved and it is very sophisticated. However, foreign substances, such as black raffia (a term used for polyethylene haybands with which today we bind our fibre stock fodder rolls) and material from the synthetic wool packs that become mixed with wool was causing a headache for the top maker and wool comb. I saw instances of this problem. When the bulk wool came through the chute in the roof to the wool floor, there were several large pieces of this polyethylene hayband, and the two wool pickers were able to retrieve them; unfortunately, what they miss causes trouble. I was gratified to find that the wool I was looking at did not come from Australia. The polyethylene is not degradable. It stays in the paddock, and gets around the sheep's feet. It breaks down under sunlight, but the fibres cause problems.

Mills that in days gone by had 40 or 50 wool pickers and handlers now operate with two or three. The work is done by machinery feeding wool to the scourer, in tonne or larger lots, from the bulk wool brought in, which has been bought by description. The polyethylene fibres going through the scourer are unable to be detected, and when it is spun into cloth it will not take the dye, and this has ruined some of the finest worsteds produced at Bradford and elsewhere. This has cost the mills hundreds of thousands of dollars in compensation that will ultimately be passed back to the grower in the price that ultimately is offered. This is an area that needs to be looked at by the grower in an effort to keep his paddocks and feed lots free of the offending haybands.

The industry is looking at a new type of nylon and paper pack to replace the offending poly-packs. My colleague reminds me of the contaminants which get into the wool when the grab is taken for sampling. Later in my travels I saw some of these contaminants in the fibres and they do stand out. They do not break down and they cause a real problem to the wool industry and to the people making the fine suits that we see gracing members in this House.

Mr Fletcher emphasised the clear benefits to be obtained from the additional measurement, going as it does beyond the parameters of the tug test in relation to the wool being tender and, whilst the fault of tenderness or break in the fibre has been found to extend well beyond the limit of visual appraisal, it is measured in terms of Newtons/Kolotex which is rather technical for me.

In my conducted tour of the mill I was given demonstrations of the additional measurement test and the print outs, which supply the top maker and wool comb with a full scale of the sample and sample performance on these matters. The read-outs on the technical side require woolgrowers and anyone associated with the wool industry to become familiar with the terminology of the project listings and this will be a fertile field for the Department of Agriculture and the Australian Wool Corporation to make known to woolgrowers.

My two-hour tour of the Whitehead Mill was a most enlightening experience. It started with greasy wool coming on to the floor, and being fed to the scour plants, where one sees the conclusion of a wool year going to its maker. I was struck by the speed with which the raw wool is fed into the plant, and the efficiency and obvious dedication of the men and women who man the plant. One soon understands why Bradford is a centre of leading wool manufacturers. I saw the plant scour, wash, dry and spin wool into yarn, and the threads on the bobbins of plain or dyed colours ready for cloth manufacture.

As a woolgrower, it was an exciting experience for me to see the process in action. But, overshadowing this, of course, one had to be aware of what happens on the home front and of the need to get behind the Australian Wool Corporation and the Departments of Agriculture in their campaigns to make all growers aware of their responsibilities for quality control of their products for the benefit of themselves and the nation.

I was grateful to Graham Walker, Phillip Dewhirst and Graham Mitchell (Department Directors at Whiteheads), who were very generous with their time and in showing me around that mill. I intend keeping in contact with Malcolm Fletcher and his staff about the progress of the additional measurement as it comes more on stream. They all recognise Australia as a premium woolgrower. It behoves us all to get the maximum benefit from this fibre.

Before I left Leeds, my host (Richard Brownness, an old RAAF pilot, so we had some things in common) took me to meet Dr Brian King, a Director of an organisation called WIRA, which does its share of wool promotion in Europe.

Dr King and Mr Browness arranged for me to go to the Confederation of British Textiles, in London. There I met with the Director, Mr Ian McArthur, a true Scot who served as a member of the House of Commons for 10 years and, therefore, understands the function of government. I found him to be most helpful in his approach to my inquiries about the place of wool in the fibre market.

He explained how his organisation had evolved, on behalf of its members, who number some 13 employer organisations, six trade unions and four association members, being the Clothing Export Council of Great Britain, the International Wool Secretariat (United Kingdom Branch), the Society of Dyers and Colourists, and four textile research councils. He also provided me with a report called, 'A Plan for Action', from which I will quote today. It was prepared because the woollen or fibre industries had fallen behind and, consequently, people had lost jobs. I will read from the foreword:

The United Kingdom textile industry has suffered considerable contraction during recent years. This contraction has been far in excess of that experienced by the industry in other developed countries. The outlook for the decade suggests that, unless positive corrective action is taken, the contraction will continue, causing a substantial loss to the national economy, and a further sharp fall in employment.

We believe, however, that this trend can be halted and the industry recover its position as a powerful manufacturing and wealth-creating force. This will require the adoption of determined and positive investment and marketing policies by individual companies themselves, encouraged by Government measures to improve the industry's trading environment: measures which would be generally beneficial to British manufacturing industry.

This paper sets out the present economic and trading circumstances of the textile industry, examines recent trends, considers their implications and proposes action to rebuild confidence and fulfil the potential of the industry in the national economy.

The report further states:

The textile industry, with the closely related clothing industry, is a major sector of the national economy. In 1981, textile and clothing sales were £8 900 million. To put this figure in perspective, it was very nearly as large as the sales of the whole motor vehicle manufacturing industry.

The industry took a close look at itself, and I shall read the following comments about the method of assessment:

The BTC has used a computer model of the United Kingdom textile and clothing industries to assess the future outlook for production and employment. The model takes account of the volume of consumer demand, and of the volume of imports and exports at every stage of production. It has been used in several ways. First, to estimate the effect of anticipated changes in the trading environment; these changes are primarily the outcome of the recent bilateral negotiations under the multi-fibre arrangement with the EEC's low-cost suppliers, and the proposed accession of Portugal and Spain to the community. Secondly, to take account of reduced manufacturing capacity in certain sectors, and, thirdly, to allow for assumed improvements in competitiveness of the United Kingdom industry which might result in a degree of import substitution and improved export performance.

People in the United Kingdom are most concerned about the exchange rate, and the report has this to say about that matter:

In common with industry in general, the textile industry has suffered greatly from a long period of sterling's strength, particularly against other European currencies. A high sterling exchange rate makes it easier to import and harder and less profitable to export, thus affecting our industry on two fronts. A lower exchange rate, combined with the prospect of reasonable stability, is essential if we are to exploit our export opportunities and combat imports.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: When do you expect Australia to re-enter that valuable European market?

Mr RODDA: That matter would need to be investigated. When I see New Zealand selling lamb in such a market, I think there must be something wrong with us. However, I cannot answer the honourable member's question. On the question of redundancy the report has this to say:

It is unfortunately inescapable that greater efficiency must involve higher productivity, and so almost certainly lead to a

contraction in employment. The employment prospects of those remaining in the industry can be expected to be much better than if the projected decline were allowed to continue unchecked, but this does not help the position of those displaced.

It is inequitable, and demonstrably unfair, if textile employees made redundant are treated less favourably than workers in other industries receiving Government aid for restructuring and modernisation. Recent experience has been that for many displaced people in the textile industry statutory redundancy payments have been the limit, reflecting the depressed profitability of the industry.

We recommend that additional compensation for redundancy should be provided by Government for a period of five years. This new scheme would have three main elements: a minimum basic payment, a payment based on service and age, and income support payments to those above an agreed age at the time of redundancy.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: When you were overseas, did you see—

Mr RODDA: What I am talking about is perhaps a stepping stone. The British Textile Corporation came to certain conclusions. The paper identified two requirements:

First, the textile industry must ensure by its own efforts that efficiency and competitiveness are constantly improved. This means continuous investment in the improvement of our manufacturing facilities and methods, and a major marketing drive, particularly in the EEC, where the largest opportunity lies. But this positive approach depends on the restoration of confidence.

Secondly, therefore, is the need for action by Government to help restore confidence. This means intensifying the attention given to manufacturing industry in fixing economic priorities, and backing the textile industry's investment programme. With these determined actions, the United Kingdom textile industry will continue to make a major contribution to our national well-being.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

Mr RODDA: I always welcome encouragement from my colleagues. Mr McArthur made available to me a newsletter dated June 1984. In response to 'A Plan for Action', it says:

Welcome ... plan of action

Welcome but very modest, was the BTC's initial reaction to the Government's announcement in March of a £20 million scheme of investment support for small textile clothing and footwear companies. The disappointment plain in our reaction was against the background of the much more far-reaching proposals in our major report on the industry's position and prospects, 'A Plan for Action'.

Just to show that all is not lost and things are just as difficult in Britain as they are in this country, the report states:

And thirdly, the improved perception of the industry can only help in other ways in encouraging a better response to the industry's needs—the forthcoming negotiations for renewal of the multi fibre arrangement are just one example; the measures to deal with imports from China and Turkey dealt with later in this newsletter are others.

Members interjecting:

Mr RODDA: With regard to China, and the interjection from my colleague about global movement, this is interesting:

Few details have yet emerged of the agreement on textile trade reached between the EEC and China at the end of March. Publication of the details needs to await final settlement of various points left outstanding, and acceptance of these, and the clauses already settled in negotiations, by the EEC Council of Ministers.

What is already known is that the agreement will act as a framework for trade in textiles with China to the end of 1988. Quotas have been fixed for products where China is already an important supplier, with provision made for new quotas to be introduced if China diversifies its exports (for example, into wool products, where Chinese capacities are known to be increasing).

In regard to Turkey, the newsletter states:

Our task now is to ensure that the new restraints are effectively applied by the Government and the EEC, and to monitor the development of imports not yet covered by restraints. In a letter to the Minister for Trade, the BTC stressed the need to prevent abuse of the exemption from quota of goods claimed to have been shipped from Turkey before 9 May, and the BTC Director returned to this point in public, when he addressed the annual conference of the Amalgamated Textile Workers' Union on 18 May.

We have also urged close monitoring of cotton yarn imports, the only product for which Turkey has agreed a voluntary restraint,

and the European Commission has agreed to stress to Turkey the need to observe the limit strictly.

Through talking to the people across the broad spectrum of the textile industry, one sees what an effect events on the global front can have on an industry. It came through loud and clear to me that the demand for natural fibres in the United Kingdom has shown an upturn. The need for quality control, however, cannot be emphasised too much.

The Australian Wool Corporation, headed by David Asimus, is making a big impact on one of our most important industries. It has been referred to as being the 'gold medal' industry, and the growers, like Dean Lukin and Glynis Nunn, have had to perform, and perform well. I have never met David Asimus, but he is a man of great attainment. He is a woolgrower and was appointed to the Wool Commission on 1 January 1973. He was also appointed Chairman of the International Wool Secretariat on 7 November 1979. He has given distinguished leadership to both organisations on the world scene, and it was good to see the very high accord and respect with which he is held in Great Britain as a leader in the wool industry and indeed as an Australian.

Likewise, I think the leadership that Dr John McPhee has given as Managing Director of the International Wool Secretariat has set an excellent course for the woolgrowers to take, and they can be comforted by the knowledge that he is a person who has used his skill in researching the wool industry. I think it behoves us, whether we be a one or 10-bale producer of wool or one who runs many thousands of sheep, to realise that the onus is on us to ensure that our clips are correctly classed, that our animals are well cared for, and that we follow the guidelines set out in the new arrangements in the additional measurements for wool. It will not be until 1989 or 1990 that we will be able to sell wool direct from the farm to the manufacturer who wants it, thereby creating a big saving.

Before going away, I was approached by certain stock breeders in this country to see whether I could find out why they cannot export live animals in the market of the United Kingdom, where great interest has been expressed in the quality of the sires bred in our studs here. My colleague the Deputy Leader and I travelled to Kent to see Dr Richard Crawford, who is in charge of this area. We had a most interesting discussion with Dr Crawford, who had some chastening words for us in relation to the blue tongue scare. Fortunately that scare about blue tongue proved to be unfounded. Blue tongue is carried by the mosquito *Culis coxoides* that frequents the northern regions of this country and it has been found in the Northern Territory and Queensland as far south as northern New South Wales. Therefore, Tasmania is the only State that would be able to export stock to the United Kingdom, but only after the stock has been quarantined for 12 months. That puts a big constraint on access to these fine animals that are bred in South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales. Dr Crawford assured us that his Department was having ongoing discussions with the Department of Health and the Commonwealth livestock people, and the matter was being monitored. In due course reassessments will be made, but he points out quite properly that Great Britain has 9 million head of cattle and 33 million sheep, which I found surprising. With that order of livestock, they are not going to agree lightly to something that might cause them problems.

That is an area that is of great interest to us. I have not terribly good news for my beef breeder friends that something will happen quickly because, for a very good reason, it is not happening. My colleague and I were invited to breakfast at the Smithfield meat market, and it was a great experience. We got there at 7 a.m. The market started at 3 a.m. and was in full swing by 5 a.m.

The market is an historic spot. It began in about 1100 AD at a paddock which was called smooth field but which now has the name 'Smithfield.' On the five week days it supplies butcher shops and people who enjoy good meat such as a steak, a joint, a rabbit or a turkey. Indeed, it supplies the 10 million people who live within a radius of up to 30 miles of London. There are no live animals at the market. There are excellent carcasses, and the selling is done by arrangement. There are traders in the market and a butcher may ring up and order 50 sides of meat or 12 turkeys.

We saw giant rabbits from Red China and fat lambs from New Zealand. That would appeal to the shadow Minister of Agriculture (the member for Alexandra). We saw turkeys weighing 75 lb. each that were grown in the United States of America. We had breakfast at 9 a.m. in a pub, under the market, called the Cock and Fox. We were served what amounted to six or seven courses on a large plate. It was the largest serve that I have ever seen and was described as a 'butcher's breakfast'. It was indeed a climax to our inspection of the meat market. I recommend that anyone visiting London should visit the market. The manager-superintendent is Mr Douglas Noakes, M.B.E., a personality who knows everyone in the market. As we walked through, he talked to all the traders and barrow pushers.

I went to England to see what was taking place in agriculture and to compare agricultural conditions there with those in this country. However, because of the very nature of our country, I do not think that we could emulate what is done at Smithfield, although we can admire the high quality of the carcasses there. I was surprised to see the variety of meat at the Smithfield market and the places whence it came. I marvelled at the smooth way in which the meat marketing was carried out for such a big bailiwick. I support the motion.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport): I add my condolences to those expressed by other members regarding the relatives of former members who have died during the past year. Of those members, I knew Claude Allen the best. He was one of the most loyal and hardworking local members of Parliament that one could find anywhere. He set an excellent example to younger members such as I was when I entered the House. As a result of Claude's death we have lost a close friend.

I also express appreciation for what Charlie Wells did for me. Although probably no member abused me more on the floor of the House after I had made a speech, especially about industrial relations, Charlie was my friend. After I had made a vigorous speech on industrial relations, he would take me outside the Chamber, and try to straighten out my views. He would sometimes tell me that I was on the mark or close to it and, at other times, that I was so wide of the mark that it was not funny.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: It was the only thing—

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Charlie would condemn me roundly in the House and then take me outside and give me a little fatherly advice. I appreciated him for that. He was a member who could have a violent disagreement with me in the Chamber; then outside he would tell me to keep up the good work or something to that effect. For the sake of Mrs Wells, I record my appreciation of what Charlie meant to me over the years. I also pass on my condolences to Mrs King and Mrs O'Neil, the widows of deceased former members.

In the Address in Reply debate it has been traditional for me to talk about the economy and one or two vital areas relating to it. Today, however, I shall depart from my normal practice to deal with separate issues, although they are central to the running of the economy, especially the

first. There is an enormous contradiction in the way in which Governments, and especially this Parliament, spend so much time talking about the industrial system, the central thrust of that system, and how the State Commission and the Federal Commission must improve the rates of pay, fringe benefits, sick benefits, compensation for injury, job security, and superannuation benefits, and reduce working hours for those in the workforce.

The history of the trade union movement, the Industrial Commission and especially Labor Governments shows that that has been their entire thrust. Therefore, our industrial society sees those who have a job as being the oppressed whose conditions must be improved and who need protection. Indeed, the entire emphasis of the philosophy of the Labor Government and so much of the industrial movement is to look after those who have a job and to ignore those who have not. So, the unemployed are ignored completely by the system. They just do not count when it comes to sharing in the so-called wealth of the country, the wealth of the industrial society. The Industrial Commissions seem oriented to the philosophy, 'May we make those with a job even richer while those that do not have a job should just be ignored.'

We have a fragmented society developing where the haves, those with jobs, will enjoy better and better conditions through the industrial system and the have not's, those who have not got a job and are unlikely to get one, will become poorer and poorer by comparison with those in employment. The past 18 months has seen a surge of new benefits for those with jobs, while the unemployed have been largely ignored. Let me substantiate that statement. First, there was the so-called wages accord, which will, according to the Prime Minister, be of great national significance and which guarantees to those with a job wage indexation so that they cannot miss out, while it guarantees nothing, certainly not a job, to those who are unemployed. I find it intolerable to have a system which guarantees further wage increases for those with a job as the economy grows or inflation occurs but which guarantees nothing to those who have no job and who are in fact the sacrificial lambs compared to those who have a job.

Secondly, we have seen in the past 18 months substantially increased job security and increased payments for redundancy. That was a recent decision handed down by the Commonwealth Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. Of course, we know that it is likely to flow on to State Industrial Commissions and, therefore, to State awards. Throughout Australia we will have seen the beginnings and, perhaps, before not too long, the completion of a major new move to make it even more difficult to have job flexibility and flexibility in the number of people being employed within any company. There are real dangers in that because we start to lock employees into companies, irrespective of the performance of a company; as a result, employment resources, namely, the people (the most important resource of all) are locked, at times, into inefficient enterprises.

Thirdly, through the actions of the South Australian Bannan Government, even greater perks are now available under the Workers Compensation Act. It was one of the first Acts that the Government amended when it came to office 18 months ago. It increased the perks and therefore the costs of premiums to employers for workers compensation. We have seen premium rates escalate at an alarming rate during those 18 months, and the Bannan Government must take responsibility for it. I highlight the point that it is good enough for an unemployed person to have no guarantees about getting a wage or job, whereas we give enormous and extravagant guarantees to people who may be flouting a system of workers compensation. I stress (as you, Mr

Speaker, take a personal interest in workers compensation) that I am not talking about genuinely injured persons.

The fourth point is that we have seen a further explosion of the shorter working week within the workforce which has also added to costs and increased the perks and benefits for those with a job but increased the living costs for those who do not have a job. The fifth point is that a very generous superannuation scheme for the building industry has been worked out with the full blessing of the Federal Government. A lot has been said in this Parliament about how generous the State Government and Federal Government superannuation schemes are. The scheme for the building industry is far more generous and requires a far greater contribution by employers, as well as providing for portability. So, I stress that it is very dangerous to give a generous superannuation scheme to a building industry which already has portability of long service leave and then, on the other hand, to give nothing whatsoever to those without a job.

The sixth point is that job contractors have been brought under the excesses of the industrial system through amendments to the State Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act. That will further give guarantees to people with a job and increase the costs for those who are unemployed and for the rest of the community. The seventh point is that huge site allowances—45c to 50c and, in some cases, 55c an hour—have now been granted to virtually any building worker on a large construction job in South Australia. Site allowances were originally paid when people were required to work under very undesirable wet and unsafe conditions. We have seen these sorts of conditions thrown aside and site allowances paid to every person on a large building site, irrespective of the conditions. The Commissioner of the Commonwealth Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Commission has a great deal to answer for because of the way in which he has handed out substantial site allowances, which have been against the long-term interests of the community and which will escalate building and construction costs enormously and give even better benefits to those with a job to the detriment of those without a job.

All these six or seven points have been introduced under Labor Governments both Federal and State in the past 18 months. It is time that we highlighted the extent to which Labor Governments, in particular the Bannan Government in this State, have completely ignored the unemployed and been willing to hand out those increased benefits at the expense of unemployed people who are unlikely to be able to find a job. It is not just a case of ignoring them: every time costs within an industry rise, it becomes increasingly difficult for more people to be employed and increasingly more difficult for unemployed people to find a job. That is the very reason why, after some economic improvement throughout Australia, we are finding that the unemployment rate is starting to flutter again and where the drop in the unemployment rate seems to have peaked or flattened out and is now marginally rising.

Traditionally, at this time of the year, we would expect unemployment to drop fairly dramatically and not to rise again until about October or November when school leavers start to come on to the job market. However, that is not the case at present. The indications are that, due to excesses by Federal and State Governments over the past 18 months, we are about to see a further rise in unemployment, as we experienced, unfortunately, back in the Whitlam era when unemployment as we know it today became a fact of life.

It is important to highlight the extent to which Labor politicians offer lip service and political campaigning only to the unemployed but material wealth and improved benefits to trade union membership, to the long-term detriment of the unemployed getting jobs. It is time that this double

talk and these double standards were brought to the attention of the public and that the Government stopped handing out increased benefits at the expense of the unemployed.

Another matter which I wish to raise and which is closely related to that matter is the extent to which we hear politicians talking at length about industrial development, growth and expansion, help for small businesses, increased employment and wanting South Australia to win. All that rhetoric contains the basic assumption that politicians, and particularly the present Government, will adopt policies to fulfil these objectives. However, such an assumption could not be further from the truth. Our Governments impose penalty after penalty on companies that may succeed or try to succeed, grow, expand and strengthen their employment base as well as our national economy. I will highlight how Governments say one thing about industrial expansion when in fact their policies are directly counter to that.

First, if employing more people has been against the best interests of our society, successive Governments have imposed a tax on the employer for employing these extra people. I refer, of course, to pay-roll tax. I find it incredible that our system has allowed pay-roll tax to become the dominant source of taxation revenue for State Governments to the point where, in South Australia (and I understand the same applies in other States), something like 45 per cent of all State taxation revenue comes from pay-roll tax.

We are taxing the very people who are attempting to employ more people and increase overall employment, yet they are being discouraged from doing so. It is generally recognised that at present the biggest social and economic problem in our community is unemployment. What Governments do and what they say are poles apart, and this is related very closely to the point I made earlier.

In Opposition, the Premier spoke at great length about pay-roll tax and how it was detrimental to the creation of more employment. However, the Labor Party has now been in Government for two years and despite the Premier's promises about restructuring the tax base of this State and reducing the proportion of tax that comes from pay-roll tax, thus ensuring that the imposition on employers trying to increase their employment base is removed, nothing whatsoever has been done—absolutely nothing. The promise made by the Premier before the election in regard to restructuring the tax structure of South Australia was nothing but a hollow promise made in an attempt to win some support from the business community. It has realised that the Premier has let it down and members of the business community are disillusioned.

The Premier proposed the financial institutions duty on financial transactions. Companies who use their assets properly, particularly liquid assets, rather than just burying them away, are the very corporations which are penalised to the greatest extent by FID. In other words, companies which constantly turn over their assets, investing in various areas to get maximum return for our economy, are the companies that are penalised by FID. If a company invests some money in land for 30 years and does not turn over that land, it suffers no penalty from FID except for a tax on the original transaction. I think that that situation is against the best interests of trying to encourage an efficient and highly productive economy through the private sector. I think the imposition of that tax in that way is against the commercial interests of businesses in Australia and particularly in South Australia because, despite the Premier's promise that there would be no new taxes imposed, the level of FID imposed by the Government is higher than that imposed in any of the Eastern Labor States.

The Government has allowed land values to escalate greatly. This is because of inactivity in providing adequate building allotments in the metropolitan area. This is the

biggest inflation of land values to occur since the time of the Whitlam Government. We know the extent to which this has occurred, despite the Government's having had plenty of warning. I am pleased that the Minister for Environment and Planning is in the House at the moment, because he must carry the full responsibility for the shortage of residential blocks in the metropolitan area and the subsequent inflation of land values as a result of that shortage. Warnings were given about 12 months ago that housing activity was picking up and that, unless substantial new residential areas were released by the Government, residential blocks in the outer metropolitan area particularly would rise in price substantially. I remember attending a dinner in mid-1983 at which I was told by a number of builders that the cost of land had risen from \$8 000 at the beginning of the year to about \$13 000 by that time, that is, at the middle of last year; of course, prices have risen substantially since then.

In the past two years a greater escalation in land values has occurred in Adelaide than has occurred in any other capital city in Australia. The rise has matched the rise in land values and inflation that occurred during the Whitlam days. The Government, and the Minister for Environment and Planning in particular, must carry the responsibility for that inflation. As a consequence of land values escalating, water and sewerage rates also escalate at an enormous rate, as does land tax, which escalates at an even greater rate because it is a progressive tax and goes up by a greater amount. I asked the Premier to reassess the impact of land inflation on the various tax measures imposed by the Government, in particular in regard to water, sewerage and land taxes, and council rates as well. In my district land values escalate on a very sensitive basis when there is a movement elsewhere in the metropolitan area.

If land values escalate by, say, 20 per cent in an outlying area, the more sought after and scarce land in a district such as Davenport escalates some 30 per cent or 40 per cent. Therefore, some people have been severely hit at this time. I want to refer to some figures in regard to the escalation of land values. These imposts are being imposed by the State Government on small business people who are asked to pay these increased taxes, whether water, sewerage or council rates or workers compensation premiums or land tax.

I refer to a letter from Mr Jack Symons of Symons and Symons Pty Ltd which was written to me late last year and in which he states:

Dear Sir, Further to my complaint to you on the ever rapidly increasing hidden costs attached to running a small business, I have listed some frightening increases in land tax. As you will see, our land tax has increased by 1 888 per cent since 1973 (a period of 11 years) and in the years prior to 1982 the site value was not shown on the assessment. In 1982 the site value was \$200 000. Just 12 months later in 1983 the site value is \$290 000—an increase of 45 per cent. In short, the land tax in 1973 was \$257.71 and in 1983 the tax payable is \$4 865. Small business cannot afford these exorbitant charges. Together with pay-roll tax, workers compensation and the 38-hour week, plus increased rates of pay, it is little wonder that manufacturers are closing their doors and more and more people are losing their jobs resulting in a greater financial burden to Governments.

Then, under the heading 'Incentive is the key word', Mr Symons goes on to say:

What is needed is an incentive to work. Members of Parliament would be well advised to go back in history and apply a little Playfordism, offering incentives to employers and employees to get on with the job and build a better Australia for everyone.

Mr Symons's family has been in the glass manufacturing business for many years, but he is finding it increasingly difficult to maintain even existing employment levels, and extremely difficult to compete against interstate companies which are able to dump products here on a very large scale,

particularly for large projects. We find therefore a small businessman *cum* manufacturer bitterly complaining about the imposts that are being made in a number of areas by the State Government. I will quote from a letter from another small businessman. I will not refer to his name because I have not sought his permission to use it, although certainly Mr Symons was only too pleased to have his name referred to. In a letter to me of 10 May 1984, it is stated:

Dear Sir,

With reference to your remarks on small business, I look after a small company which rents two shops (which I will call A and B). Land tax rises since 1980 amount to 284 per cent; water rate rises since 1980, 267 per cent, with all other taxes having similar rises. Shop A (now self-service) employees have been reduced from 8 to 2 since 1980.

Shop B—employees reduced from 16 to 9. Result—drop in employment over 100 per cent. Inflation and wage rises must bear some of the blame, but we must have viable small business or large Government spending and a massive Public Service and huge unemployment. There is no alternative.

These two letters stress the sort of cost pressure that small business men find themselves under at present. If one looks at the issues which are imposing those cost pressures, they are the very issues that I have talked about this afternoon: wage rises, the additional costs of employing people, the impact of pay-roll tax, land tax, water and sewerage rates, and the impact of other taxes. These two small business men make it quite clear. The result is that unless those cost imposts are immediately abated by the Federal and State Governments, particularly by the State Government, they have no alternative but to continue to reduce their employment and ultimately, of course, it could be reduced to the point where the business is no longer viable and they are forced to close down.

I have mentioned already the increase in workers compensation premiums as the result of amendments introduced by the Bannon Government. It is not only the amendments to the Act; it is partly the substantial wage increases and add-on costs of employing people that has forced up those premiums. Then there is another point: the substantially increased power and scope of the Industrial Commission, as handed down through amendments to the South Australian Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act—another amendment introduced by the present Minister of Labour. Those amendments substantially reduce the flexibility for employing people, and particularly employing subcontractors, and threaten to bring all subcontractors under the industrial system and the Industrial Commission, which again will substantially increase costs to the building industry.

I cannot stress too highly the need for this Government to back off increases in fare rates, charges and other imposts imposed by the State Government. Unless it does so, the record of this Government for small business will be the worst that has occurred for many years, and certainly the worst that I have seen in the ten years I have been in Parliament. The Premier must start grappling with these charges and costs. He needs to make sure that sufficient land is available to keep land values down and to stop the inflation rate. The Government has been slow and tardy in doing that so far. The Premier needs to adjust various rates and taxes so that they come into line with increases in the inflation rate rather than well above the inflation rate. I include in that such things as water rates, which have increased this year by a real 17 per cent when there is an anticipated inflation rate of 5 per cent. There are increases in land taxes, and we do not know how great they will be, but certainly well above the 5 per cent expected to be the inflation rate this year, and increases in other charges.

This afternoon the Minister of Transport announced increases in STA bus fares which in fact worked out at an average of 11.8 per cent. It might be an appropriate time to point out to the House that only one or two hours ago

we heard the Minister of Transport announce that there would be average fare increases of 9 per cent this year. I went to the Minister's office and obtained a copy of those fare increases, and if one looks at the increase it will not be 9 per cent, as the Minister suggested, but 11.8 per cent. So, this Parliament is being cheated by the Minister.

Mr Ingerson: What is the inflation rate?

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: The inflation rate will be about 5 per cent but what concerns me is that the Minister has the hide to stand in this House and say that fares will rise by only 9 per cent when in fact they are rising by 11.8 per cent. For anyone wishing to check that, I will read into *Hansard* the fare increases: 2 sections, an increase of 16.7 per cent; 2 zones inter peak, an increase of 16.7 per cent; 2 zones an increase of 11.1 per cent; 3 zones inter peak, an increase of 11.1 per cent; and 3 zones, an increase of 7.7 per cent. Adding those up, it is an average increase of 11.8 per cent. How could the Minister this afternoon—

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Did you add them up and divide by five?

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: The Minister for Environment and Planning knows what the Minister of Transport has done. He has included no fare increase for pensioners when there was no fare for pensioners, and added that up and has divided it by that figure.

Mr Becker: Made it six.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Not once. He added no fare increase for pensioners during week days, no fare increase for day trips, no fare increase in concessions, no fare increase for the cash weekly and monthly concessions. He has included all of those figures to get the 9 per cent, but the three fares we all know of are the 60 cents fare that has gone to 70 cents, the 90 cents to \$1, and the \$1.30 to \$1.40. One has only to average those increases to find that it is about 12 per cent rather than the 9 per cent the Minister has claimed. That is how shonky this Government is! The Minister of Water Resources was caught out by the financial writer of the *Advertiser* at the beginning of July for doing the same thing with water rates. That Minister announced water rate rises of 13 per cent, when the increase was in fact 17 per cent. It is dishonest government. It is Government attempting to fool the people when in fact it should realise by now that the people will not be fooled.

Moving to another matter, this is a sad reflection on how little attention our community gives to people within the kindergarten system who have special disadvantages. I would like to read to the House a letter I received from a mother. After talking to her, I have decided not to use her name so that she or her family are not embarrassed in any way. However, I have her permission to read the actual letter and I ask the House to note it. It states:

The following is a copy of a letter sent by me to Mr L. Arnold, but I feel that it relates to Public Works also. I had asked Mr R. Payne—

I presume the Minister of Mines and Energy—

to notify you of my problem but as I have not heard from you, am writing directly to you.

I did not hear from Mr Payne. The letter continues:

The problem is that South Road Primary School, which my son attends, has no remedial teacher. I find it difficult to understand why, to enable my son, who has a specific learning difficulty, to receive the education he is entitled to, I will probably have to take him away from the school he attends and send him to one where the forward thinking Principal saw the needs of these children and did something about it.

When it is known that one in every five children has a learning disability, surely it is a large enough number to warrant having a remedial teacher, trained to help these children, in every school because they, the children, are in every school. SPELD has the knowledge to help these children; why can't this information be used?

It seems wrong to me that an Education Department Guidance Officer tested my son and said he had problems with reading and

spelling but gave no guidance whatsoever to either the lad's teacher or me. I went to SPELD, had my child extensively tested and did a course there myself so that I could help him at home. All this to get the education he is entitled to receive at school, but can't because there is no provision for children with his problem.

I do not mean that I do not want to help him, but it is a fact that parents are not the best people to teach their children and I cannot afford \$50 a week to have someone come in every day. If the problem had been picked up in the junior primary school, he would not have the problems he now faces in year 5. He feels he is stupid, is very aggressive toward those who criticise, gets very frustrated because what is in his head will not go down on paper quickly enough, so he blindly lashes out and generally feels that life is not really worth living; all this from a 10 year old.

Mr Becker: There are many others like that.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I know there are thousands like this. I will touch on that matter shortly. The letter continues:

Learning disabled children have trouble with school work and are often in trouble at school; because of their frustration they are a disruptive element in the class. These children, if given help, could be equal or better at the school work given their classmates, instead of feeling inadequate, useless, dumb and that the whole world has dealt them the wrong cards.

In the long term shouldn't we be looking at the overall consequences, resultant of these children not receiving the help they are entitled to? To many learning disabled children, school is a torture chamber, a place where they are humiliated, so they become the vandals who hate the place that caused them so much degradation that they destroy, mutilate or burn, and we pay. Schools are where children are taught and prepared, in part, for the adult world. Many learning disabled people can't get jobs because they come out of school with a self image so low that they feel no-one would want to employ them and that they probably couldn't do the job anyway, so the Government pays them the dole. There are people signing contracts not having any idea of the contents because it is incomprehensible to them, so they may be sued or have items repossessed. There are drivers on our roads who can't read the signs quickly enough to take the necessary action, and some who do not know left from right; the results, accidents and high insurance premiums. We all have to pay in hard cash because of these things, and it should not be so.

It seems that teachers are reluctant to ask for what they feel is needed, for fear of losing what they already have; for example, give a remedial teacher and take a language teacher, so please don't give with one hand and take with the other. Teachers are on the dole; employ them to do what they have been trained for, be selective, look at the ability of employed teachers, because some leave a lot to be desired, and above all train teachers to teach children with specific learning difficulties. I really think this problem should receive a great deal of thought and appropriate action taken. I know from personal experience the problems and sadness it can cause. It is not easy to see a loving, beautiful child change into an irrational, hate filled being who wants to get back at the cruel world that makes learning so hard for him.

I found that a very touching letter, one which I am sure the member for Hanson fully understands (through his involvement in one area of helping disabled people) and one which I believe needs very urgent attention.

I was then interested, on almost exactly the same day, to receive a copy of the Kindergarten Union of South Australia's Annual Report 1983. At page 26 (table 7) this report highlights that in 1983 new referrals from within the metropolitan area were 594 for people with a speech difficulty needing speech pathology. Of the 594 who were referred, only 397 were actually seen. In continuing therapy for 1982, referrals were 199, which meant that 596 children were seen in the metropolitan area and 250 in the country, making a total for the State of 846 children.

That means that approximately 200 children who were referred to the Kindergarten Union needing speech pathology or speech training, or at least a referral to examine what their problem was, could not even be seen by Kindergarten Union staff. A third of the children whose parents came along and said, 'My child has a speech difficulty,' could not even be seen, let alone treated by the Kindergarten Union.

Mr Becker: It is a tragedy.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: It is a real tragedy, and it is time that action was taken by our community. Surely, our

priority in other areas is not so high that we are prepared to allow any child to come out of our schooling system without even being able to carry on a basic conversation and communicate with other human beings. I think that it is the most disgraceful negligence that one could possibly highlight within our community. Every human being deserves the basic elements of being able to read, write and speak. To deny any person that right is, I think, a sad reflection on this Parliament's and this Government's priorities.

I looked further at this annual report, at pages 25 and 26, and found that there are 19.6 full-time equivalent teachers (let us round that off to 20 teachers) in the special services area of the Kindergarten Union to cope with the problems. I have talked about those referred students with speech difficulties. If one looks at the total figures for all children who must be attended by the Special Services Branch of the Kindergarten Union, one finds that 1 692 people were referred to that branch in 1983. That means that every staff member had to deal with 85 students during that year.

It is just not feasible to expect a speech pathologist or some other teacher with special training to teach 85 disadvantaged children who have specific difficulties or, if they are attempting to do that, one thing is obvious, and that is that they are not coping with the children's problems. I was interested to see the crisis that is occurring within the Kindergarten Union and the lack of special teachers available to help children within the kindergartens with their special difficulties such as speech and other difficulties, including social problems. As a result of that we end up with the sort of difficulties about which the woman wrote to me in the letter I read to the House this afternoon.

The one thing that comes out of that letter is that, if more staff had been available to help children in the kindergarten system, her son, at the age of 10, would not be facing the learning difficulties he is facing in primary school, and certainly would not be experiencing the hostility he is obviously expressing towards the whole of the education system and society in general. I hope that the Minister of Education, and the Premier, who has taken responsibility for children from 3 to 8 years of age in the child care area, appreciate the need to give urgent attention to this area so that never again do we have inadequate resources to deal with young children at kindergarten who have major speech difficulties and other social problems.

Mr Becker: The Minister in the House at the moment did not recognise these things when he was the Minister.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I hope that the Minister in the House will take this problem to Cabinet, even though he is no longer the Minister responsible, and make sure that Cabinet does something about it, because it is time that some action was taken.

The third point I wish to raise relates to a major problem along the edge of the Adelaide foothills with the very poor reception of FM radio transmitters. Most of my constituents find it extremely difficult to get satisfactory quality on their FM receivers because of the very poor transmission. There is a need to establish immediately a translator station similar to that provided for television but to be received by standard commercial radio receivers in the FM band.

FM radio transmissions commenced in Adelaide more than eight years ago but have never been received properly by many foothills residents because of sound distortion caused by indirect signals or multipath interference. It is believed that more than 30 000 householders will benefit from this scheme in suburbs from Tea Tree Gully through Beaumont, St Georges, Glen Osmond, Urrbrae and Mitcham to Panorama and Seaview Downs. I am delighted to see the member for Mitcham is here strongly supporting this case.

In general, good quality stereo FM signals can be received only in locations with 'line of sight' to the transmitting

masts at Mt Lofty. The exception to this is the community access station 5 PBAFM, whose transmitting antenna is located above the Para Hills Primary School. FM radio reception 'shadow' areas are similar to those where households had difficulty receiving television before the establishment of the UHF translator station above the Grenfell Centre. Householders on the plains enjoy quality stereo radio sound as well as a diverse programme selection as a result of the continuing allocation of public FM radio licences. There are five FM stations now in operation. Residents of the foothills have waited years for FM radio reception and, although technology exists to remedy this situation, Government priorities seem to indicate that this basic service is as far away now as it was when FM transmissions commenced over eight years ago.

The public FM radio band is limited on most commercial home receivers at between 87 and 109 MHz. Though there may appear to be large spaces between stations, the band is almost totally committed at this time with city and country radio and TV transmissions. It was necessary some time ago to reallocate frequency positions to ABC FM (which we will be talking about in this House tomorrow) and other stations in the band to solve inter-station interference problems. A key issue now emerging in this matter is that there may be only two or three suitable frequency positions available in the whole FM band to provide for a translator station to serve householders in the so-called 'shadow' areas with satisfactory FM reception. A minimum requirement for these householders is the ability to receive the national broadcaster (ABC FM) and one commercial station.

Television problems were solved by an automatic translator station on top of Grenfell Centre. This station receives standard VHF signals from the towers at Mt Lofty and rebroadcasts them in a limited radiation pattern to the Hills face areas in the UHF tuning section in the television receiver, which is standard equipment in most sets.

FM radio receivers, however, do not have this circuitry. Translator proposals for FM stereo radio must be based on secondary signals being broadcast back in the FM band, if not, 'front end' signal converter equipment costing \$50 to \$100 plus installation would need to be fitted to every FM radio receiver, and that would be totally unsuitable, particularly for all those joggers in the eastern suburbs who put on a set of headphones with a small FM radio clipped to their belts and take off around the streets.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppgood: It is not always safe, because you lose one of your senses—

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: They do not run down the road; they jog along the footpaths. We have adequate wide footpaths. As there may be a high fidelity set and several portables in each of a possible 10 000 homes, a translator service in the UHF band is clearly not practical. No further public radio licences should be granted until satisfactory FM transmissions are operating for the remainder of the city's population.

A group of people in the 'shadow' area of Glen Osmond has discussed the problems for some time and made a study of technical options available to provide suitable reception to householders in the foothills area.

The group, led by Glen Osmond resident and business man Mr Ian Janzow, is proposing a first stage plan to establish an automatic FM translator station serving council areas between Athelstone and Mitcham and costing between \$60 000 and \$90 000. I personally thank Mr Janzow for his help in preparing the material I am using in the House this afternoon. It is of a technical nature and, although I do not have that technical knowledge, I understand the problem because I am in part of that shadow area that needs proper FM transmission from a translator in the city. A planned campaign to enlist support from other groups, local councils

and individuals has been launched by this group at Glen Osmond.

The Government's expenditure priorities in the area of communications and broadcasting needed urgent review in this matter. In terms of an annual budget of millions to develop the broadcasting network in this State, \$75 000 is pocket money when it comes to providing 30 000 householders with good quality FM radio programmes that others have enjoyed since transmission began over eight years ago. This is a sleeping dog issue that has slept too long. Foothills residents have been denied access to the national FM broadcaster for years, a fact which is clearly contrary to the responsibilities described in the Broadcasting Act.

From discussions that the residents have held with Mr Starr (head of the ABC's engineering department) it was obvious that the concept of the ABC being an entrepreneur in this matter held a very low priority rating. If the Government put up the 'pocket money' (only \$75 000) and directed its broadcasting officials to deal with the issue, Australian business and technology would solve the problem within six months. However, traditional rigidities and lack of immediate practical support from the Government appear to be a problem at this stage. The Government's approach should be, in the short term, to assist the ABC in setting up an experimental station located on a suitable high structure within the inner eastern suburbs or the city, and then to plan and budget for its upgrading or expansion in the forthcoming years.

Perhaps even the new Telecom Building being constructed should have a tower on top, because it will be the tallest building in the city. Frankly, Adelaide's topography is ideal for a simple solution by means of putting a translator on top of one of the tallest buildings in the city. From personal experience, I know that that works in respect of television and I understand that it would work just as readily, on a technical basis, in relation to FM radio.

In relation to commercial FM translators, the group is aware of one company's plans to move its frequency position on the band and to establish its own translator station to improve the station's coverage of the foothills. Although these applications are being handled through set procedures and may take two years or more, it seems likely at this stage that the foothills will receive stereo hi-fi transmissions from a commercial source before the national broadcaster.

I bring this matter to the attention of the House because I know that other members, as well as their constituents, are affected by the FM transmission shadow. I call on Government members to put pressure on their Federal colleagues, especially the Minister for Telecommunications (Mr Duffy), to ensure that the \$75 000, which after all is only a drop in the bucket, is provided. If the Federal Minister will not provide the translator, the Government should take up the responsibility for providing it. After all, it will cost only \$75 000 to ensure that 30 000 people in the metropolitan area receive a reasonable and acceptable standard of FM transmission.

Finally, I come to one of those small cases that highlight the inefficiency and the significant extent to which costs are incurred within Government authorities when there is no need to incur such costs. During last session, I raised the matter of the cost of the Emerson cross-over at the intersection of South and Cross Roads.

It went back to the former Government on 23 December 1979. A new crossover at Emerson was commissioned and approved, not by the Liberal Government but by Mr Virgo when he was Minister of Transport under the Corcoran Government. It was to be constructed at a cost of over \$300 000, the track work to cost \$43 500 and the switch gear \$265 000. Everyone knew then that a new signalling system was to be installed. In fact, it was being talked about

as early as 1976. I recently found out that they are in the process of pulling out the crossover at Emerson, which was to cost \$300 000.

I asked on how many occasions the crossover had been used. The Minister said that the information was not readily available. I believe that it has never been used. The STA, at a cost of over \$300 000, therefore installed the crossover which has never been used and which has now been pulled out. I would like to read the answer that the Minister supplied to me. It is as follows:

I. In September 1982 Cabinet approved a project for resignalling of the Adelaide metropolitan railway system. This modernisation means that there will no longer be a need for the Emerson crossover and some other crossovers in the present system. Accordingly, the Emerson crossover was removed.

The removal of the crossover will simplify the trackwork and reduce the cost of resignalling the area. Future maintenance costs of the trackwork and signalling will also be reduced. The trackwork removed will be used elsewhere in the system.

In answer to my second question, the Minister replied:

II. The installation of the crossover formed part of a project for the upgrading of the section of track between East Avenue, Clarence Park and Angus Avenue, Edwardstown, and was not separately costed. The estimated cost of the work is—trackwork \$43 500, and switchgear \$265 000. The crossover was commissioned on 23 December 1979.

In answer to the third question, the Minister stated:

III. The crossover was installed for emergency use in the event of derailments or train breakdown. The crossover had little use due to the low incidence of accidents or breakdowns.

I understand that it was never used. If I am wrong in that understanding, let the Minister say so. The reply further states:

The State Transport Authority does not maintain records of the number of occasions each crossover is used.

I point out the inconsistencies in the Minister's reply. He said that it was put in there in case train breakdowns occurred, in which case I presume that it is possible to shunt the train to the crossover and for other trains to pass. He also stated that, with resignalling, a crossover is no longer needed. I do not understand how a signalling breakdown stops the need to overcome a train which has broken down on the track. Perhaps they use the other line and the improved signalling equipment allows them to do so with reasonable safety.

I highlight that, on a day when we have had STA fares increased by almost 12 per cent and when the Premier and the Minister complain about the \$18 million deficit of the STA, here is one small area in which over \$300 000 could have been saved if the STA had done better planning. That is where it is better to reduce the operating costs of the STA.

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

Mr TRAINER (Ascot Park): In my contribution to the Address in Reply I support the Speech made by the Governor and the condolences expressed to the families of recently deceased members.

In the limited time available to me (I will only speak for quarter of an hour, as I do not wish to prolong the sittings of the House), I will make a few remarks about the Address in Reply as an institution in itself. On this occasion (as on previous occasions since being the Whip) I have put myself last in the speaking order. I am not sure whether that is good or bad, but it does give me the opportunity to make one or two concluding remarks based on what has transpired in the days leading up to the last day of the Address in Reply debate.

On previous occasions I have said that the Address in Reply debate is a waste of time. Once again we have spent three weeks on it since the Governor's Speech on 2 August.

Traditionally, all members, except the Speaker and the 10 Ministers, take part for one hour each. The Address in Reply debate began on Tuesday 7 August and continued on 8 and 9 August. Again last week it continued on 14, 15 and 16 August and is only finishing today—21 August.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: On a good note.

Mr TRAINER: I hope that it is on a good note, as the Minister on the front bench states. Most of the time spent has been wasted time. Members have made some endeavours to use the time wisely but, in the main, the speeches fall into three categories. A few members tend to deal with one subject at length—a manifesto of their own political philosophy or some important issue; some deliver speeches that read very much like the essays that teachers used to require at the beginning of the term along the lines of 'What I did during the holidays'; and others tend to contribute what amounts to a collage of grievance debates.

The 60 minute speeches could be reduced to 30 minutes and the time saved could be better spread across several months when members often wish to raise issues on behalf of their constituents but do not have the opportunity to do so. It would be valuable if we could have a grievance period of two or three 10-minute speeches (perhaps one from each side) immediately following Question Time each day. Members could genuinely have an opportunity of putting matters on the community's political agenda when members of the press are present. Currently the grievance speeches are delivered at about 10 p.m., when the press is totally disinterested, as a result of which we do not achieve very much. Back-benchers should be given a more important role in the Parliament than being merely division fodder. If that is all we needed, we could save the taxpayers a lot of money by having a couple of dozen cardboard cut-out members on the back bench. The attendants could move them from one side of the Chamber to the other as required for a division.

However, there are far more important roles for a back-bencher than to be merely what is politely termed 'division fodder'. Indeed, if the back-bencher was taken out of his or her district, we would have to employ many more social workers to fill the local gap. Back-benchers should be given an opportunity to contribute, to represent their area, to put forward issues that they consider important and to get their issues on the political agenda. There are, unfortunately, few chances for that to be done during the year and, although the Address in Reply debate does fulfil some useful roles, it is inadequate for this one. Without abolishing the Address in Reply debate, we could reduce the time allowed by half the current one hour and allocate that time more fruitfully to enable members to have more frequent opportunity for grievance debates during the course of the year.

Unfortunately, one member on the Government side—the member for Unley—has been ill and has not been able to contribute. However, over the past three weeks about 35 members have participated in the debate, the majority of whom spoke for the full hour. I will speak for only a few minutes. The member for Brighton and one or two others made only a short contribution, but in the main most members squeezed every possible minute out of the 60 minutes allocated to them.

I am not sure how much the House is wiser for what has been contributed. When I spoke on this matter on 30 August last year, I sought leave to incorporate in *Hansard* some tables which I had collated and which detailed how much time was used in regard to various aspects of Parliamentary activity, such as Question Time, and so on. Reference to those tables will indicate that the Address in Reply debate accounts for almost one-eighth of Parliamentary time spent each year. The average is around 12 per cent to 12½ per cent of Parliamentary time being taken up by that debate. I believe that some sort of revision of this is long overdue.

In the few minutes that I have available to me I cannot deal with any one lengthy topic, because, in keeping with what I have been saying for the past few minutes, I do not think that it would be appropriate for me to do so, having criticised my colleagues for taking the full 60 minutes available to them.

In the brief time that I will use, I would like to comment (not adversely) on the ruling made by the Speaker on the opening day of Parliament regarding the wearing of hats in the Assembly Chamber. Under existing Standing Orders, the Speaker, it seemed, was obliged to rule the member for Mawson out of order, although the Speaker undertook to assess the situation to ascertain whether the Standing Orders might possibly need revision. I have done a little reading myself in trying to find out exactly what is the background of the relevant Standing Order. It is somewhat strange that there is a tradition that women should not have their heads covered in Parliament whereas in relation to churches there is a very strong tradition that men are uncovered and that women's heads are covered. Particularly in the high Anglican churches and Catholic churches, it was nothing unusual in the more traditional areas, say some 20 years ago, for a woman to take out of her handbag a hanky to cover her head when entering a church or to use what they called in some Southern European countries a mantilla of lace. I will refer further to that in a moment.

Another aspect of that ruling put to me by a couple of members is that to not have ruled in that way would have been partly in breach of the Sex Discrimination Act, that is that women were permitted to be covered in this Chamber while men were not. But I think that is not quite valid and that what should be relevant is what is the normal dress to be worn by a member on a certain occasion. Some of the research that I have undertaken on this matter is as follows. I refer to *The House of Commons at Work* by Eric Taylor, which states:

Naturally, gentlemen must speak with heads uncovered. There is one well-known and curious exception. During the progress of a division, if any member wishes to address the Chair he must sit down and put his hat on. The reason for this convention is stated by Cushing to be that debate at the moment is quite out of order, and that by sitting down and remaining covered a member makes it quite clear that he is not attempting to deliver a speech. Hats are not usually worn in the House nowadays, and recourse has occasionally been made to the use of ladies' hats (by men) and Order Papers (which the Chair has not considered adequate).

Obviously, there are some occasions when it is considered appropriate to be covered. *An Encyclopaedia of Parliament* by Norman Wildy and Phillip Laundy states:

The dress of members of Parliament in general has become increasingly informal since the last century, when no member of either House would have appeared within the precincts of the Palace of Westminster wearing anything on his head but a high silk hat. In fact, as Harry Graham wrote in 1920: 'In both Houses the hat has long come to be regarded as a sacred symbol. It is with this article of clothing that the member daily secures his claim to a seat on the benches of the House of Commons; with a hat he occasionally expresses his enthusiasm or sympathy, on a hat does he sit at the close of a speech, with the certainty of raising a laugh; and without a hat he cannot speak upon a point of order when the House has been cleared for a division.'

The book *Mother of Parliaments* by Sir Herbert Dunnico refers to the religious significance of certain customs in the House that might possibly be related to the wearing or the not wearing of head apparel and he points out what is believed in some circles to be the origin of the custom of bowing to the Speaker. He states:

Members upon entering or leaving the Chamber bow in the direction of the Speaker's Chair and it is generally assumed that their bows are tokens of respect to the Speaker. In origin it is not so and they have nothing whatever to do with either the Speaker or the Speaker's Chair. When the Speaker enters the House at the commencement of each sitting, he also bows in the direction of his Chair. We have already stated that prior to 1832 the Commons

met in St Stephen's Chapel in which, behind the Speaker's Chair, there was an altar. Members upon entering and leaving bowed to the altar as is the custom in the Anglican and Catholic churches today. This custom is still observed, although for more than a century no altar has been there [in the House of Commons].

As I mentioned earlier, in present times women may attend services in most churches in Australia without hats. Some older women prefer to wear hats as part of their best outfit, and these women, of course, are permitted to attend services. In context with that custom, the Parliamentary Library pointed out to me a section in the Bible in Book I Corinthians, chapter II, in particular verse 13, which states:

Judge in yourselves: is it comely that a woman pray unto God uncovered?

It is also stated in Chapter II that:

Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered, dishonoureth his head.

But every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered dishonoureth her head; for that is even all one as if she were shaven.

For if the woman be not covered, let her also be shorn: but if it be a shame for a woman to be shorn or shaven, let her be covered.

For a man indeed ought not to cover his head, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God: but the woman is the glory of the man.

The Parliamentary Library pointed out to me that this is based on the erroneous first century belief that the weakest point of a woman was her head and that if uncovered evil spirits might enter. I am sure that fear of evil spirits is not the origin of the non-acceptance of women being covered in here.

Referring again to my belief that the Address in Reply time could better be used by devoting that time to grievance debates during the course of a year, I point out the remarks that I made in March 1983 when once again as Government Whip I was winding up the Address in Reply debate. I stated at that time:

I rise on this occasion to make the final contribution to the Address in Reply debate in this current session. I hope that it will also be the last contribution made to the Address in Reply in its current format.

That turned out to be not the case. In August 1983 I went on to say:

My remarks in March 1983 are equally suitable on this occasion, although the element of prophecy proved to be sadly astray in March when I expressed my hope that my contribution on that occasion would be the last ever delivered in the traditional form. Perhaps it will be more prophetic this time.

I hope that this is the last time that we will have a lengthy Address in Reply debate.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Minister of Water Resources):

I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): Members of the House would be aware of my long-term interest in the racing industry, which indeed is a multi-million dollar industry in which an enormous number of people are employed, spread over the three racing codes of horse racing, horse trotting and greyhound racing. These codes encompass sports that are recognised as being both industrially useful and publicly entertaining. I have become progressively concerned about the number of public criticisms made about procedures relating to each of those codes, particularly in regard to horse racing and dog racing.

Mr Becker: What happened to the races on Saturday?

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: The member for Hanson wants some information about the races on Saturday. I

point out that, indeed the weather played a significant part in the cancellation of races 5 to 8 at Victoria Park.

However, prior to that weather coming in and the track condition becoming apparently unsafe, there were some incidents on the course that under ordinary good management should never have occurred. The breakdowns with the release gates and the false starts—two of them, in fact—that occurred on that day are a repeat of what has been happening often, indeed unfortunately too often, in recent times in that industry.

It was not that aspect of the industry about which I proposed to speak in this debate. Neither do I want to canvass at great length the unfortunate situation that apparently arose at Eagle Farm in Queensland last Saturday where a horse (I understand from reports it was Bold Personality) was posed as another horse, Fine Cotton, and won a race on which it apparently had attracted some million dollars in punter investment. The bookies and the stewards, I gather, on that course suspected some malpractice and accordingly took action about which the details are widely reported.

However, in our own State in recent times there have been incidents which I think have done the credibility of racing some injury, in fact, to the point where I believe the credibility of racing across Australia is, to use Mark Reid's comments, 'in the balance' and, indeed, it is our job wherever we can, either through this avenue or through the offices of the Minister, to try to assist the industry overall in lifting the level of credibility surrounding that racing industry.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: It's never been going better.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: The Minister says that it has never been going better. Financially, for the Government and ultimately for the respective codes, some of those clubs are going very well, but some of the clubs in the distant country regions are going very poorly, to the point of going out of business. I have had correspondence from the Whyalla and Strathalbyn greyhound racing code expressing great concern about the viability of their respective clubs. Again, that is a matter of financial distribution about which the Minister claims he has his finger on the pulse. I do not think that he has, nor do I think that the Minister is paying enough attention to the role of the stewards on some of these courses.

Let me settle down for a moment to talk about greyhound racing in particular. In yesterday's *News* there was an article reporting a positive swab case at Angle Park. It involved the running of a race some five or six weeks ago when a greyhound, Zapper Fox, was nominated and started in a race at Angle Park, ultimately won its race and was subsequently called by the stewards for a swab. According to the press report, that swab was unable to be taken on the day of the race and the dog was released back to its owner and brought back to the stewards the next day for a swab that was found to be positive. So, too, were allegedly found in the Angle Park kennel some meat crumbs containing caffeine and some other substance that is illegal in the diet of the dog. It may be in that instance that the security was not good enough at Angle Park.

I do not know the answers to these multiple allegations surrounding our racing industry in its several codes, but it raises the question whether the facilities are good enough, whether the personnel are diligent enough or in fact whether there are sufficient personnel available to that greyhound-racing code to police its activities. Again, a recent press report on the club membership at Angle Park, where the greyhound club is apparently under fire because only a limited number of persons (100, I understand) can become members of the club, indicates that it is only from that exclusive membership from which nominations can be received for officer positions within the club, and that no

new member can enter the club unless it is by agreement of the majority of that 100 membership.

Rightly or wrongly, they are the rules of that club. Rightly or wrongly, the distribution of surplus TAB funds to the club is under fire. I do not profess in these few minutes available to me to express a view on these rather unsavoury reports about our racing industry and its respective codes. I conclude these remarks by simply drawing to the attention of the Minister of Recreation and Sport what appears to be a somewhat untidy situation surrounding a number of the activities associated with our several codes of racing and, accordingly, call on the Minister to arrange for a legitimate and independent investigation of those activities.

It is easy in this place to call on the Government to set up inquiries for this or that purpose. The request that I make is not accompanied by wild allegations: I am simply disturbed at the number of mechanical and administrative breakdowns associated with the industry in recent times. I am concerned about the doubts prevailing in the community and the depreciation in credibility concerning the racing industry, and I am concerned about the criticism that is levelled at these all-important elements of the racing industry in South Australia, as reported in the press.

I repeat my call to the Minister to put together a panel of independent professional people who can investigate the allegations and reports surfacing so often in recent days (indeed, too often), and I do so in the interests of the industry and without prejudice or without reflecting on those who are working very hard and very long hours, often for little or no remuneration, to make the industry successful.

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

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): During this grievance debate I will to refer to the problems that are obviously arising from investment in property trusts. The warnings are out loud and clear that all is not right with the property trust industry. For those people who read the financial pages, it is crystal clear that some property trusts are in danger, that sharp practices are occurring in the property trust industry and that the promised return on investment in some property trusts cannot possibly be achieved. I wonder, Mr Speaker, if one looks at the whole of the property trust industry and the sharp practices that are now occurring, whether the whole of the property trust industry will not at some time in the future come under a cloud.

One of the frustrating things that I find as a member of Parliament is that I know that South Australian people are making certain investments that will eventually run into trouble, and as a legislator I find it impossible to head off quickly enough the problems that are occurring, so that many people are in danger of severely restricting the return that they will receive from money invested.

This money is usually the result of years and years of saving through superannuation and lump sum payments on retirement. It also brings into focus the whole of the investment advice industry and the need for extreme care in choosing people to give proper investment advice.

The problems associated with investment in property trusts were sharply drawn to my attention in an article in the *Advertiser* earlier this year by Mr Mike Attard. He referred particularly to the poor management of some property trusts and the fact that managers of some property trusts were not managing as well as they should be. I refer to his article, which states:

Unfortunately, not all trust managers are doing the right thing by investors, who entrust them with their savings. For example, a few trust managers buy properties which they own—directly or through an associated company—for the trusts they manage. Some

of these managers not only buy properties or land from themselves, but have the properties or land developed or renovated by other companies, which they also own. This is a conflict of interest specifically prohibited by law in other parts of the world. The reason is very simple. If you are buying something from yourself on behalf of someone else, whose interest are you going to look after—your own, or that of the third party?

Mr Attard then expanded on the further question of this sort of sharp practice, by saying:

The question which poses itself automatically is whether this manager is buying those particular properties because they are good investments in themselves, or because they are good propositions for the associated company. Quite apart from that, there are other problems that can, and, in this particular case, did occur.

What happened was that the associated company got itself into financial trouble. The trust manager and the associated company—one and the same person, of course—then sat down in the one chair and renegotiated the leases for the associated company. The result was that the trust previously being paid at 9 per cent on the value of the properties, is now receiving 6 per cent per annum. In my opinion, this is totally wrong and categorically unacceptable.

As the months of the year have proceeded, the criticism against what is happening in certain property trusts is getting louder. I would certainly hope that the criticisms are brought as much as possible to the public attention.

In an article by Ian Gill, the General Manager of Paul Terry Corporation, published in the *Advertiser* on Monday 20 August, one can note that the warnings are getting more pointed. That article suggested that Mr David Bennett (General Manager of Hooker Property Trusts), said that Hookers had inspected a large number of properties selected by some other fund managers and was prepared to go on record as saying that they (Hookers) would not have approved of the purchase of the majority of these properties. They just do not fit within our conservative guidelines and do not give the security that property trust investors require.

A recent investment publication contained 43 invitations for prospective investors to participate in some form of managed investment. Investors face the problem of deciding which ones to choose and they also must face the fact that there are no guarantees who the winners will be.

The article gave a 14-point guide to potential investors suggesting to them some of the pitfalls that prevail in the property trust industry, including a potential conflict of interest between fund managers and the vendors of properties, excessive fees, poor property spread, lack of information in estimated growth, little or no previous track record, the nature of the tenants, lease terms, the quality of income, location of properties, the nature of the constructions, the size of the investments, and the spread and type of property in a trust.

Many of these points are of course beyond the average investor and they must rely heavily on their investment advice. The greatest warning, however, in my opinion, comes in the article from the *Business Review Weekly*, page 33, 11-17 August issue. If the content of that article contains only half the truth, the alarm bells in the industry must be ringing very loudly indeed. That article suggested that horror stories abound about the unscrupulous marketers, inexperienced fund managers, questionable properties, unrealistic prices, dodgy valuations, and the lack of a free and informed market in unlisted property trusts. Two of Australia's most conservative professional bodies, the Australian Institute of Valuers and the Institute of Actuaries of Australia, have demanded that action be taken to clean up the property trust industry.

The article is also careful to point out that not all property trusts are involved in sharp practices, and some of them are very safe and sound indeed. In this article, the whole situation of property trusts at the moment, unless some further regulation enters the industry, appears to be a house

of cards. I refer again to the article in the *Business Review Weekly*, which quotes Mr Brian Randall as having said:

Unlisted trusts, however, present another problem. It is one that could have serious consequences, not only for the unit holders, but for the property market as a whole.

The question was raised last month by Brian Randall, a senior partner in the Melbourne broking firm of Randall and Company, in an address to the Building Owners and Managers Association of Victoria. Mr Randall said:

In the case of unlisted trusts, provision exists in their trust deeds for unit holders to serve notice on the managers that they wish to redeem their units at the last quoted buy price and the manager is required to organise the sale or redemption within a prescribed period. In normal conditions it may be possible for the manager to maintain its own secondary market by arranging for a buyer. It may be noted that a commission of at least twice the Stock Exchange brokerage rates is normally charged to both the buyer and the seller in such circumstances.

If a buyer cannot be found, the manager is often empowered to repurchase the units from the liquid funds held by the trusts. This is all right provided there is not a rush of redemption requests. Every manager of an unlisted trust is extremely anxious to retain the confidence of the investors in the trust, and by so doing hopefully discourage redemptions.

These conditions could lead to a chaotic industry condition if there was an overall eroding of confidence. There are a couple of property trusts here that—if they had a run—it would be a disaster. It would screw the entire property market up.

The control in this area rests with the National Companies and Securities Commission, and in March it issued a statement demanding a higher standard of disclosure in property trust prospectuses. It would appear to me, however, that further action needs to take place to overcome the problems that I have previously illustrated and deeper consideration must be given to the licensing of investment advisers.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to raise one of the matters about which I am concerned relating to my district. I am pleased that the Minister of Recreation and Sport is in the House, because I have been approached by the President of a small racing club in my district who is concerned that the South Australian Jockey Club might take action that will reduce the number of clubs operating on Eyre Peninsula. I would like to know whether that is so. I will quote briefly from the letter, but I do not want to identify the person or the club, although I am happy to give that information to the Minister. The letter reads, in part:

In February three people came and inspected courses on Eyre Peninsula. When they were asked a question they all denied it.

This gentleman said that the club had never had any loans or payouts, only a small amount from the TAB. He also said:

We endeavour to race as a service to the public, and are spending money on the course improving it and the facilities all the time, and are raising the stake money all the time. In our opinion, it is about time the SAJC came clean instead of coming at you from behind and denying it.

I have been aware for some time of suggestions that some of the smaller clubs should not be permitted to race and that their current rights should be transferred to larger clubs. I would like the Minister to assure me and, in particular, my constituents in the isolated parts of the State, that the South Australian Jockey Club does not intend to make life difficult for those people. If it does, I assure the House and the South Australian Jockey Club that I will get up in this place and say some things about it that I would have liked to have said a long time ago.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: What do you mean by that?

Mr GUNN: I am here to represent isolated communities, and I intend to protect those people. I have raised the matter. I have not named the club or individuals, which I could have done. If life is made difficult for the small clubs in my district I will be critical of those who are responsible.

I make no apology for what I say. I hope that the Minister will address himself to the problem.

The next matter to which I refer concerns petrol sniffing. Last night on a television programme a great deal of time was spent on this subject. Certain members of the House are aware of the problem. Unfortunately, many of us have seen it at first hand. I do not want to be unduly critical of the Government, but I think it is time that some positive action was taken to rectify these problems. We will prevent people from sniffing petrol only if some alternative programme is put in place for them.

During the past 10 years people have believed that self management and granting of land rights of a large portion of South Australia would solve all the problems of the Aboriginal community. Anyone with any knowledge in this area knows that, in many cases, just the opposite has happened. In these areas, as in any other area where one has poor conditions and unemployment, one has to find something constructive for those people to do. Before we can do that, we need to employ people to teach them how to manage their own affairs. At this stage I believe that we have not made a very good job of it. In my opinion, those cattle properties in the Far North have the potential to employ many Aboriginal people constructively.

Before that can take place they have to be shown and they have to help the management. The only way that will take place is to employ practical people who have the experience and the ability to pass on the knowledge they have and to put it into effect. We can have all the programmes in the world. People can write as many reports as they like, and stand up and pat one another on the back and say what a great job they have done by handing over this land. Those people will not be helped in the long term unless we make sure we have people there who are not only dedicated but have the practical ability to manage those properties, and can set them up and make sure they are maintained in an effective and proper manner.

If we make a comparison with how Granite Downs and other adjoining properties are managed and then go on to the North-West Reserve of South Australia, we can find some of the best pastoral property in this State. If we look at Amata, any responsible South Australian would have to be concerned to see the conditions under which people live and the amount of money spent there. I do not care who it is or from what side of politics he comes. Anyone who goes to Amata will have to be concerned about what has taken place. It is time we reassessed the manner in which money was made available and looked at the management of those areas. There ought to be programmes to teach people how to break in horses, and so on. We will not achieve anything until we employ people with practical experience. We do not want political theorists, drop-outs from European society, or people with way out ideas; we want practical, sensible hard-working people. We may have to pay them more than we pay currently, but that would be a good investment for the future of Aboriginal communities and the people of this State. I have said enough on that subject.

The other matter I wish to raise is in relation to the Wudinna Area School. For a number of years that school

was in the district of Eyre and I had the pleasure of visiting it on many occasions. On one memorable occasion I took the former Prime Minister, Mr Fraser, to that school when he was Minister for Science and Education. It was a useful exercise. A few weeks ago I was invited to look at it, as I had not been there for a while, and I was surprised, to put it mildly, at the condition of it. I will quote the following letter I received, dated 10 April:

Dear Mr Gunn,

For many years the Wudinna Area School parent community has heard of the impending redevelopment of their school. In 1981 a concept plan for redevelopment was drawn up and, in general terms, accepted. Little was done with the plan beyond acceptance as no specifics were then entered into. At that time it was explained that the first stage of rebuilding would begin in 1984. At this stage we believe we are not on a current Education Department rebuilding list, i.e. the concept of a new school is a distant mirage.

On 9 March 1983 we wrote to the Minister of Education, Mr L. Arnold, outlining both our concerns and needs. To this date we have not yet received a reply. On 10 August 1983, we wrote to the Minister of Education inviting him to visit our school and to review our situation first hand. A copy of our letter is enclosed for your information. We have had a visit from the Minister but have received no correspondence of his impressions or recommendations.

I cordially invite you to attend our school to review our situation for yourself. As part of a visit we would like to discuss methods by which we can hasten the redevelopment of our school. I invite you to attend at your earliest possible convenience, realising that the Principal and a group of school councillors would meet you and conduct a review conjointly.

Yours faithfully, A. E. Smith, Chairman, School Council, Wudinna Area School.

I took the opportunity and was surprised at the condition of the school. It has a large number of transportable buildings, and one had been transferred from the old Haslam school.

Of all the schools on Eyre Peninsula, it is probably the school that needs upgrading more than any other, as it is possibly in the worst condition. I realise that a large amount of money is needed to rebuild a school of that size, and I know the Minister is aware of the problem, as I have written to him in relation to it. I suggest that a plan be drawn up to redevelop the school so that at least a start is made in the very near future. It is an old school with a large number of students, and serves an important part of Eyre Peninsula. It has a fine reputation. It has many dedicated teachers, and the people in that area are entitled to reasonable facilities. I call on the Minister and his staff to enter into discussions with the school council, to draw up a programme for development, and to make a start. They could build a new administration and library complex as a first step. The time has come when the Department and the Minister should indicate quickly to the school council what they have in mind, as it is long overdue.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: I will have to come and have a look at it, too.

Mr GUNN: Yes, I am sure the school council would be interested. I understand that my colleagues, the Hon. Arthur Whyte and the member for Flinders—

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

Motion carried.

At 5.57 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 22 August at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 21 August 1984

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

ABORIGINAL STUDENTS

8. **The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What is the Government's policy concerning the provision of secondary schooling for tribal Aboriginal children who come to Adelaide and, in particular, is there consultation with parents and students about the courses, the number of subjects to be undertaken and the level of difficulty?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Traditional Aboriginal people are concerned about the provision of an effective and appropriate form of secondary education for their children. The people realise that the provision of secondary education outside their own communities needs to be cautiously approached to avoid undesirable cultural impact and carefully established so as to provide an environment that will stimulate students to experience and use English, and assist students to increase their social and academic skills.

After close consultation a programme was established in 1980 that provided accommodation in Adelaide at Wiltja House, and a carefully prepared curriculum for Aboriginal students at Ingle Farm High School. As the traditional Aboriginal students gain from these carefully developed programmes they can, after consultation with their parents, Wiltja House, Ingle Farm High School personnel and the Principal of their tribal Aboriginal school in their community, undertake language courses at Gilles Street Language Centre, attend an alternative school, other high schools or join more regular classes at Ingle Farm High School.

9. **The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What sort of pastoral care and support is available to tribal Aboriginal students after school hours and on weekends when they are placed in hostels?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Wiltja House is the only accommodation operated by the Education Department for traditional Aboriginal children attending Ingle Farm High School for special secondary studies. The Aboriginal children are under the pastoral care of a house supervisor who lives at Wiltja House in a family situation. Part-time instructors are used in a variety of after school hours and weekend activities. In addition, an advertisement has been placed for a full-time education worker to assist in the after hours care of the students.

10. **The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Is it a fact that some recently enrolled tribal Aboriginal students seeking secondary school education may be returned to their people because of lack of programmes, teachers and suitable accommodation?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The secondary education programme in Adelaide for traditional Aboriginal students has proven to be particularly successful and popular with Aboriginal parents who see the programme as a means of providing for their children some educational experiences not always readily available in traditional areas. The success of the programme resulted during the first term this year in more Aboriginal students attending Ingle Farm High School than was anticipated. Some students were sent home, but it might be noted that the State has now provided an additional 0.5 salary to support the programme, and a study of the educational needs of traditional Aboriginal students has begun. This study will include consultation with traditional communities.

ANCILLARY STAFF REVIEW COMMITTEE

11. **The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: When will the Ancillary Staff Review Committee report to the Minister?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The original time by which the Ancillary Staff Review Committee planned to report on its findings was by mid 1984. This has not been possible because the committee realised that to respond fully to all the terms of reference a detailed study would be necessary. Thus, a comprehensive survey was undertaken of the duties, time allocations and training requirements, for example, of all ancillary staff employees and of all schools. The processing of this large amount of data is presently being done, to be followed by careful analysis. Consequently, the reporting date of the committee has been postponed until this work is complete. I anticipate a final report to be presented in December 1984.

WOODS AND FORESTS LABOUR

12. **The Hon. TED CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Forests: Will the Minister instruct the Woods and Forests Department to give priority to local residents in country centres when engaging labour at its various regional locations?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Woods and Forests Department is very conscious of the subject matter of this question and endeavours to maximise its use of regional resources whilst endeavouring to maintain a balance of skills and experience.

PORT PIRIE BY-PASS JUNCTION

15. **The Hon. D.C. BROWN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What action has the Minister taken to improve the intersection of Highway One with the access road from Port Pirie, where three people were killed during the Easter weekend?

2. Does the Minister intend to have these roads realigned to overcome the hazard that exists at present?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The replies are as follows:

1. The 'give-way' signs on the access road from Port Pirie, approaching the Port Pirie By-pass at the Bungama Corner, have been replaced by 'stop' signs.

2. There is no indication to suggest that the geometry of the road junction, as presently laid out, represents a significant hazard to motorists. However, the situation will be kept under review.

ANOP

19. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: Since 1 January 1984, have any Government contracts been granted to ANOP and, if so, what were they and what were the contract prices?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No.

HOME BASED EMPLOYMENT

24. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: Has any research been undertaken by the Government into the cost effectiveness of home based employment for selected public sector employees?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No.

DEPARTMENTAL EXPENDITURE

27. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: Which Departments exceeded their 1983-84 expenditure allocation, by how much and why?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The information requested will be available in the Budget papers.

EMPLOYMENT IMPROVEMENT

35. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: With respect to the improved employment situation in South Australia, what is the estimated contribution of:

- (a) the uplift in the rural economy in 1983;
- (b) the impact of the 1983 wage pause;
- (c) the improved United States economy;
- (d) the decline in interest rates, particularly as it affected the building sector;
- (e) the element of deferred demand for housing now being realised in the market;
- (f) Commonwealth employment programmes;
- (g) State Government employment initiatives; and
- (h) State taxation?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: All of these factors have assisted the improved employment situation in South Australia.

ECONOMIC RECOVERY STRATEGY

48. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: Has the Premier reviewed the Economic Recovery Strategy put forward by the public sector unions and, if so, which elements of that strategy does he intend to adopt?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes. The Budget and other economic statements will indicate where the strategy recommended by the sector unions is similar to that adopted by the Government.

FID

52. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: When is it intended to exempt service organisations from FID taxation?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Government stated at the time of introducing FID that exemptions to charities would be applied in the widest possible terms. Nevertheless, it has been necessary for the Commissioner for State Taxation to be satisfied that organisations seeking exemption were able to meet the criteria contained in the FID Act. The matter was referred to the Crown Solicitor and, in keeping with her advice, steps have now been taken to approve applications for exempt accounts received from service clubs.

PUBLIC SERVICE

60. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: What are the current numbers of male and female public servants respectively, in clerical, administrative and executive positions?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: As at the end of June 1984, the number of male and female public servants in clerical, administrative and executive positions is as follows:

	Male	Female	Total
Clerical Officers	2 701	3 503	6 204
Administrative Officers	652	60	712
Executive Officers	230	9	239
Total	3 583	3 572	7 155

VOLUNTARY AGENCIES

63. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. How many voluntary agencies in South Australia are now receiving Government financial support and what criteria are used in allocating such funds?

2. What other support is the Department of Community Welfare providing to voluntary agencies?

3. Has consideration been given to providing Departmental staff on full-time or part-time secondment to assist voluntary agencies and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I refer the honourable member to my reply to his identical question earlier this year (*Hansard* 17 April 1984, page 4034). The position is substantially the same.