

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 6 August 1981

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

PETITION: BEVERAGE CONTAINERS

A petition signed by 31 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to restore the Beverage Container Act to provide that PET bottles be subject to a deposit was presented by the Hon. H. Allison. Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: SPEECH AND HEARING CENTRE

The **Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education)**: I seek leave to make a brief statement in response to a question from the member for Albert Park which was asked yesterday.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. H. ALLISON**: Yesterday in the House the member for Albert Park asked for a progress report on the replacement of the fire-damaged buildings at the Woodville Speech and Hearing Centre. I am now in a position to tell him that work will begin on the new buildings on Monday next and the work is expected to take about six to eight weeks. I will forward a more detailed report of the building specifications as soon as possible.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: HOSPITAL ACCREDITATION

The **Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON**: On Tuesday 4 August 1981, in another place, the Hon. R. J. Ritson, M.L.C., asked a question which raised issues concerning quality assurance for patients and delineation of clinical privilege for doctors and dentists. The issues which Dr Ritson raised are of such critical importance, not only in respect of the incident to which he referred, but to the nature and quality of services provided by health professionals to the public, that I wish to provide not only specific answers to Dr Ritson's questions, but also to advise the House of action I propose to take as a result of the matter being raised.

Dr Ritson asked whether a patient who had been admitted to a dental bed at the Royal Adelaide Hospital on Friday 31 July was under the primary care of a suitably qualified medical practitioner; whether the Royal Adelaide Hospital has a system of delineation of privileges as between medically qualified staff within the hospital; and what powers of enforcement of quality assurance exist in the case of (a) hospital service patients, both medical and dental, (b) private patients of medical practitioners at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and (c) private patients of dental practitioners at the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

The specific answers to Dr Ritson's questions are as follows: first, a patient was admitted to the Royal Adelaide Hospital on 31 July with face and head injuries. It has been alleged that the patient had leaking cerebro-spinal fluid. This has not been proven. The patient was admitted to a dental bed and was under the care of a dentist. However,

consultations had been provided by a general surgeon, an ear, nose and throat surgeon, a neurosurgeon and an ophthalmologist—

Mr BANNON: I rise on a point of order. Leave has been granted for this Ministerial statement as a Ministerial statement, but as I understand it the Minister is answering questions asked in another place which surely it is proper to respond to in that place under the procedures of the House and not out of order, as it is out of order to do so in this House.

The **SPEAKER**: Order! I cannot uphold the point of order. Standing Orders make it very clear that it is the right of a Minister to make a statement on any matter pertaining to his or her responsibility. Leave having been granted, and the Chair not being previously aware of the content of the matter, no action will be or could be taken by the Chair.

The **Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON**: I repeat that consultations had been provided by a general surgeon, an ear, nose and throat surgeon, a neurosurgeon and an ophthalmologist over the period between his admission and prior to the issue being raised in Parliament. Due to a professional demarcation dispute between oral surgeons and plastic surgeons over the care of this patient, the patient was transferred to another hospital on the morning of Wednesday 5 August. This was done at the direction of the oral surgeon in charge of the case.

Secondly, although there is no Delineation of Privileges Committee as such at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, the mechanism for privileges is via Appointments Advisory Committees of Dentistry and Medicine. This is common practice in Australian teaching hospitals. These committees have representatives of the professional colleges, the University of Adelaide and the administration of the hospital. Both committees have independent Chairmen who do not hold staff positions. These committees were reconstituted not long after I assumed office, following my recognition of the inadequacy of existing appointments procedures. The reconstitution of the committees has ensured that greater objectivity and independence are exercised in the matter of medical appointments to the hospital and has allowed the board to exercise more control over the selection of medical staff. In a letter dated 24 April 1980 to the Chairmen of the Boards of Royal Adelaide and the Queen Elizabeth Hospitals, I said:

The Board of Management has my full support in establishing an Advisory Committee in conjunction with the University of Adelaide; in appointing an independent Chairman of that committee; and in establishing terms of reference for the committee.

I feel sure that your board will share my view that the board itself should take steps to see that the committee's method of operation is designed to ensure a rigorous assessment of appointments to such categories of staff as may be determined by the board as coming within the committee's overview. Appropriate criteria should be agreed upon by the board so that it is satisfied that the merits of all applicants are subject to closest scrutiny.

Thirdly, the answer to Dr Ritson's third question about powers of enforcement of quality assurance for hospital and private patients, both medical and dental, is that all patients at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, regardless of insurance status, are under the same rules of professional conduct for treatment. The assurance of quality stems from three principal factors: first, the quality of staff appointed is critical to this process.

Members interjecting:

The **Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON**: I cannot help but note the levity with which this matter is being treated by members of the Opposition, by contrast to the gravity of the subject.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister of Health.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I believe the mechanism by which all applicants are rigorously scrutinised on the basis of merit is designed to achieve the best possible outcome.

The second factor is the system of peer review which has been established and is being actively pursued at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and other teaching hospitals. Peer review encompasses a wide range of activities, including regular clinical case reviews, tissue audits and death audits. The Royal Adelaide Hospital, in addition, has introduced a system of criteria audit and is one of the first in Australia to introduce this new initiative of systematic examinations of outcomes of patient care. In the last financial year, I approved funds for the development of these initiatives in peer review, not only in the Royal Adelaide Hospital, but all other major hospitals in South Australia.

The third factor is adequate administrative procedures. During the last six months, all the manuals of practice at the Royal Adelaide Hospital have been under review. This process is, in effect, an on-going one and manuals are continuously being up-dated and supplemented by administrative instructions. This process was followed in the case of delineation of privilege between oral surgeons and plastic surgeons when it became clear in March of this year that there were difficulties with clinical privileges between the two groups which share an area of overlap as well as having their own areas of exclusive competence.

The question of clinical privilege between oral surgeons and plastic surgeons is currently under consideration, and the Royal Adelaide Hospital administration will be consulting with the Medical Committee of the Board of the Hospital, with the Royal Colleges and with relevant specialists, to determine a system of delineation of privileges in the best interests of patients.

All three factors—staff appointments, peer review and administrative procedures—are taken into account in the process known as hospital accreditation, to which Dr Ritson referred in the statement which prefaced his question.

The Government has specifically supported and funded the hospital accreditation programme as it applies to Government hospitals. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital was accredited in 1980, Modbury Hospital has recently gained accreditation and the Royal Adelaide Hospital intends to seek accreditation in 1982.

I have given instructions to the Health Commission that the goals inherent in hospital accreditation will be vigorously pursued in all hospitals throughout South Australia to ensure that quality assurance programmes and delineation of privilege operate effectively in all branches of medicine throughout the health and hospital services of the State.

The SPEAKER: I refer to the point of order raised at the commencement of the Minister's statement. Having now been provided with a copy of the statement, it is only just that I point out to the honourable Minister and other Ministers that they have no opportunity to answer a question from a member in another place in this place. I note that the commencement of the Ministerial statement now delivered to me purports to do that and then move on to other material. It is important that the material by way of a Ministerial statement does not—

An honourable member: Very underhanded.

The SPEAKER: Order! —seek to be an answer to a specific question which can only rightly be answered in the place from which it emanated.

The SPEAKER: Before calling on Question Time, I indicate that questions relating to the Premier will be taken

by the Deputy Premier in the temporary absence of the Premier.

QUESTION TIME

ELECTION PROMISES

Mr BANNON: I address my question to the Deputy Premier, acting on behalf of the Premier. What response has the Government given to a delegation from the South Australian Chamber of Commerce which visited the Premier several weeks ago to complain about his Government's failure to deliver on its election promises? I understand that the Premier was visited by a high-level delegation from the Chamber of Commerce on Friday 3 July. I am told that that delegation advised the Premier that the chamber was dissatisfied with the Government's failure to honour its election promises to business in this State and with its lack of consultation. I am further told that the Premier was advised that, unless the Government moved to assist business, the chamber would withdraw its support, and there was also a suggestion that business groups might once again wage a 'stop the job rot' type of campaign against the Government. Today's unemployment figures reinforce that comment. I am told that the Premier asked his media adviser, Mr Rex Jory, to convene a meeting of Ministerial press secretaries, who were told to ginger up their Ministers because it was important to get the Government back on the rails.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am not quite certain as to which high-level delegation from the Chamber of Commerce the Leader referred to.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: We will name them if you want them named.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I was present at one meeting with officials from the chamber. That occasion could well have been on 1 July, or at about that time. If that is the date on which the Premier and I met with the officials from the chamber, the statements that the Leader made are quite erroneous. If the meeting was not the one that I have referred to but another meeting, from information that has come to me I suspect that his statements are still quite erroneous. I am told that at the meeting the chamber did not complain, but that the representatives were generally pleased with what was happening under the Liberal Administration following the 10 years or so that they had suffered under a Government of a different complexion. In fact, generally that has been the attitude in the business community. For the edification of the Leader of the Opposition, let me quote some remarks which were made this year by Mr Arnold Schrape in a public speech. He said, amongst other things—

The Hon. J. D. Wright interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: He is employed by the chamber and is an official spokesman. He said:

South Australia's prospects are certainly very much better now than they were a year ago.

He made these comments this year. He also said:

The motor vehicle industry is in a much stronger position; the retail traders are experiencing their best trade for many years.

I interpose there to point out that these sentiments came through loud and clear at the meeting I attended. One of the leading retailers from Rundle Mall, whom I will not name, said that record figures were obtained. If members opposite want to check these figures, they appeared in the business pages about three weeks ago. This year South Australia has had the biggest growth in retail sales and the best sales figures since 1976. Unfortunately, that sort of news does not gain the prominence it should, although the

gloom and doom of the Leader of the Opposition seems to attract attention in some circles. This is the group to which the Leader referred. Let me cite some other examples that, I believe, give the true picture of industry and commerce in this State, and a correct assessment of the position. Mr Schrape stated:

... the retail traders are experiencing their best period for many years. The life insurance industry, particularly where it is involved with superannuation, is reporting very high business levels.

He said further:

It is a measurable fact, by counting heads, that there are a lot more people in work today in the State than were in work 18 months ago...

That is about the time that this Government came into office.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will talk about that in a moment. He continued:

... and that is employment. It is also true that there are a lot more people offering for work than there are jobs to offer them, and that is unemployment. The latter situation, and most particularly as it affects young people, is greatly to be regretted, but it does not negate the first point, that there are more jobs filled this year than last, or the year before last.

Does that lead one to think that Mr Schrape, as spokesman for that group, was complaining, or that the group came along to tell us what a bad job the Government is doing? Of course, the former Premier, the predecessor of the present Leader, brought these people into his office and gave them a sherry to find out what was going on in the latter days of the previous Administration. We do not go to such lengths. In the latter days of the Dunstan Administration, the former Premier brought in these people and gave them a drink just to find out what was going on.

There would be something wrong if the Government did not have, or seek, frequent contact with groups such as this, and if, on all of these occasions, everything in the garden was rosy. Of course, there are areas which concern us all and to which we must give attention, but the general picture and message from that group certainly give the lie to anything the Leader has said this afternoon to suggest that the group was dissatisfied with the Government to any degree.

The unemployment figures that have been announced today are the cause of considerable regret. It is a fact that unemployment has increased across the nation.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: That is not a fact.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Nationally, the upward movement from June to July increased the unemployment rate across the nation. The strikes that have bedevilled this country during this period are the direct cause of this escalation in unemployment.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not know what contact members opposite have with employers or employer groups: in fact, I do not know whether any of them have been employers, but it is a fact of life that employers will not take on new employees—

Mr Keneally: Have you been an employer?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: In a very small way, yes. Employers in industry will not take on—

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: In a very small way.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have persistently requested honourable members to act responsibly in the receipt of an answer to a question raised by their Leader. I ask that there be no further interjections while the Minister's answer comes quickly to an end.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The answer will come to an end when I have made the points that are pertinent to this question, and I am quite sure that you, Mr Speaker,

will acknowledge that. The fact is that employers will not take on new workers at times of industrial disputation. We have had a transport workers strike, the strike on the waterfront in Melbourne has caused shortages in industry in South Australia, and the postal and Telecom dispute has had a dramatic effect on industry and commerce in this nation. That is the cause of the unemployment. It ill behoves the Leader of the Opposition to continue with this aura of gloom with which he has surrounded himself and which he is trying to impart to the public of South Australia. There is an air of optimism among that group to which he referred in his question and it ill behoves him to knock it.

HOSPITAL COSTS

Mr EVANS: Can the Minister of Health advise the House of the current status of South Australia's cost-sharing agreement with the Commonwealth in those areas which affect her portfolio? Because of statements that have been made recently, particularly by the Opposition, about South Australia's ability to maintain a free hospital service, I am asking the question so that the Minister can indicate to the House and the people of South Australia the exact position in relation to the cost-sharing arrangements and, in particular, whether South Australia is in a position to maintain a free hospital service.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: South Australia is not in a position to maintain a free hospital service, and I would be pleased to explain the reason why. It is true that legally South Australia could continue that free hospital service after 1 September, but financially it would be quite impossible to do so. The status of the cost-sharing agreement is that until 1 September we are operating under the legislation which was passed some years ago. After 1 September we will be operating under amended Commonwealth legislation, which has removed the requirements for all States to provide a free hospital service to uninsured patients. The Commonwealth has removed that requirement from its existing legislation. That requirement was, of course, embodied in the agreement and as a result—

The Hon. J. D. Wright interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: There is nothing whatsoever that South Australia could have done.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition wants the call, it is necessary for him to be still within the Chamber.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I would rejoice in the opportunity to debate this issue with the Deputy Leader. What I have done and intend to continue doing is to protect the interests of South Australia's health consumers and taxpayers in respect of the cost-sharing agreement. As I said, it is necessary, because of the amended Commonwealth legislation, to amend the agreement to recognise the changes that have been made to that legislation. That in no way means that South Australia will necessarily opt out of the agreement. I point out to honourable members opposite that their colleagues in Tasmania, who could hardly be described as being ideologically committed to the Fraser Government, have taken the same course of action as this Government has taken in deciding to impose fees for hospital patients. The reason is that had we not done so the South Australian Treasury would have had to pay the cost penalty of not doing so.

The revenue that is anticipated from hospital charges in the current financial year is in the region of \$50 000 000; that revenue will be cost shared between the State and the Commonwealth. Should South Australia decide to continue with a free system, this Government would have to find the \$25 000 000 short fall in what it could be expected to raise

from revenue charges. This is a fact that seems to have entirely escaped the Opposition, particularly its spokesman on health. He does not seem to be capable of distinguishing the difference between a cost-sharing agreement and free hospital treatment. The two were inseparable under the previous legislation; they will not be inseparable from 1 September.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The agreement has not been repudiated, but if the Commonwealth were to make an offer to the South Australian Government which, in the belief of this Government, warranted our opting out of the cost-sharing agreement, we would be obliged to consider it, in the interests of the taxpayer. If the Commonwealth were to offer us a sum or inducements which were to the advantage of South Australians—and they are the people in whose health care and purses I am interested—then we would be obliged to consider it. One of the changes to the Commonwealth legislation which will operate after 1 September is that either of the States, South Australia or Tasmania, will be able to opt out of the agreement at any time they like between 1 September 1981 and 1985, which is when the agreement runs out.

In summary, it would not be financially possible for us to maintain a free hospital system. We do still have a cost-sharing agreement whereby our hospital costs are shared 50-50 with the Commonwealth, and if we should be made an offer by the Commonwealth which would merit consideration and which would be in the best interests of South Australian taxpayers in terms of inducements to opt out of the agreement, the Government will consider it, as it is able to do at any time between now and 1985. I hope that I do not have to reiterate the points I have made many times and which seem not to be able to be understood by the Opposition. The record is there, and I would strongly recommend that the Opposition spokesman takes the trouble to read the proceedings of Federal Parliament, to read the new Act, and to understand that he is operating in a different ball game and not living in the past.

UNEMPLOYMENT

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Will the Deputy Premier, representing the Premier, say why preliminary Australian Bureau of Statistics figures released today show that total unemployment in this State rose to 48 800, or 8 per cent of the labour force, in July from 45 000 or 7.5 per cent in July last year? Does the Deputy Premier agree that the fact that this State, with only 9 per cent of the national labour force, now has 13 per cent of the national jobless means that confidence and this Government's performance as economic managers are seriously lacking?

On 4 June 1980, the Premier told the member for Ascot Park that when we are talking about confidence in South Australia and its performance in the economic and industrial senses, the share of unemployment becomes an important measure. I could not agree more with that statement. In July 1979, under Labor, this State had a 10.3 per cent share of the national jobless. A year later, in July 1980, the share was 11.7 per cent under the Liberal Government. Today we have learnt that South Australia's share of the national jobless total was an appalling 13 per cent in July 1981.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable Deputy Leader not to continue to comment.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am quoting facts, Sir, rather than commenting.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will decide what is comment and what is fact. The word 'appalling' as used was comment.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Thank you for your advice, Sir. I will continue without commenting. The July 1981 share appears to be the highest monthly figure ever recorded by the Australian Bureau of Statistics. On the Premier's own criterion the South Australian economy appears to be in real trouble. I am told that interstate we are now being described as the 'peasant State'. For the record, whilst South Australian unemployment rose by 3 800 in the past 12 months, the national total fell by 10 200.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The figure initially quoted by the Deputy Leader was issued today, I understand, by the A.B.S. The Deputy Leader asked why it issued that figure. I suppose it was issued because that is the figure the bureau gathered as a result of its researches; that is the short answer to the question. I know that he did not quite mean that when he asked his question.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: It doesn't worry you, though?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Of course it worries us all, Mr Speaker. However, since this Government has been in office the total number of jobs in South Australia has increased, whereas in the declining years of the Labor Government the total number of people in employment in South Australia declined.

One other pleasing fact I should bring to the attention of the House is that there are fewer young people unemployed in South Australia than there were during the corresponding period last year. One can mess around with figures and can do one's sums in all sorts of ways, but the fact is that unemployment has risen nationally and has risen in this State as a result of the strikes—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: It has not risen in the nation; it has come down.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The figures supplied to me indicate an increase in unemployment across the nation. I emphasise again the effect of the disputation on unemployment in the nation and, indeed, in this State. The fact is that the water front dispute in Melbourne had a significant effect on employment in this State. If I were to indicate what the Opposition ought to be doing, I would say that it should be using its best offices with the union movement to encourage that movement to moderate its wage demands and to use any influence it can to keep to a minimum industrial disputation as a result of wage claims. If they can do that, I believe we would be able to do more in this State to encourage employment and attract industry.

GLENELG TRAM

Mr OSWALD: Is the Minister of Transport in a position to deny another rumour being circulated around Morphett, this time that the State Transport Authority is about to withdraw trams from Jetty Road, Glenelg, and provide a new terminus east of Brighton Road? During the last week the member for Hanson, the member for Glenelg, and I have received letters from the Senior Action Group (Grey Power) of Glenelg. I think the text of their letter will explain that group's concern. The letter is as follows:

Dear Sir,

It has come to our notice that a rumour is circulating around the district that 'Glenelg trams will soon be stopped travelling down Jetty Road, the terminus being at Brighton Road'. Our members [pensioner groups in Glenelg] are very perturbed as it will bring hardship to elderly people, mothers with children and others, etc. as it is a long walk to the beach.

The letter was signed by Mrs M. P. Williams, the Secretary.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Not only have I heard the rumour, but the organisation that the honourable member refers to has been in touch with me as, indeed, has the honourable member. Not only has that rumour been circulating, but the latest rumour is that we are going to do away with the Glenelg tram altogether. I do not know where that rumour comes from, but I can give the honourable member, and the House, a categorical denial that the Government has any intention of doing away with the Glenelg tram. Also, I can give a categorical denial that we intend to take the tram off Jetty Road, and the terminus will remain where it is at the moment.

INDOOR AQUATIC CENTRE

Mr SLATER: Will the Minister of Transport say at what stage is the feasibility study in relation to the proposed indoor aquatic centre? The Minister probably realises that one of the most important factors in regard to the aquatic centre will be its location. I understand that a number of locations have been considered. At what stage is the feasibility study, and has a specific recommendation been made to determine the actual site?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I am delighted to see the interest shown by the member for Gilles in the aquatic centre, as I have never been too sure whether the honourable member and other members of the Opposition support it or not.

Mr Slater: We do.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I hope that is on record, namely, that the member for Gilles supports the aquatic centre. I believe that is a matter of very great interest to the people of South Australia, as indeed is the necessity for an aquatic centre, which will be an extremely important facility for this State.

The member for Gilles asked at what stage is the feasibility study. The feasibility study was in the stages of near completion when, as the honourable member realises, the West End development programme was announced. Immediately upon the announcement of the West End development programme I referred the alternative site of the West End development to the consultants, Hassell and Partners. The consultants have now come down with a series of five or six sites, including many sites which have been recommended to me by various honourable members, and the choice has now been pared down to two sites: one is the West End site, and the other site is at Underdale. I am expecting a completion of that report within the next few weeks. I believe it is urgent that it be completed as soon as possible, because there is no doubt that the sooner we get on with this facility the better it will be for the sporting people in South Australia.

WOOD SUPPLY

Mr BECKER: Will the Minister of Environment and Planning say whether he is worried about the reduction of natural wood resources which have been affected by domestic use in open fires and pot bellied stoves. I understand that, because of the high cost of household heating, people are scavenging dry wood from our natural scrubs and reserves under the Minister's control. Furthermore, I am told that considerable damage has been done by the scavengers while seeking cheap fuel, and that these people are disturbing the natural habitat of Australia's flora and fauna, upsetting the delicate balance of man and nature. In view of the popularity of pot bellied stoves and open fires and in view of the dangerous pollutant effect of low grade coal,

it appears from reports that there is a considerable increase in sales of natural wood which could in a few years wipe out this important resource.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: Yes, I can tell the member for Hanson that I am worried about the reduction of natural wood resources in South Australia. I believe it is of concern to many people. I appreciate that in the past there has always been a large quantity of cheap wood available. It is also appreciated that there has been more interest of late in open fires and pot bellied stoves and in the burning of wood generally. Of course, we would also appreciate that now the quantities of natural wood resources are very restricted and, in fact, are limited.

I am pleased to be able to tell the member for Hanson that the staff of my department has already had discussions and will continue to have discussions with the officers of my colleague, the Minister of Forests, to ensure that appropriate amounts of wood for domestic use at an acceptable cost are available in future.

It is regrettable that there has not been more planning and more thought put into the future of this commodity, but we are organising discussions to ensure that there is an adequate supply for the future.

BOWDEN-BROMPTON EVICTIONS

Mr ABBOTT: Will the Premier say why the Government has broken the promise it made on 6 May that any tenant who has to be rehoused would be assisted with alternative accommodation in the same area, as a direct result of the proposal to sell houses and properties no longer required for transport corridors through Bowden and Brompton to C.P. Detmold Pty Ltd and Gerard Industries Pty Ltd? Also, why have some residents been given seven days notice to vacate their homes when other residents have been given three months to quit without any offer of assistance with alternative accommodation as was guaranteed?

On 6 May, the Premier announced that two companies, the packaging manufacturer C.P. Detmold Pty Ltd and the electrical accessories maker Gerard Industries, would spend a total of \$5 000 000 expanding their factories in the Hindmarsh council area. He said that the two companies would acquire land next to their present properties and that the Housing Trust had guaranteed that any tenant who had to be rehoused as a direct result of the proposals would be assisted with alternative accommodation in the same area.

I understand that 16 properties have already been sold by the Highways Department to C.P. Detmold Pty Ltd. However, while a committee of Government departmental officers and Hindmarsh councillors was meeting to examine more closely the expansion needs of Detmolds and a wider programme for the development of housing within Hindmarsh, the Detmold company was handing out eviction notices to residents.

On 10 July, residents of East Street were instructed by Detmolds that they would have to leave their homes. Some residents were given seven days notice to leave and some were given three months notice. I have received numerous complaints from constituents about this matter, and those constituents would like to know what in hell the Government intends to do about this matter by way of assistance.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am interested to hear that the honourable member has received such a large number of complaints, and I would certainly be more than happy to investigate them. It is possible, of course, that assistance can be given, as the honourable member has so rightly said.

Mr Abbott: It was promised.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I suggest the honourable member would do a great deal more good by coming for-

ward with examples and the names of those people concerned and putting them to the Housing Trust or to the Minister of Housing than by raising the matter in this House. I would be delighted to forward to the Minister the names and details of the problems so that action can be taken and assistance given.

PLASTISHIELD BOTTLES

Mr RANDALL: Will the Minister say whether plasti-shield bottles can be used in this State and what the Government will do about them?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The Government has been concerned about the plastishield bottle and the introduction of that container in South Australia, and it has taken action, and will do so through regulation, to ensure that that bottle is not used in this State.

SEX EDUCATION

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Does the Minister of Education intend to seek information from the Victorian Liberal Minister of Educational Services when he undertakes his investigation of the veracity of allegations made by the member for Brighton as promised in this House yesterday, and does he accept that Minister's assertion that the member for Brighton behaved pretty irresponsibly? An article appeared in today's *Age* under the heading 'Victoria's Sex Education Under Fire Again', which stated in part:

People who believed Australia's morals were being corrupted by communist influences were trying to undermine the State Government's sex education guidelines, the Minister of Educational Services, Mr Lacy, said yesterday.

'That is how cynically I would sum up the position,' Mr Lacy said. He was commenting on a Liberal M.P.'s statement in the South Australian Parliament that a woman teacher and a male student had intercourse in front of a class in a Victorian school.

Mr Lacy said he had not heard of the M.P., Mr Glazbrook, until he read of his statement. But for him to have made such a statement without checking with the Minister's office or his department was pretty 'irresponsible'.

'I think he is regurgitating under privilege material circulated by a group in Victoria, the Concerned Parents' Association.'

Mr Glazbrook, who represents Brighton, said many other incidents in Victoria had been reported as having occurred in classrooms in health education courses. For instance, intercourse had been simulated, oral and anal sex had been discussed, children had been required to draw various positions of intercourse and had been subjected to vulgar 'literature'.

Mr Lacy said: 'For about the past twelve months I have been aware of similar accusations and I have repeatedly called for evidence of these activities. No one has been able to provide any, nor has anybody been able to name a single school in Victoria where such activity has taken place.'

'I intend to challenge Mr Glazbrook in the same way as I have challenged every other accuser and I suspect the result will be the same. I publicly challenge him now, if you care to print it, and I will follow it up with a letter inviting him to submit evidence.'

Mr Lacy said he had repeated such challenges until he was sick of doing so.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The honourable member obviously has the same press release that I received this morning from the *Age*, dated Thursday 6 August, headed 'Victoria's Sex Education under Fire Again'. During the course of the morning I have spoken briefly with a representative of the Victorian Education Department and pointed out that the member for Brighton had, in fact, acted to a great extent in good faith in so far—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I was not showing you anything, I am reading—in so far as in the course of his address he said that 'it had been claimed that'. In this article 'They've

got your kids' it is quite unquestionable that the various claims made in the article were addressed to members of this House. This document is authorised by Mr Denis Bayles, Box 1041, Geelong, Victoria, and further copies can be obtained from the Secretary of the Concerned Parents Association. The point that has been made is that the member for Brighton acted in good faith. He said 'it has been claimed that', and he quoted the source of that information.

An honourable member: So he's backed down?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: No-one has backed down. If that matter is now in dispute with the Victorian Minister of Education, it still has to be proven whether in fact this document is erroneous. I am taking up that personally, but I suggest that, when we have further information from both the claimant and the disclaimant, then we will be in a better position to assess the veracity of both the claims.

At no stage did the member for Brighton state to the House that he had personally substantiated this particular piece of information, and this can be checked by having recourse to *Hansard*.

Mr Trainer: Grossly irresponsible!

The SPEAKER: Order! Members have been invited on a number of occasions to remain silent when answers are being given. At this moment I particularly identify to the member for Ascot Park that he was included in that general warning.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: This, of course, was only a small portion of a much larger address to the House. It is one small section which was taken up by the Victorian media, and I am not sure, in fact, that what the member for Brighton said in this House was accurately reported over Victorian television.

HOSPITAL COMPUTER

Dr BILLARD: Will the Minister of Health say what action the South Australian Health Commission has taken in regard to a computerised patient information system for metropolitan hospitals, and will the Minister advise the House whether allegations by the Opposition's health spokesman (Dr Cornwall) of a fiasco have any foundation?

Two weeks ago the Opposition spokesman on health made attacks in another place on the practices employed by the Health Commission officers in pursuing a programme of health computer system acquisition for the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Those attacks were subsequently responded to by the Minister of Health in a statement she made in this House on 22 July. Since then the Opposition health spokesman has extended those attacks to allege:

The South Australian Government is about to embark on the greatest computer fiasco seen in the State.

Specifically, he alleged that the Government had disregarded proposals for suitable patient information systems made by the Management Services Division of the Health Commission.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I am interested to see the fresh so-called revelations of the Opposition spokesman on health. I think that Dr Cornwall is rapidly earning himself the reputation of being the political reincarnation of the boy who cried wolf. He seems to be continually making statements which are subsequently proved to be based on false information yet which are widely reported by some sections of the media without checking with the source, namely, the Minister or the Health Commission, as to the veracity of the allegations.

Much of the material printed in today's *News* is grossly inaccurate, and I would like to inform the House of the details, but before doing so I should say that the Chairman

of the Public Accounts Committee has informed me that the committee has written to me (and I have not yet received the letter) asking for a copy of the Management Services Division's report on the computers, which I shall be very pleased indeed to provide, because it will settle once and for all that all procedures undertaken by the commission in investigating proposals have been undertaken with the utmost care, and strictly in accordance with the procedures laid down by the Supply and Tender Board and by the commission's computer policy.

I note that in that report in today's *News* there was also a side report referring to allegations of a Mr Vroom, who was an unsuccessful tenderer. Had anyone taken the trouble to check with me Mr Vroom's allegations, I would have been able to tell them that the joint hospitals and Health Commission evaluation committee dismissed the system tendered by Computer Management Centre, of which Mr Vroom is an officer, because the system did not satisfy the functional requirements of the original tender. It failed to meet the mandatory evaluation requirement concerning proof of ability to handle the volume of transactions from the three hospitals. Also, it is unlikely that the other hospitals would agree to confidential patient information being processed on a privately owned computer bureau outside Government control. I mention these facts to demonstrate the importance of reporters checking with the source before they print material which can be damaging to Government officers.

In respect of the first point raised by the member for Newland, proposals of the Management Services Division in respect of the patient information system were accepted and acted upon. In the event, the proposals were modified to take account of new information derived from both the tender call and other sources. The Management Services Division of the Health Commission has been involved in all aspects of the changing strategy in the interim patient system project. To suggest that it has not shows either plain ignorance or malice.

I recapitulate on what has occurred so far: the Management Services Division recommended to the commission a project to provide an interim patient information system for the three major hospitals based on commercially available packaged software, designed for installation over different sites. The recommendations covered the desired features of the interim system, which included such factors as ability to handle large volumes of data on modern, powerful equipment, low risk of operational failure, and proven in Australia. That is a point that is made in the article in today's *News*. The proposal was endorsed by the Health Commission, and tenders were called. In the tender evaluation, 'proven in Australia' was interpreted as the ability to operate and demonstrate the software in Adelaide, and to prove that the functional capability was as specified in the tender document.

The Management Services Division estimated the cost of the tender to be \$180 000 to \$260 000 to provide the admissions registrations function to each of the three hospitals, based on minimal terminal numbers in the hospitals. The tender evaluation committee recommended the Burroughs offer as the only one meeting all requirements; it did comment on the level of costs but recommended an overseas visit to check on the product and saw the Royal Adelaide Hospital as the first site for implementation.

The Management Services Division estimated the cost of a full implementation of the Burroughs system to be between \$460 000 and \$580 000 per annum. Before making a recommendation to the Minister of Health and the Government, the Chairman of the Health Commission advised the hospitals of the likely costs and sought their commitment to such a plan. I understand that his letter of February

advising hospitals is in the hands of Dr Cornwall. That simply demonstrates the absolute futility of members of the Opposition using one piece of information believing that they have the whole story and rushing into print to condemn the Government, the Health Commission, or whatever other department and completely ignoring subsequent events and subsequent relevant documents which tell the whole story. Subsequently, the following transpired: there was an independent check by the Health Commission on information provided by Burroughs in its tender. This shows the scrupulous care to which the commission has gone in making sure that this computer proposal is attended to with meticulous and painstaking care. Instead of taking at face value, as one might expect to do in a tender document, information provided by Burroughs, the commission took the trouble to check with, as I recall, the provincial Administration of Transvaal, in South Africa, which administers a general system used by hospitals. It found that the information provided by Burroughs was not correct. Of course, Dr Cornwall is not aware of this. This information negated the advantage of Burroughs over the next preferred tender. The strategic planning consultants advised that the Burroughs product was complex and both difficult and costly to install. They believe that to proceed would have been 'risky' in terms of time and cost. At that time, the Commission's Computing Policy Committee reviewed the issue and decided to revise the approach; the Management Services Division concurred. It was at about that time that Dr Cornwall, obviously in possession of commission or related documents, burst into print and said that the commission was not doing as I had said it would do in my statement to the House last year. I was not able to reply, as I have already indicated to the House, because it would have been improper for a Minister to comment on tenders currently being considered by the board.

The decision not to proceed was conveyed to hospitals on 5 May 1981. Obviously, Dr Cornwall has not got a copy of that letter—he is basing his assumptions on correspondence which is no longer relevant. The revised approach, seeking new offers from Burroughs and I.B.M. just for the Royal Adelaide Hospital, was endorsed by the Supply and Tender Board. The overseas visit by Dr Britton and Mr Blight was to review the two systems only; it was not intended to be a comprehensive evaluation of all the systems available. The call for the revised offers closed on Monday 3 August. No decision has been taken as yet: I repeat, no decision has been taken as yet. This series of responsible actions is what was described by Dr Cornwall as a fiasco.

I welcome the invitation of the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee to provide the report. I hope that, when the report is received, Opposition members who are on the Public Accounts Committee will be able to enlighten their colleague in another place about the gross irresponsibility of his actions and allegations and that they recommend to him that if he continues to cry wolf, when and if ever he finds something that is of genuine concern, I believe it will be unlikely that either the Parliament or the media would take any notice, because he has demonstrated that he is willing to use non-existent issues in an effort to gain headlines.

L.P.G.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy say what positive plans he or the Government has for the promotion of the use of L.P.G. in South Australia as a motor fuel and for provision of sufficient convenient outlets for use by motorists to achieve that end? I believe that, if by way of explanation I quote from the report of

the South Australian Energy Council for the year ended 30 June 1980, the import of my question will be seen by you, Sir, and other members of the House. Under the heading 'Energy for transport', the following appears:

Higher retail prices for motor spirit have enhanced the economic viability of L.P.G. as an alternative to motor spirit. From June 1979 to June 1980 the number of automotive L.P.G. outlets in South Australia increased from 11 to a total of 29—

under a programme implemented by the previous Labor Government, I might add—

A recent Energy Division analysis—

and this is the important part of the explanation—

has indicated that the proposed Cooper Basin liquids L.P.G. production has the potential to substitute for about 30 to 40 per cent of the gasoline consumption in South Australia.

I believe, Sir, the intent of the question will be now quite clear to the Minister.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: There has been an increase in the use of L.P.G., so much so that during the period of restriction which had to be imposed recently in South Australia we had to include provisions for the supply of L.P.G., because our taxi fleet, to a large extent, now runs on it. There has been increasing use of L.P.G. since this Government came to office. A company called Gogas, which is the L.P.G. arm of one of the major companies, has sought to extend its operations in South Australia since we have come to Government. We believe that conversion to L.P.G. will be seen to an increasing extent in the future. I think that the Minister of Transport has suggested that there will be an experimental bus running on L.P.G. in South Australia.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: You have said nothing about assisting with the provision of outlets.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The South Australian Gas Company is the major supplier of L.P.G. at the moment, and it did a very good job with supply during the period of restriction. Of course, the outlets have to be a commercial proposition. I had discussions with the Gogas company, the commercial arm, when its representatives came to see me with a view to increasing the number of outlets in South Australia. It has to be a commercial proposition; one cannot just say one will be establishing X outlets in Y positions around Adelaide and hope that something will turn up. The company, I think, would have liked the programme to go a bit quicker, because the indications were there earlier that L.P.G. would catch on more quickly than has eventuated. Certainly, the company is interested in increasing the number of outlets in South Australia.

It is a matter of public education, I guess, and the extent to which this Government, or any Government, is prepared to spend money on trying to convince people that they ought to convert to L.P.G. I think that the element which would convince people to convert is the economic element—there has to be a clear advantage in converting from a petrol engine to an L.P.G. engine. There must be a payback period which is not too long if the general motorist is to be convinced that he should convert. Certainly, for high mileage vehicles such as taxis there has been a high percentage of conversion to L.P.G. The factors that I have mentioned, such as the economic advantage of conversion, what happens in relation to the relative prices, what happens in relation to the supply of liquid petroleum, will all be influential in the rate at which conversions are accomplished.

I believe that the single most potent factor in converting to l.p.g. is not the number of outlets, or where they are (because they will not spring up unless it is economic for that to happen), but the economic one; that is, whether it pays the motorist to go to the expense of paying \$700 or \$900, or something of that order, to put a tank in his boot,

together with the considerations of the pay-back period and the advantages of the difference in the cost of the fuel. The cost is the single most potent incentive, because what most motivates the average consumer is what it will cost and what he will get out of it. This company is certainly interested in more outlets, but it is not economic for it to put up outlets in an unco-ordinated fashion unless the rate of conversion by the public warrants it.

LOCK COAL DEPOSITS

Mr BLACKER: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy report to this House the latest developments in the assessment of the Lock coal deposits, and whether it is expected that a commercial excavation will be undertaken within the next few years? I have been contacted by a number of residents at Lock who are undertaking a projected population survey for the construction of community facilities. This latest specific information is required for the planning of a new church in the area.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I would not place the exploitation of the Lock coal deposit very high on a priority list, certainly when it comes to population forecasts in that part of South Australia. The factors that must be weighed in assessing the viability of any deposit are location, quality, size of the deposit, transportation, use, and so on. When one weighs up those counts and compares them with, say, the Wakefield or the Kingston deposit, then Lock would certainly not be at the head of the list. I shall obtain for the honourable member a more accurate and up-to-date assessment of the activity currently going on in that area. I think that will tend to confirm the general impression that I am conveying to him.

STONY POINT ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY

Mr MAX BROWN: Will the Minister of Environment and Planning say whether the Government has given the Santos environmental study concerning its Stony Point project any consideration, and, if so, has the Government come to any firm proposal that it might enact in respect of fulfilling its responsibilities concerning adequate environmental safeguards if and when an indenture for the project is drafted? I have gone on public record in support of this project, but I have qualified that support by saying that everything possible should be done by the State Government to provide adequate environmental safeguards. I strongly believe it is most urgent that Santos be given the green light for its project, and, equally, that the Government should, as a matter of urgency, provide details of the safeguards that are required.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: Yes, I can assure the honourable member that the Department of Environment and Planning is looking very closely at that project. This Government is very anxious to see that project proceed as quickly as possible. Let me say that, under the requirements of the environment impact assessment procedures, it is necessary to go through a specific procedure involving public comment. That has taken place, and the department is looking closely at the matter. We realise the responsibility that we have in protecting the environment in that area, and I can assure the honourable member that that is exactly what we are doing.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: WILDLIFE SERVICE INVESTIGATION

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment and Planning): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I refer to the comments made by Mr Millhouse in this House on Tuesday 4 August 1981, and I am able to make the following statement concerning the issues raised.

In June 1979, the then Minister of Environment, Dr J. R. Cornwall, arranged for a police investigation of the Inspection Section of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. The investigation team operated under the direction of the Crime Director, Senior Chief Superintendent K. Lockwood (now Assistant Commissioner (Crime)), and included an inspector and five experienced detectives. This investigation was initiated mainly because of public statements made by Mr B. J. Field after charges against him in relation to his possession of protected birds were withdrawn in the Christies Beach Magistrates Court on 19 June 1979. In August 1979, as a result of consultation between the South Australian Police Commissioner, interstate Police Commissioners, and the Commonwealth Commissioner, a joint task force of State and Commonwealth police officers was established to assist in the investigation.

The investigation was thorough and ranged throughout Australia. In consequence of facts established, two former officers of the National Parks and Wildlife Service were arrested in this State, two customs officers were arrested in Western Australia and later extradited to South Australia, and action was commenced against a customs officer in Canberra. These men were charged with having conspired together and with others to take and sell protected animals, as defined by the National Parks and Wildlife Act, between July 1973 and December 1974. The court proceedings commenced in the Adelaide Magistrates Court on 14 April 1980. Up to that time Field had declined, on legal advice, to make a statement to the investigators, and therefore the court proceedings were commenced without his evidence being available. Shortly after the proceedings commenced, Field notified his willingness to then make a statement, and accordingly he was interviewed by police.

During the course of the hearing the police were advised by the Crown Law Office that further information had become available indicating that the facts established by the investigation did not constitute evidence of the commission of an offence by any person. The matter was therefore not taken further before the presiding magistrate, who dismissed the charges, although the Crown had sought an adjournment to enable the Crown to assess the information which was to have flowed from Mr Field's indication of co-operation.

Field had also commenced an action against the Government to recover payment for the services he claimed he had provided as an agent for National Parks and Wildlife Service and to obtain replacement for some birds he said he had used in this work. This matter was settled by agreement in the Supreme Court on 6 April 1981 with a denial of any liability. Mr Field has continued to make statements about his involvement with the National Parks and Wildlife Service and allegations of malpractice by persons associated with that service and Customs during the time he claims to have been working as an undercover agent.

His main allegations are against former employees of National Parks and Wildlife and persons outside the service. Mr Field has never at any time suggested that present employees of the service may be suspected of having committed any offence, and indeed the police have confirmed

this situation. It remains true that, even after exhaustive investigation by both police and officers of the Crown Law Department, no evidence has come to light indicating the commission of criminal offences by staff of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. Certainly, Mr Field has not himself provided any such information. If Mr Field or Mr Millhouse is possessed of relevant information not previously given to the police, I consider that each has an obligation to communicate this information to the police for appropriate action. I must say, Mr Speaker, that, given the circumstances of the exhaustive investigation by the police, the manner in which the member for Mitcham has used his position of privilege in Parliament to attack present and former staff of the National Parks and Wildlife Service is most reprehensible.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier): Mr Speaker, I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham persisted in standing. He has been seen and he will be taken in the order of the sightings the Chair has made.

Mr Millhouse: I thought I was up first, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: An article in today's *Advertiser* refers to an answer I gave yesterday about the possibility of sales of Australian uranium to France. Part of that article could be taken to infer that I support French development of a neutron bomb. In fact, in my answer yesterday, I described French atomic bomb testing and plans for neutron bomb testing in the Pacific as 'quite outrageous behaviour'. Regarding the sale of uranium to France, what I said was in the clear context of the French Government's indicating its acceptance of Australian safeguards and, therefore, the use of our uranium for peaceful purposes only.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 18 August at 2 p.m.

Mr MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I desire to speak to that motion, and I hope that I will then be able to give a personal explanation subsequently, I thought the Minister was merely going to give a personal explanation.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitcham will be given the call to make a personal explanation after the Chair gives the call to the member for Peake, the member for Gilles and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr MILLHOUSE: I have very grave reservations about this motion to avoid sitting next week, which is the object of the motion. This is only the sixth sitting day of the present—

Mr Ashenden: You are never here.

Mr MILLHOUSE: I am always here, as is every other member.

The Hon. H. Allison: Either mentally or physically—

Mr MILLHOUSE: It is a funny thing that when I am here people tell me to go away, but when I am not here they seem to miss me.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You're a nice little fellow, of course.

Mr MILLHOUSE: The member for Hartley has spoken and he, no doubt, speaks for his Party. They tried to put me out at the last election.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: We didn't succeed.

Mr MILLHOUSE: No, they did not succeed. I remember on the day before the election—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Mitcham to come to the discussion before the House relative to the adjournment until 2 p.m. on Tuesday week.

Mr MILLHOUSE: I was a bit distracted, but I will go on now. I have very grave reservations about this motion. We sat for two weeks: this is the second week of sitting in four weeks. I was naive enough to think that we did not sit last week so that we could all be available to watch the Royal wedding last Wednesday evening and the Government would not have to adjourn specially for that happy event. I did watch it, and I thoroughly enjoyed it.

Mr Becker: What's this got to do with the motion?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hanson must remain silent. The member for Mitcham is asked to come back to the motion before the Chair.

Mr MILLHOUSE: I may say that I had not even noticed the member for Hanson. Let me come back now to the point that I was making: I did watch the wedding, at the same time as the Labor Party was at least showing a little honesty in acknowledging its Republicanism at its annual convention, wherever that was (in Melbourne, I think). I was naive enough to believe that that was the reason we did not sit last week, but I now know that the reason was a deal between the Government and the Labor Party that the Government would allow this House not to sit last week so that the Labor Party delegates, whoever they are, could go to the national convention. In exchange, the Labor Party undertook to behave itself in this place.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MILLHOUSE: That is the reason why we have not even had an urgency motion in this session. I could not understand why there had been no urgency motion or a motion of no confidence.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MILLHOUSE: It is because the Labor Party has done a deal with the Government.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member for Mitcham continues to defy the Chair in coming to the point of the motion before the Chair, I will have to cause him to be named.

Mr MILLHOUSE: Oh!

The SPEAKER: Order! I would very quickly make the point, so that there be no misunderstanding, if it should be inferred from the statements that the honourable member for Mitcham has already made, that the behaviour of this place is determined from the Chair, and from nowhere else.

Mr MILLHOUSE: Yes, I take your ominous warning to heart, Mr Speaker. When I said that the Labor Party had behaved itself, I meant in a political sense, in a sense that was congenial to the Government. In other words, the Labor Party, so that we would not sit last week, undertook not to embarrass the Government with urgency motions or no-confidence motions. That is absolutely reprehensible. We are all in this place to do a job, not to suit our own convenience, and I for one had been looking forward to a good week of controversial debate last week. Indeed, I believe that the people of South Australia are entitled to that. To add insult to injury, having had a week off following the first week of the session, we are now to have another week off.

I want to know whether the Labor Party has done yet another deal with the Government or whether, for some reason, the Government has done a deal with the Labor Party. I want to know the reasons for our not sitting next week: I can think of none. We try to pretend to people outside that this place sits a lot and that we work hard, but I point out that this is only the eighth week of sitting in

the year, and we are now in about the 31st or 32nd week of the year. We have hardly sat at all this year, and now we are to take off another week. I for one am not in favour of this motion. I believe that we should sit next week, as we are expected to do by the people of this State and, indeed, as we always used to do before two or three years ago, when the member for Hartley introduced this absurd system.

The system is absurd and, to add insult to injury, it is being abused by our sitting every other week instead of having one week off in every four weeks. Therefore, I propose to oppose the motion unless some pretty cogent reasons are given for our not sitting, which we have not had so far. I know that the Government hoped that the motion would slip through without any debate or any attention being called to the matter, but unless, later in this debate, some pretty cogent reasons are given for our not sitting, I intend to divide on the matter.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the member for Todd will remain silent.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier): It is quite obvious that the court is not in session next week and the member for Mitcham has some time on his hands. I know I have a good reputation as a negotiator, but I would not insult the intelligence of members of the Opposition by suggesting for a moment that I had done a deal that they would not move any no-confidence motions. I give the complete lie to that suggestion, as indeed would members of the Opposition with whom I talk from time to time about the programmes of the House. That suggestion is a complete figment of the honourable member's imagination, and again I take as a compliment his suggestion that I would have the negotiating skill to be able to do a deal with the Opposition by which it would be muzzled and it would not, if it was so minded, move a motion of no confidence or an urgency motion to castigate the Government. That suggestion insults the intelligence of every member of this House, and certainly of members opposite. Of course, it is absolute nonsense.

Unfortunately, the honourable member is not here often enough to know just what is planned in relation to the sittings of the House. I have made widely known in the House (and if the honourable member had been here at the appropriate time he probably would have had a copy of the planned sittings of the House), and we worked on the generally agreed basis that there would be time off in the sittings of Parliament. I always understood that this general idea of having, say, a couple of weeks on, one off, two on, one off, was welcomed by most members in this place.

I think that there was general agreement between the Government and the Opposition and, indeed, I was under the obvious misapprehension that the member for Mitcham supported that view. That was the basis on which we initially drew up a programme of sitting for this new session. The member for Mitcham certainly made no representations to have the list changed. That proposed programme has existed for some time and next week was marked as a week during which the House would not sit. As a result of that, members of this House quite rightly made appointments which are difficult to terminate at short notice.

As I said in the first sentence of my remarks, obviously the member for Mitcham has some time on his hands next week. The court is obviously not sitting, so he is asking that all members of this House, including the Premier, Ministers and others, cancel the arrangements that they have made in accordance with the published programme of the sittings of this House so that the member for Mitcham can come here during an unscheduled sitting week and sound off. It

would be far better if the member for Mitcham, in this feigned interest in the sittings of this House, was to show a bit more assiduity in his attendance when the House is in session. I do not know what the programme of sittings of the court is, but I always know by observing the behaviour of the member for Mitcham that quite obviously his court is not in session.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Maybe he has lost a few briefs lately.

To suggest that the Government has done some sort of deal with the Labor Party in relation to its lying down is absurd. To suggest that members, after the sittings of the House have been settled for about six or eight weeks, should cancel their engagements and come back here next week to accommodate the member for Mitcham is equally absurd. In relation to the non-sitting of the House last week, a request was received that the House should not sit—

Mr Millhouse: Where did it come from?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will tell the honourable member. There was a request because the Australian convention of the Australian Labor Party would be held during that week and that required the attendance of some of the leading Labor Party members of this place. That did not seem to be an unreasonable request by the Deputy Leader. The Government, having considered the matter over a period of two or three weeks, put itself in the Opposition's position and, being reasonable people, we acceded to it. We believed that the legislative programme of the House could accommodate a week off.

Mr Millhouse: You have had an easy ride throughout the whole session.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: If we have had an easy ride, it has had nothing to do with the fact that we have done a deal with the Labor Party. That is patently and obviously absurd and it is an insult to the intelligence of everyone in this place, including that of the member for Mitcham. If the honourable member wants to come to the House next week, let him come, and, if he sits there in his accustomed seat and ruminates and longs for his colleagues who are elsewhere, that is too bad. His opposition to this motion is, to use the words that I have used in relation to some of his arguments, patently absurd.

Question—'That the House at its rising do adjourn until Tuesday 18 August'—declared carried.

Mr Millhouse: Divide!

While the division was being held:

The SPEAKER: Order! There being only one member on the side of the Noes, I declare that the Ayes have it.

Motion thus carried.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: ADELAIDE AIRPORT

Mr PLUNKETT (Peake): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr PLUNKETT: While making my speech in the Address in Reply debate yesterday I claimed that I live right on the boundary of the airport. The member for Hanson replied, 'You don't live under the flight path,' to which I replied, 'I live under the flight path.' The member for Hanson then claimed, 'You don't; tell the truth.' I would like to put on record, and it can be substantiated quite easily, that I do live on the boundary of the airport under the flight path of the aircraft. I make certain that I do not tell untruths; I always tell the truth.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: INDOOR AQUATIC CENTRE

Mr SLATER (Gilles): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr SLATER: During the course of my question to the Minister of Transport this afternoon and his reply in relation to the aquatic centre, the Minister said that I had been opposed to the aquatic centre being built in this State. That is not the case and, if the Minister cares to peruse *Hansard*, he will know that I am not opposed to the aquatic centre. I believe that the Minister tried deliberately to misrepresent my position on the matter. I am in support of the aquatic centre, but I have expressed my opposition to the method and the manner in which the funding for the project was proposed by the Minister.

MINISTER'S STATEMENT

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Adelaide): Sir, I do not wish to make a personal explanation but I am seeking guidance from you. Earlier this afternoon the Minister of Health made what she described as a Ministerial statement. I suggest that that was carrying it a bit far, but nevertheless that is what she said it was. The Minister sought permission to do so, and leave was granted. Then, a point of order was taken by the Leader of the Opposition about the matter, which you, Sir, will well remember. You, Mr Speaker, said in your reply disallowing the point of order that you were not aware of the content of the information in that statement. Neither was the Opposition, at that stage. The delivery had not arrived. It appears to me that from what you said that, had you been aware of the contents of that document as it unfolded, you may have advised the Minister to do it in some other way, or you may have refused leave. I would like your interpretation, Sir, of your words. I felt that the Ministerial statement went much further than I would have allowed had I known its contents.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will also appreciate that, having had the opportunity of viewing the Ministerial statement, I indicated my concern about the matter. It is my intention to pursue it with the Standing Orders Committee and to report back in due course.

Mr Millhouse: The Minister of Environment and Conservation—

The SPEAKER: Order!

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Mr MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr MILLHOUSE: The Minister of Environment and Conservation took the opportunity at the end of Question Time to make a statement arising out of the speech that I made in the Address in Reply debate on Tuesday evening, and without reference to the answer that he gave me in this House yesterday to the question I asked him on the same matter. He finished his Ministerial statement by saying that I had used my position of privilege in Parliament to attack present and former staff of the National Parks and Wildlife Service, and that this was most reprehensible. I utterly reject that. The fact is that I would have raised all these matters much earlier if they had not been *sub judice*. I could not raise them, nor could any member raise these matters in the House once the proceedings had been

taken against Mr Field. He had taken his proceedings against the Government in the Supreme Court and a prosecution had been launched against the four officers of the State and Commonwealth Public Services.

It was quite impossible for these matters to be raised under our Standing Orders, which, in my respectful opinion, need review, until all these matters have been dealt with. The Address in Reply debate was the first opportunity I had to canvass these matters, and I took it. The Minister yesterday, in answer to my question as to what action, if any, he was going to take as a result of what I said, said that the allegations were serious and that they were going to be investigated. Whether or not he has resiled from that today is a matter that I shall take up with him in due course. He certainly did not mention any investigation.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Mitcham that he knows full well the limitations of a personal explanation. I ask him not to continue to debate the issue.

Mr MILLHOUSE: I certainly shall not. I make it clear that I personally am now prepared to discuss any matter which is within my knowledge with any officer of the Government, or with any officer of the police, Commonwealth or State. I am quite happy to do that, and, although I cannot speak for Mr Field, I believe that he is in precisely the same position. In his Ministerial statement, the Minister said that Mr Field had not been prepared to discuss matters with the police at the time of the prosecution of the four men. I can say that that was on my advice. I advised Mr Field not to talk to the police until his claim had been settled. The Government refused to settle it at that stage; indeed they said that there would be no settlement.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I rise on a point of order. I believe that the member is going way beyond a personal explanation, for which the House has given him leave. He is now debating whether Mr Field should or should not have given evidence at any time. He is using information that he has as the legal practitioner representing a person in court, having given that person certain advice or not. It has nothing to do with the honourable member's personal explanation regarding whether he made statements in the House yesterday against certain persons in a Government department. I believe that the honourable member is going beyond the personal explanation area.

The SPEAKER: Order! I had previously warned the honourable member for Mitcham that I was watching very closely. When the member for Fisher arose, I was about to intrude again into the debate. Therefore, in that sense, I uphold the point of order that he has raised. I warn the member for Mitcham for the last time that, if he proceeds beyond a personal explanation, I will withdraw his leave.

Mr MILLHOUSE: The relevance of the personal explanation to what I was saying is this: yesterday, the Minister drew attention to the fact that I was counsel to Mr Field. He endeavoured to reflect on that. Today he has linked this by saying that Mr Field, on legal advice, would not speak to police. I am explaining why I gave him that advice. I believe that I am entitled to do that in view of what the Minister has said on those two occasions. I do not propose to continue for very much longer, in any case. I was saying that, if it had not been for the stupid stubbornness of the Government—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now going far beyond the pale and I warn him for the last time.

Mr MILLHOUSE: I will try to finish the sentence. I believe that I am entirely in order. What I—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will not accept a statement which can be held as a reflection against a ruling of the Chair. I ask the honourable member for Mitcham to withdraw the last remark.

Mr MILLHOUSE: I am sorry. I am quite lost. I do not know what you want me to withdraw.

The SPEAKER: The member for Mitcham was told by the Chair that he was going beyond the pale. The honourable member said he believed that he was totally in order, which is a reflection against the Chair's ruling. I ask him to withdraw the statement.

Mr MILLHOUSE: There has been a misunderstanding between you and me.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Mitcham to withdraw the reflection on the Chair.

Mr MILLHOUSE: If there were any reflection on the Chair, I withdraw it. I withdraw it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I am not satisfied with the withdrawal made by the member for Mitcham. I ask him unequivocally to withdraw the statement that I claim is a reflection upon the Chair. The honourable member knows the consequences if he fails to do so.

Mr MILLHOUSE: I certainly withdraw anything that may be a reflection on the Chair, because I did not intend any reflection on the Chair. What I meant was what I was going to say. You, Sir, have not even heard what I believe is in order, because I have not said it yet. I was only going to finish the sentence. I said that I believed that what I was about to say was in order. That is all I said. But, if you regard that as a reflection on you, I withdraw it, and I have withdrawn it. But, if I may now endeavour to complete the sentence which began, 'If it were not for the stubborn obstinacy of the Government' in refusing to settle, they could have had Mr Field's evidence in time to use for the prosecution.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: AIRPORT FLIGHT PATH

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr BECKER: The member for Peake, in his personal explanation this afternoon, referred to an interjection that I made during his speech in the Address in Reply debate. My interjection was that he did not reside in the flight path—

An honourable member: You said he did not tell the truth.

Mr BECKER:—and did not tell the truth, when he claimed that he did. My understanding of the flight path of the main runways of Adelaide Airport is that runway runs north-east and south-west. The other major runway runs north-west and south-east. Also, I understand that the member for Peake's residential address is on the side of the Adelaide Airport and that it does not come in the corridor that is considered the flight path, which is the approach to either of the main runways. In the 15 years that I have lived at Glenelg North, I have never known an aeroplane to fly over the Glenelg golf links and the suburb of Novar Gardens on an approach to Adelaide Airport. It is physically impossible. That is why I made that interjection.

At 3.50 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

FIRE BRIGADES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 1)

The Hon. W. A. RODDA (Chief Secretary) brought up the report of the Select Committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA (Chief Secretary): I move:

That the report be noted.

Mr Speaker, I am pleased to table the report of the Select Committee on the Fire Brigades Act Amendment Bill, 1981. I should point out, Sir, that the Select Committee was appointed to examine the Bill on 30 October 1980, and that the committee has spent some nine months taking evidence from executive staff, operational staff, union representatives and other interested persons, both in this State and in other States.

The committee recommends major changes to the administration of fire services in South Australia. It recommends that the present Fire Brigades Board be abolished and that the Fire Brigade become a Government corporation, headed by the Chief Officer. This decision was made after considering carefully all of the evidence submitted to the committee, including the advice from an experienced fire engineering consultant, Mr R. Cox.

The proposed departure from an administration where there is a board to one which is headed by the Chief Officer directly responsible to the Minister I am sure will be envied by all other States. From the evidence taken by the committee, it is apparent that the South Australian Fire Brigade should operate as a Government corporation because the provision of fire services is a public service. It was considered by the committee that the top person, that is, the Chief Executive Officer, should be Chief Officer of the corporation and that that person should be appointed on a contractual basis. The committee notes that morale within the brigade would be lifted considerably if such steps were taken and permanent positions were at last created.

The committee also recommends that there be a fire service advisory council to advise the Government on all matters relating to fire services in South Australia. This will involve reporting to the Government on the ways and means of improving the efficiency of both the Metropolitan Fire Service and the Country Fire Service. There will certainly be a considerable number of matters which the council may like to discuss and further advise the Government on. For example, it could well be that it would be desirable to have closer liaison between the Metropolitan Fire Service and the Country Fire Service with respect to training programmes and that it may be worth while to examine the possibility of introducing an exchange programme in order to ensure that the high standard of training for Country Fire Service personnel is maintained. The advisory council should be widely represented to ensure the Government is provided with an expert source of advice on all matters concerning fire services in South Australia.

If the passage of this Bill through both Houses is successful, then I will take the necessary administrative steps to establish this council. I envisage that it will consist of 10 members, with representation as follows: a Chairman who would be appointed by the Minister; a representative of the Fire Brigade Officers' Association; a representative of the Fire Fighters Association; two persons nominated by the Country Fire Services Board; a representative from local government; a representative from insurance companies; a person nominated by the South Australian Chapter of Architects; a person nominated by the United Farmers and Stockowners Association; and a person nominated by the Building Owners and Managers Association.

The establishment of such a council would obviate the necessity for section 28 of the principal Act of the Country Fire Services Act to be operated on. This section establishes an advisory council to the honourable the Minister of Agriculture to advise him on all matters pertaining to the

Country Fire Services Act. It has not been operated on, to date, I believe.

I would also like to give an undertaking to the House that, as Minister responsible for the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service, I would also take the necessary administrative steps to establish a consultative committee within the corporation. The purpose of such a consultative committee would be to provide both clerical and administrative staff as well as operational staff within the corporation with the opportunity to exchange ideas on matters affecting their work environment.

It is the policy of this Government to encourage on a voluntary basis communication between employees and management. The exchange of information is the core of good industrial relations and the formation of this consultative committee will enable this objective to be achieved.

Mr Speaker, there were so many matters discussed by the committee that it would take me hours to elaborate. One can see by the evidence tabled with the report that the committee spent an enormous amount of time listening to the various interested persons. The terms of reference of the Select Committee were quite specific; that of the Amending Bill before the House, and while this confined the committee to reporting on the administration of the brigade, there were other matters which have been mentioned in the report, albeit briefly.

One matter which was continually raised in evidence was that of the funding of the South Australian Fire Brigade. It is recommended by the committee that the Government establish an expert committee to examine present funding arrangements and to make recommendations to the Government on a more equitable method of funding. It would not be within the expertise of the committee to examine such arrangements, even if the terms of reference had permitted the committee to do so. However, urgent attention must be paid to the funding question.

Another matter which was raised by the operational side of the brigade was the matter of accident rescue. This is a matter which I think, as Minister, I need to take up with the Police Department and the Chief Officer of the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service in the near future.

The committee notes that there is the equipment and manpower available to the brigade to assist in this area and also recognises that men from fire stations can be at the scene of an accident within six to seven minutes. While the Police Department is presently responsible for accident rescue, it is felt that the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service could well provide some assistance in this area, and I will be convening a meeting to discuss this matter in the not too distant future.

I believe that the recommendations of the Select Committee are sound and what the operational staff of the brigade are seeking. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 5 August. Page 322).

Mr MAX BROWN (Whyalla): Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker, and welcome back. Last evening I was about to enter into a matter that causes me some concern. It is a matter of consumer protection, or should I say the lack of consumer protection. Consumer protection was developed under the previous Government into a phase of government that gave much needed buying protection to the general public. Unfortunately, under the present regime there are

grave doubts in my mind as to whether or not we are heading towards no consumer protection at all. I have experienced over the past few months an area of some disquiet in the field of consumer protection. It would be disastrous if this State went from the State with the best consumer protection in the Commonwealth to the situation that exists in Queensland under the rule of the banana republican.

While on the subject of consumer protection, I want to deal with a case brought to my attention by a constituent which shows quite glaringly the need for Commonwealth consumer protection legislation. Of course, it would be a matter of wishful thinking if I said I might expect Mr Fraser to do something about it. The case in question involved the advertising of a repair kit by a company of interstate origin, in fact, a company based in Queensland. The company was V.I.P. Vinyl Industrial Products, which advertised in national papers a product I can only describe as a repair, renew, refinish, on-the-spot process kit.

The brochure, of which I took a photostat copy, was headed 'Let an expert repair, renew and refinish your vinyl with our new on-the-spot process.' On that brochure was a photograph of a young man actually in the process of renewing vinyl. Below, it states:

Your name, address and phone number go in this space. This attractive folder is your silent salesman. Include it in your mailings to prospects, or hand it to them when making calls to sell your services. Leave it after completing the job, too.

It leaves room for the craftsman's name, the order form, the quantity, the price, the amount of money, and the total amount of what the services might entail. With this brochure came a letter from the manager of the company, which I want to read in full, because it certainly states things that I found not to exist in the final article. On the letter was a photograph of the General Manager, a man by the name of Mr Ken Wilmshurst. The letter stated:

Your friend at VIP. That's how I hope you'll think of me, as you enter the exciting, profitable field of Vinyl Repair—and during the years ahead, too, when you are reaping the rewards of your knowledge and skill in a business of your own that grows larger each day.

I'm here to be just that—your friend and counsellor—not some unknown name at the bottom of a letter. I am interested in your progress as a successful VIP Craftsman, and I will help you in every way I can.

It is fairly important to take note of those two paragraphs because what this salesmanship is doing is literally saying to the purchaser that all he has to do is to buy the repair kit and suddenly, overnight, he is a craftsman. The letter continues:

We've always felt that our business should be maintained on a personal basis. That's the way we can accomplish most for our VIP Craftsmen. We have a selfish motive, it's true in wanting to help you. We know that as your business grows and succeeds, ours will, too.

The letter continues:

I hope that in the very next mail I'll receive your order to get you started in the growing and increasingly profitable business of Vinyl Repair. Remember, the know-how and skill you'll get, and the fine quality of your equipment and materials, can be your source of profits for years to come. And we will continue to supply you with only the finest quality so that your customer satisfaction will bring you a continuing number of additional customers and repeat business.

Forgive me for saying so, Sir, but the whole correspondence is a con act, because unfortunately it gives the impression to the purchaser that, after the purchase of this particular kit, suddenly, overnight, he becomes a craftsman in that field. I think that is a shocking state of affairs. On the reverse side of the letter statements are even more to the point and I shall read only part of this. It states:

From our experience we have learned how to conduct our business efficiently and well. We have no needless expenses, no fancy

showroom. This all helps to keep our prices low. Another reason is our large buying power.

Mr Slater: It probably helps them to keep on the move, too!

Mr MAX BROWN: That is exactly right. The letter continues:

Just as important, we run our business without high priced salesmen.

You can say that again! The letter continues:

That's why we are able to offer a complete money-making package at this sensible price.

Mr Slater: How much?

Mr MAX BROWN: I will get to that in a moment. The letter continues:

But let me assure you that even though our price is low, you get everything you need to start a good, solid business that can grow and prosper, and bring you literally thousands of dollars, year after year. We know that VIP craftsmen will come back to us when they need more material and supplies. That helps us make a profit.

I am glad that 'profit' is important, because for a while I had some doubts that the company was ever going to make any profit at all! The letter continues:

More important, that's how you make your profit. Later, when you buy supplies at your special low discount price, every dollar you send us can bring you back twenty times that much. If you spend \$10 for material—

and get this—

this probably will bring you back \$200 in repair work. Don't be misled because our complete going-into-business outfit is so reasonably priced. It can make you literally thousands of dollars.

I turn now to the next part of the information flaunted at us. This goes even further towards confusing the situation. The letter states, in part:

The VIP Kit you receive from us will have enough material and supplies to bring you back well over \$1 000. Just think for a minute what this means to you.

You'll get the kit, and learn the technique in just a matter of hours by working on the practice material we supply right with the kit.

Literally, within a few days you can be ready to earn money! That's just 2-3 days, mind you. And within the week you can earn more than the cost of your entire kit! After that it's profit—all profit.

If you're wondering whether you can do this work, let me assure you that men—and women, too—with absolutely no knowledge, no experience, no special aptitude, have learned, in a matter of hours—

Mr Slater: Even the member for Mallee might be a goer.

Mr MAX BROWN: Yes, he would even be in it. The letter continues:

... and have earned good money with this skill. Remember this is not just wishful thinking! Actually, you will be amazed to learn that you can get \$10, \$15—

and they don't stop there—

and \$20 for an hour's work.

The member for Mallee could probably get only \$10, but others could get \$20. The letter continues:

And, more important, the people who pay you, feel they're getting a bargain. The truth is, they are getting a bargain, for your \$10 or \$20 charge saves them the cost of reupholstering or buying new furniture, which could easily cost ten times your modest charge.

A constituent of mine brought the matter to my attention. I do not intend to name the person, but he was an invalid pensioner and he endeavoured to assist his unemployed son to find some financial assistance in his very bad environmental life. The investment made by the invalid pensioner was \$450. The man's son was unemployed, although I understand that the son's wife had a job, and so the son was unable to obtain an unemployment benefit. My constituent raised two issues: one, his son was affected by fumes to his eyes when using the equipment; secondly, he raised the matter of his own inability to obtain a refund of

his money, despite the guarantees spelt out in the advertising letter.

To complicate the case even further, I received another complaint from a constituent, in this case, a lady. Her husband had to wait 2½ months before receiving the advertised article, and, upon receipt of the article, because of the length of time of waiting for it, and for other reasons, he decided not to keep it. Upon her making arrangements to return the article, this wonderful and amazing product became unreturnable, and no refund of money was possible.

In an endeavour to assist my constituents to overcome this obviously bad situation, I wrote a letter to the Chairman of the Trade Practices Commission, in which I stated that I was very concerned about the methods of salesmanship carried out by the Queensland-based company Vinyl Industries Products, a division of Behmin Corporation Pty Ltd, whose postal address is Geonic Street, Woodridge, Queensland, 4114. In that letter I stated in part:

Upon making inquiries and finally forwarding money, correspondence was forwarded to the consumer (a copy of which I enclose . . .

I marked out the correspondence and I brought to the attention of the Trade Practices Commission the points that I have brought to the attention of members of the House. I further stated in the letter that a guarantee was made by the company in that advertisement that, by investing \$440, one could in fact earn \$20 per hour, or \$440 per week. Of course, that does not eventuate, although it is obviously not a guarantee by the firm. The inference is present and I contend that it misleads the general public. I then stated:

The brochure marked (c) is probably the cruellest of all. I contend by signing this brochure, the purchaser of the kit, overnight as it were, sells his processes with the kit to the general public as an expert.

In no circumstances could that person be described as an expert. I concluded as follows:

I believe the whole procedure opens up some doubt in my mind as to whether the whole salesmanship process is not dangerously close to fraud, and I would appreciate very much if your commission could investigate the firm in question.

Incidentally, one of my constituents, on use of the kit, has found it harmful to his eyes . . .

I received a reply from the Trade Practices Commission, stating that the commission had referred my letters to Vinyl Industrial Products. The reply stated:

As the company concerned is located in Queensland, the matter has been referred to our Brisbane office for consideration.

I received a further reply from the Trade Practices Commission, as follows:

You express concern that the general public, including some of your constituents, are being misled into believing a comfortable living can be made by investing money in a VIP kit and setting up a business as a vinyl repairer.

You claim in your letter that one of your constituents found some items in the kit harmful to his eyes.

This office is now investigating the matters raised in your letter and will advise you in due course what action, if any, the commission will take.

Later, the Trade Practices Commission sent a final reply, which simply stated:

The two constituents referred to this office by you were written to regarding their complaints against V.I.P. It would appear from the information received from those constituents that their complaints do not fall within the ambit of the Trade Practices Act.

That is the point I make. It seems to me that, because there are no consumer protection laws as such in Queensland, by answering an advertisement in a national newspaper, people have no redress whatsoever.

Mr Slater: The moral of the story is don't deal with Queensland.

Mr MAX BROWN: Of course. As the member for Gilles would know, honourable members can advise their constituents not to become involved in this sort of thing; however,

invariably they do become involved, and that is why there should be national consumer protection laws. To this time, I have received no further correspondence, but I believe the case that I have outlined shows quite glaringly the need for national consumer protection legislation and the non-existence of consumer protection legislation in Queensland. Consumer protection laws are a very necessary part of our everyday life, and I know that they brought great relief to the purchasing public in this State. It would be a calamity if our consumer protection laws were not maintained and, in fact, intensified. I hope this Government does not allow the situation to keep developing to the extent that the consumer protection laws will decline.

Last evening, I said that I was concerned about this debate because of the filibustering that goes on and the needless play on words. I do not intend to be party to that sort of thing, and I believe that serious attention should be given to a change in the Standing Orders of this House so that this debate is carried on in an orderly fashion and so that members have time to raise urgent matters. I support the motion.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): Before I make any other comment, may I say 'Welcome home' and how pleasant it is to see you, Mr Deputy Speaker, back in the Chair.

Mr Slater: Where has he been? Has he been on leave?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am sure, Mr Deputy Speaker, your presence has been missed by anyone of a responsible nature in this House. In taking part in the Address in Reply debate, which is a tradition that has fallen out of tradition in recent years, I want to speak of the contribution made by Sir Thomas Playford to the economic development, prosperity and future well-being of South Australia, and the debilitating effects of the subsequent decade of the seventies. Honourable members have spoken at length about the integrity and simplicity of style of the greatest of all South Australians. Sir Thomas Playford was the Commonwealth's longest serving Government Leader, a record unlikely to be bettered. However, in all that time—more than 26 years—Sir Thomas was never a person to raise the expectations of his electors to an unjustified level about what his Government could or would achieve for them. He fully appreciated that the history of South Australia was based on individual enterprise and initiative, characteristics which, of necessity, had been developed to overcome particular difficulties associated with the State's climate, location and apparent lack of natural resources.

These were difficulties which government, on its own, could not hope to overcome without the support and co-operation of the people, and Sir Thomas never pretended otherwise. At all times he took the people into his confidence, outlining those challenges, while always sustaining his optimism and faith in the ability of South Australians to meet them. In return, he received support and co-operation from the people, and he continually praised those who gave it, including, of course, the trade union movement and the Labor Party of the time, and this State is undoubtedly much the richer for his particular style of government.

Sir Thomas practised that style that he made his own out of a need, as he saw it, to encourage, to sustain, to protect and to facilitate individual enterprise and initiative. He was not bound by ideological conviction, but by a firm belief that people wanted to manage their own affairs and should be given the chance to do so. What people want is money in their pockets and security. When they have jobs, they and their families can afford to live the sort of life they choose. Those were his comments, which members of this place and South Australians heard many, many times.

This security is what he strove to give the people of South Australia throughout his term of office.

In the time since the departure of Sir Thomas from public office, we have seen a pronounced change in the style of government in South Australia. Stable, strong, lean and efficient government became big and intrusive government, generating unrealistic community expectations and striving to fulfil those expectations with priorities which became confused, were often in conflict and were always expensive.

The most obvious single reflection of this change in style was the growth in the public sector itself. The number of officers employed under the Public Service Act was 5 043 in 1955, or 6.2 public servants per 1 000 head of population; and after some modest growth, 7 797 officers were employed in June 1965, or 7.4 per 1 000 head of population.

During the following 14 years (and Labor occupied the Treasury benches for all but two of those years), growth in the Public Service accelerated rapidly. At June 1979, the number of officers employed under the Public Service Act had increased to 17 222, 13.3 per 1 000 population, an increase of 121 per cent in 14 years. These figures do not include daily and weekly-paid employees, the Government's maintenance and construction work force, teachers, members of the Police Force and employees of statutory authorities which, by 1979, had grown to more than 50 000.

It was from 1970, when the Dunstan Government was returned, that growth in the public sector took on great momentum. Between 1970 and 1979, the number of officers employed under the Act increased by 68 per cent, but this was not matched by growth in the work force generally. In the same period, the number of wage and salary earners in employment in South Australia increased by only 9.7 per cent. In fact, in the 1970's the public sector was the only real growth industry that we had and the consequences of maintaining that situation do not require elaboration in this Chamber today. Significant changes had to be made in the deployment of resources available to the Government, and especially in the amount of taxpayers' money which had to be set aside to pay the wages of those public servants.

In Sir Thomas Playford's last Budget in 1964-65, just over 40 cents in every dollar spent from the Revenue Account was allocated to the lines for wages, salaries and related payments to those directly reliant on the Government for an income. In the A.L.P.'s last Budget in 1978-79, this allocation had increased to more than 58 cents in every dollar. In addition, the level of wages increased at a much faster rate than overall Government spending during that same period. Between 1964-65 and 1978-79, Government spending went up by almost 460 per cent while the amount within this allocation provided for wages, salaries and related payments rose by just over 700 per cent.

It can be appreciated therefore, that with wages taking up an increasing proportion of Government outlays, the growth in the public sector in terms of manpower has brought with it severe limitations on the ability of the Government to purchase other resources to be applied for the direct benefit of taxpayers. This is a fact which is overlooked by those who tend to evaluate the success of a programme by the amount of money spent, or the quality of Government service solely by growth in numbers of public servants.

Certainly, people are an important resource which a Government must pay for. But there are other resources which must also be purchased to ensure that Government service is effective and relevant to community needs and aspirations. These include, for example, the materials which our teachers need to teach our children and run our schools efficiently; the equipment police require to detect crime; concessions for those in need; and, in a more general sense,

the cost of telephone calls, stationery, cars, travel, office accommodation and published information for the public. If a proper balance is not struck between the purchase or provision of these various resources then, inevitably, this leads to inefficiency and an inability to service adequately the needs of the community.

The growth in the public sector in South Australia during the life of the former Government created marked imbalances between different sections of the Public Service. It has been one of the responsibilities of my Government to begin to rationalise the resources available to us so that these imbalances can be corrected. Such action has been especially necessary where, as has been shown in some areas at least, Government funds have not been applied as efficiently as they might have been.

Past reports of the Auditor-General did in fact comment about this matter and I refer in particular to those reports covering the financial years 1973-74 and 1975-76. The 1973-74 report of the Auditor-General advocated the sort of action which the Government has now taken through implementation of programme and performance budgeting, by commenting in part as follows:

I consider that a prerequisite to financial budgeting is a clear definition of the objectives and functions of each section of a department, together with the preparation of plans setting out performance targets approved by the head of the department in accordance with Government policy.

Highlighting the need for such procedures, the report went on to state that:

Departments in many cases use the previous year's expenditure as the main basis for the preparation of estimates for the following year and current functions and objectives. In some cases, the estimates are too broadly based, with the result that there is no effective control. Responsibility for performance against budget should be clearly defined and extended to all operating areas in which control can be exercised.

That was the Auditor-General's Report for 1973-74.

The responsibilities of the Public Service to ensure that efficiencies are achieved and maintained in the management of public finances received comment also in the 1975-76 report of the Auditor-General, in the following terms:

Total payments from Consolidated Revenue and Loan Account for the year were \$1 306 000 000. When one considers that the whole of that amount has been or will be provided by the public through taxes and charges, whether levied by the State or the Commonwealth, it is clear that a serious responsibility must rest on those who have the authority at various levels to expend public moneys.

They were pertinent words in the report of 1975-76, and they are equally as pertinent today. The action taken by this Government to introduce programme and performance budgeting has been based on these and similar comments, and already the efficiency of Public Service administration has been enhanced.

Public sector managers are being given more detailed information, and, with it, an increased ability to manage. The programme will ensure that taxpayers receive value for their money and at the same time will reduce the need to raise taxation to unrealistic levels.

During the 1970's, in particular, the growth in the public sector was achieved only at the cost of a corresponding growth in the amount of revenue raised by the Government. From 1964-65 to 1978-79, State Government receipts from all sources, as itemised in the Budget papers, increased by 469 per cent. These receipts included fees from public undertakings, recovery of debt services and Commonwealth payments as well as State taxation, but the contribution which came from State taxation accelerated at a much faster rate than the others.

In 1964-65, State taxation, including motor registration and drivers licence fees, contributed 16.3 per cent to State Government receipts. In 1978-79, this proportion had increased to 27.9 per cent. Within the range of State

taxation there were some very significant increases, and I refer in particular to the collection of stamp duties, which went up in this period by 832.5 per cent.

Mr Bannon: Are you including pay-roll tax in that?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: If the Leader of the Opposition wants to make a realistic comparison, I suggest that he looks at the time the pay-roll tax legislation was handed over from the Commonwealth to the States. The Government firmly believes not only that taxation must be contained within reasonable levels which will encourage private spending and investment, but that the community demands that we act accordingly, too. It was for this reason that, on coming to office, we moved to the abolition of stamp duty on first home purchases up to \$30 000; the abolition of succession and gift duties; increases in the exemption levels for pay-roll tax, together with pay-roll tax concessions for additional youth employment, and the abolition of land tax on the principal place of residence.

In this one package of taxation concessions the present Government has acted to return towards a more reasonable and realistic level of State taxation, which has been welcomed by a community which had given the Government a firm mandate at the last election to do just that. The amount which the Treasury has forgone in receipts as a result of these measures is very small, having regard to the total Budget outlay of \$1 500 000 000.

In recent months all States have suffered from the very stringent approach taken by the Federal Government in respect of tax-sharing arrangements and at Loan Council. South Australia will receive this year from the Commonwealth some \$30 000 000 less than it had expected to receive, while Loan funds have again been held at the same money level as last year, an effective 12 per cent cut in real terms. I will return to that later. It is a situation which has placed grave pressures on the Budget.

The Opposition's suggestion that we should restore taxes to make up for this significant shortfall in Commonwealth funds ignores the fact that those taxes would at the very least have to be doubled if they were to go anywhere near it. It is timely to remind ourselves why the community demanded the removal or reduction of these taxes. There is no doubt that, from the community's point of view, they tended to discourage people from saving and investing in productive enterprises. They tended to occur in very large lumps at very inconvenient times. Death duties could cripple or even eliminate family businesses, particularly small family businesses such as farms, retail shops, and so on. There would not be one member in this Chamber who would not have had evidence of that occurring in years gone by.

As a result, investment capital for growth and development was not attracted to South Australia, in the face of competition from other States which did offer these concessions. The abolition of land tax, of course, affected a wide range of people owning or buying their own home. It is particularly significant at this time, when interest rates are so high. For all of these reasons, the taxation initiatives taken by the Government have been essential and timely, especially when these forms of taxation had become such a significantly increased proportion of all Government receipts between 1964-65 and 1978-79.

At the same time, it has been obvious that some charges for business undertakings operated by the Government have not kept pace with the increased cost of providing those undertakings, and that, as a result, these charges have returned a diminishing proportion of State receipts in recent years. We believe that such charges must be restored to realistic levels. No Government likes to increase bus fares or water rates, but charges must more adequately reflect the cost of providing those services if all South Australians

are not to be taxed more heavily in other areas to pay for them.

We must also look to the other opportunities for raising revenue which will result from increased activity in the private sector. Here, I refer, in particular, to resource developments and the return which these will provide in royalty payments to the State. Clearly, money spent in encouraging and supporting investment and development in South Australia is money well spent. As a result of the policies and actions of this Government, South Australia is on the threshold of some major developments which will increase royalty returns to the State many times over during the next decade. The trend of the last 15 years has seen receipts from royalties grow at a much slower rate than Government receipts overall, and reflects the serious downturn in investment and resource development during the Labor Party's term in office. The long-term effects of those years of inactivity are still being felt in South Australia today.

In the same period, resource developments in other States, particularly Queensland and Western Australia, provided massive increases in the revenues available to those State Governments, and greatly increased their capacity to provide benefits and services to the whole community. These are the future benefits in store for all South Australians now that the present Government is laying the strongest possible foundations for mining and industrial development.

Not only did the size of the public sector grow remarkably during the seventies, but the range of activities into which the South Australian Government expanded steadily basically enlarged during those years, too. If we consider education as one example of expansion and redeployment of Government resources, we find 19.3 per cent of gross payments from Consolidated Revenue was allocated to the Education Department in 1964-65, compared with 31 per cent in 1978-79. In the same period, the number of full-time teachers almost doubled to just over 15 000, while employment was also created for ancillary staff and school groundsmen, and other areas previously well served by parent volunteers, periodic working bees, and school committees. Of course, not all areas of Government activity have shared in growth to the same extent as have new departments, and, particularly, education. Many people will totally agree that there was a need for added expenditure on education in that period to bring it up to the fine level that we enjoy today.

The last years of the seventies saw little growth in areas such as Mines, the Law and Court Departments, Tourism, Prisons, and Marine and Harbors, all of which are essential activities in their own right. The number of police officers increased by only 78.5 per cent between 1965 and 1979.

The relative lack of growth in these other areas of Government activity contrasts sharply with the doubling in the number of teachers in the same time, or the growth of 121 per cent in the number of officers employed under the Public Service Act. Obviously, such trends must be carefully re-evaluated from time to time, to prevent the development and perpetuation of significant inefficiencies in certain areas of activity, as opposed to others, and to ensure they do not lose their relevance and their ability to respond to the requirements of those who fund them—the taxpayers.

All State Governments have had to cope increasingly in recent years with higher wage demands and increasingly limited Commonwealth funds. What members of the Opposition have found it convenient to overlook, in their recurring criticism about Government finances and activities, is the extent to which the previous Government, under the former Premier, Des Corcoran, the honourable member for Hartley, had begun to face up to those problems, just before

its defeat. Of course, the need for such corrective action could have been significantly reduced if government had been pursued with more realism and less publicity and rhetoric during the earlier years of the Dunstan regime. Remember that the increase in the growth of officers employed under the Public Service Act peaked at 12.6 per cent in 1974, and slowly declined after that time. By 1979, there was, in fact, a small cut in numbers.

Government expenditure was also cut in real terms in the last two Budgets introduced by the former Government, and, if we consider the area of education as one example, departmental spending was cut by about 4 per cent in real terms in the 1978-79 Budget. It is, therefore, surprising to contemplate the Opposition's posturing about the present financial situation and the decisions which the Government has taken in relation to finances and the public sector. What they should be admitting in all honesty is that what we have done is to continue, in a positive and far more realistic way, the rationalisation of public resources which the former Government had been forced to begin because of its profligate spending in earlier years.

The former Government, indeed, had no option but to admit that for too long it had been living well beyond its means. Against this background, the Opposition's present hysterical outbursts on financial management sound particularly hollow. It is against this background, too, that all members should consider the parameters within which this Government has been required to manage its own finances, and the public sector generally. The results of the 1979 election clearly demonstrated that the electorate not only wanted a definite reduction of the public sector expansion which had occurred under the former Government but also demanded a stop to the increased taxation which the former Government had found necessary to fund this growth.

At that time, the State economy had floundered to an extent which required urgent reconstruction on an enormous scale. Firm and positive measures were taken to remove the barriers to investment and development set up by the former Government, and to replace them with a political and economic climate in which vital investment and development could occur.

As a result of the actions of the Government in response to this situation, confidence has returned to the South Australian economy, as significant indicators continue to show. Exploration levels have reached an all-time high, projects based on Cooper Basin hydrocarbons, and on copper, gold and uranium at Roxby Downs, are proceeding on schedule, and significant industrial development has occurred, with the associated creation of jobs. However, if we are to sustain and build on the achievements already made until such time as increased royalties begin to flow, and at the same time absorb the significant shortfall from Commonwealth Government funds, we must maintain lower levels of taxation and, therefore, firm control over public sector growth and expenditure. This Government will continue to pursue its taxation policies in a responsible way, as circumstances permit. At the same time, we will continue to seek an adequate return for Government services.

It has been with these aims in mind that the Budget Review Committee, chaired by the Deputy Premier, has been pursuing its task in recent months through discussions with all Ministers, departmental heads and senior officers. After that committee had been asked to review all areas of Government spending earlier this year, Premiers' Conferences and Loan Council meetings in May and June resulted in tax sharing grants only 9 per cent above the money amount of 1980-81 and, for the second successive year, general purpose capital funds of the same money amount as for the previous year, a considerable shortfall which was shared by all States.

Because of the added financial stringency arising from these decisions of the Commonwealth, it has been necessary to require departments to implement further expenditure savings beyond what the Review Committee had sought in tentative allocations of funds for 1981-82 given to departments in March. As a result of this further and essential review by the committee, South Australian taxpayers will be saved an additional sum of some \$22 000 000 this financial year, for this is the approximate amount by which departments will be required to further reduce their expenditures. Obviously, as in all other States, tough decisions have had to be taken.

If these savings are not made at this stage, we can pursue only two other options—increase taxation to a significant degree, or budget for a very large deficit. For reasons which I have outlined already, I do not consider that it would be in the interests of South Australia's future economic well being to increase taxation to any significant degree. We cannot afford to drive investment and jobs away from South Australia. At the same time, large deficit budgeting would add pressure to the budgetary position in coming years, and seriously impair the ability of this State to benefit from the improving economic conditions which will result from developments now committed or in the advanced stages of planning, including the Cooper Basin liquids project and the Roxby Downs mining operation.

No secret has been made of the fact that South Australia can therefore anticipate a very tough Budget this financial year, a Budget as tough as any which any South Australian Government will be required to introduce during the rest of this century. It is all a matter of learning to live within our means while we plan for and secure the future. We must face up to the fact that our State's income has fallen. There is a shortfall of some \$30 000 000 this year from the Commonwealth because of changes to the tax-sharing arrangements with the States. As I have already said, Loan funds were cut savagely by the Commonwealth in 1979-80, a virtual cut of 20 per cent in real terms, and there was no increase last year, another real terms cuts of 12 per cent. These are the facts of life, and no amount of posturing or pleading can change them.

This is why, as the total Budget is shared out, everyone will receive a little less. There is less to share out. If any one area or department receives more than its share, it will have to be at the expense of someone else. Obviously, the Government has had to allocate and rearrange some priorities between areas where spending has been high and deficiencies largely corrected, and those where spending has been low in the past (e.g., prisons, the shining example) and major deficiencies remain to be corrected. But no section of the Government family has any right to demand or expect more than a fair share. Any more would be at the expense of equally important members of the family.

The decisions have not been easy, but because of the Government's determination to face these difficult decisions now, and to pursue the task of economic reconstruction in a responsible manner, South Australians can also confidently anticipate that by the end of this decade this State will be in a much better position following the transformation which our policies are encouraging. It will be a State of much greater importance in national and international economic terms. Natural resource and industrial development projects will be pursued in an atmosphere in which individual enterprise and initiative are adequately rewarded. The enormous benefits from these projects will be shared by the whole community through the creation of jobs and security, and through returns to the Government, so that the sort of financial stringency which faces us now can be avoided in the future. We will be far more self-sufficient.

To the extent that a State Government can influence general economic trends and developments, then we are doing so. We are acting to establish those pre-conditions for economic growth through a contraction of the public sector and therefore lower taxation, and encouragement and assistance to those projects which hold the potential for further investment in our State. It needs to be recognised, however, that the main impact of these developments will be felt in the medium to longer term. In the meantime, the only way to ensure that all South Australians receive the full benefit from them is to be prepared to accept firm and responsible control over all public expenditure. In this way, available funds can be allocated to reflect community needs and resources, and used to provide for those needs in the most effective way. Only then can we make sure we get the best possible value from each dollar spent.

Obviously, there will be some changes in emphasis, and in particular moves from spending on those services which have received significant increases in funding in recent years to provide for other areas of Government which have been neglected in the past. This realignment must also be achieved within the total allocation of funds, which, as I have emphasised, will be significantly less, in real terms, than last financial year. We simply cannot afford to do otherwise.

South Australians know, to our great cost, the problems created by the excesses of a former Government, which set out deliberately to raise expectations about what State Governments could achieve and then maintained high and inhibitive levels of State taxation in an effort to fulfil those expectations. We are still paying for some of its excesses and, as a result, we must now all appreciate and accept that no longer can we have what we cannot pay for. We cannot buy our way to economic prosperity. We have to manage our way, realistically and responsibly. We cannot continue to tax highly to fund growth in the public sector where it is not really needed or where it cannot be justified. That is growth for growth's sake, and certainly does not mean more and better services. Certainly it would mean higher taxes to pay more wages.

In the coming Budget, we have the opportunity to continue to rationalise our resources and redefine our priorities, so that we establish the conditions under which there can be better opportunities and long-term security for all South Australians. They will be the sort of opportunities which, in the Playford mould, are provided by a Government acting to encourage, to sustain, to protect and to facilitate, but not to interfere unduly, tax highly, transform radically, or promise unrealistically. It is the actions of this Government which will secure the future of this State for all South Australians.

I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 5 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): We have just heard a further instalment from the Premier in what is his new theme, a theme of 'pass the buck' and 'blame somebody else'. Gone is the airy and heady rhetoric of the early days of his Premiership, the confident talk of 'unmistakable proof that our policies are working' and 'South Australia is open for business again'. Slowly, and in fact somewhat more rapidly than we might expect, we find the Premier switching from that tack to one that tells us, 'Sorry, it's not going to happen now, but it is not our fault; blame somebody else; blame the waste and extravagance of the former Government. We know that that Government had large financial reserves, managed to ensure that there was surplus budgeting, held State taxes at a reasonable level and kept

charges down, but forget that; times have changed. It's their fault that South Australians are finding it hard to live.'

The memory of Sir Thomas Playford was invoked by the Premier, and indeed it is as well that he did that, in some respects. Adequate tribute has been paid by other speakers and by me earlier in this session. I thought it was interesting that the Premier highlighted two aspects of Sir Thomas Playford. He said that he was a Premier who did not raise the expectations of his electorate beyond that which he knew could be achieved by his Government, and, secondly, he said that Playford took people into his confidence. Use those two tests with the present Government. Think of the talk that we had before the last election—the promises made, the extravagant assertions, the knocking and downgrading of South Australia that accompanied that. Look at the record and it can be seen that what has happened to this Government most of all is that, particularly among its own supporters, the windy rhetoric has been exposed. Expectations were indeed raised only to be dashed, and dashed terribly, with great economic consequences to this State.

Secondly, are the people being taken into the confidence of the Government? No, indeed—such are the dissimulations of the Government in its public statements, the secrecy by which it goes about its deliberations, that a form of frustration has developed within many sectors of the Public Service which has resulted in information having been made available to the Opposition and the press, information which the Government seeks to keep hidden. Thank goodness it has been made available, because, if it had not been, we would not have had a true picture of what is going on. The people certainly have not been taken into the confidence of this Government. There is no way of demonstrating this more starkly than that which I will do in a few minutes when I deal with the difference between what the Government says in its public posturing and inserts in the newspapers and what the Government says to bodies such as the Industrial Commission, where the Government knows its economic record will be cross-examined and that it is going to have to give a realistic account of its economic management.

Then, the Premier has given comparisons between the period of the early 1960s and the late 1970s—a derogatory comparison in his terms—a time, he says, of big government. Let us face the facts: he is comparing two different ages and, indeed, two different standards of living. Certainly the scourge of unemployment was less evident then than it is today, and that is something that needs urgent action and attention by Governments. However, in so many other respects, most particularly in the standard of our public facilities, the age of Playford was a prehistoric age in South Australia, and let us hope that we never go back to it. Thank goodness that throughout the 1970s (indeed, from 1965 onwards) this State has been governed by a Labor Government which had a commitment to public facilities and services and improvements in the community. Of course, government has grown in that time. Government has grown because there was a recognition of the depressed and backward state of our public services and facilities. Secondly, of course, that is not something peculiar to South Australia. We have been lagging behind the rest of Australia.

In many respects what we did during the 1970s was to catch up with developments already present in other States, at all levels of government, and in particular in the smaller States and in the Commonwealth. Does the Premier really want us to go back to that period of time when housing for most people newly arrived in this country consisted of Nissen huts, when the general level of slums and tenements

in the inner suburbs was extremely low, when in fact people just could not get houses? Good Lord, I can remember, from my own personal experience and that of many people that I know, the sort of substandard flat dwelling that people had to put with in the immediate post-war period. Do we want to return to that situation, because that is what small government means?

The Hon. D. J. Hoppood: Do you remember the back-enders, half a house?

Mr BANNON: Yes, and those down on the banks of the Torrens. This went on throughout the community. We are now approaching another housing crisis, and why are we doing it? Because of this doctrine of small government and because of the neglect of Governmental responsibility by both the Fraser Federal Government and the Tonkin State Government!

Do we want to get back to the low level of recreation facilities, a few postage stamp ovals made into mud patches during the football season because only football could be played on them, and a centre wicket of concrete for the cricket season with only cricket facilities? Throughout the last decade public recreation facilities, such as walking trails, public parks, national recreation areas and a wide range of sports and activities, were all possible due to civic and governmental action. Again, thank goodness that happened. Are those facilities to be overgrown with weeds, to be left useless because the Government will not make financial commitments? That is what the Premier is threatening us with.

Do we want to go back to the education system of the 1950s and the 1960s? It is very nice for the Premier to talk about small government in relation to education. He, I and many of his colleagues were privileged to go to schools that had decent facilities for recreation and decent teaching materials, and high standards, but they were the absolute minority. What about the State schools? For a brief period, I attended a State school and I remember very well the asphalt playing field, and nothing else—the absolute lack of any kind of adequate reading materials, no visual aids whatsoever, and nothing in any way that would aid comfort. Students crouched in dog boxes that were overheated in summer and freezing cold in winter. This was the fate of all the children in our State. South Australia had the worst education system in Australia, and now the Premier has the gall to stand up and complain that government got bigger in the 1970s. The legacy left from the 1950s—

Mr Mathwin interjecting.

Mr BANNON: The member for Glenelg was fortunate to be educated in another country. Let him try to exist in some of the primary and secondary schools that were part of our State system in the early days of this century. Those schools were battling for every cent. It is outrageous for this to go on. What about our hospitals and health facilities? What about the epidemics and the low level of public health, due to the lack of Government expenditure? What about the hazards that were the highways, some of the worst roads in Australia? Look at the system of roads, bridges and overpasses that we have today. How did that come about? By accident? No, by Government spending and Government employment, so we will have no more of that nonsense—

Mr Ashenden: What about the MATS plan? You knocked that on the head.

Mr Trainer: Do you want to bring it back?

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections across the Chamber will cease.

Mr BANNON: The Premier tried to use figures to support his claim that in some way what was happening in South Australia was outrageous or unreasonable. As I pointed out, South Australia was simply catching up the

long overdue depressed public facilities, but if the Premier is right, do the figures bear him out? Let us examine what happened to proportions of the employed population in the States working for State Governments. We find that South Australia sits squarely in the middle, in line with its population. If we total local government and State Government employment, which is the Public Service of this State, the only basis on which one can compare State for State, because the activities are intermixed in different States, we find that the numbers in the last census in 1976 show that in South Australia 19.3 per cent of the work force was employed in that sector.

According to the Premier, and on his argument, that was retarding our growth and development, so we must look to States such as Queensland and Western Australia and find there a very low level of this kind of public employment. The facts do not bear that out. The figure for South Australia was 19.3 per cent; for Queensland, 18.8 per cent; and Western Australia, higher than South Australia, 20.1 per cent. In Western Australia there were continuous Liberal Governments during that period and yet a higher level of public sector employment obtained, in a State that the Premier earlier praised. He cannot have it both ways. He must recognise that the smaller States particularly must maintain a higher level of public sector employment. It is in the nature of the spread of their populations, and the services and facilities that they have to offer.

There is nothing unusual in that respect in South Australia. We would argue that what was unusual was the quality and efficiency of that Public Service. The services were the envy of the rest of Australia. People trooped from interstate to investigate our hospital system and our education system and took back ideas and developed them in their own States. We were the leader. However, in the two years of this Government we have fallen far behind. No longer do people come from interstate to look at what is happening here. No longer are they interested. We have had to put up with the nonsense we had yesterday from the member for Brighton. That is the sort of vanguard South Australia apparently is going to be in.

What is the Premier's record after all this time? Certainly, it has been interesting to hear that in his address today he was careful not to talk about his record. True, he talked about State taxation and he compared taxation from 1964-65 to today. He asked us to look at this remarkable growth in the proportion of taxes which has been raised by the State. Indeed, there was a remarkable growth. One reason why there would be is that during that period the States were handed their own growth tax, pay-roll tax, an extraordinarily significant proportion of the State Budget. It was a tax we had not collected before. It came via revenue through the Commonwealth and it was given to the States. Naturally, that increased our percentage of taxation. Secondly, of course, our proportion grew when the Commonwealth, which, in the early 1970s under the enlightened policy of the Whitlam Government had supported and bolstered State services, under Fraser withdrew from them, cut them back, and in the special grants programmes and all the other areas we saw the great Federal cut-backs occurring.

Did we hear any peep from the other side? Not a bit of it. In Opposition they were applauded and in Government even, faced with the realities of what it was doing to the State, it was still applauded and we were told for South Australia's sake to vote for the Government which in fact was destroying South Australia's infra-structure. That is why our State taxation became a higher proportion of tax collection.

Resource development inactivity! What nonsense! Who developed the gas fields and brought the pipeline to Ade-

laide? Who encouraged further development in the Cooper Basin? Who sold that gas with a profitable contract to New South Wales? That was done at a time when the gas could not be given away, and the whole of the Cooper Basin would have been sold but for that. If honourable members would like an authority for that I would refer them to some of the comments made by the ex-General Manager of Santos. In relation to Roxby Downs and these other projects, the previous Government did more for mineral exploration and development in a time when they were not in fact developing here than did any other Government. Our record is good and we will stand on it, and stand firmly on it.

Finally, just before the Premier sat down he announced to us that we are going to have a horror Budget. We knew we were going to have a horror Budget, and he is trying to soften us up, not only for the reality of that, but to pass the buck, to put the blame somewhere else. If he thinks that people will not believe that it is all to do with the previous Government and its policies, he is going to bring in the Commonwealth Government for good measure—an extraordinary turnabout! The Government he supported, the Government that he supported not only to the extent of urging us to vote for it at the last election, but in fact by supinely giving away cast-iron agreements that were to South Australia's benefit, by creating a false stunt around the railways agreement, instead of concentrating on the real guts of the Grants Commission Report and its implications for South Australia, by giving away a 10-year binding agreement with the Commonwealth over hospital funding in this State. We heard the disgraceful statement (a very appropriate word) by the Minister of Health today in which she attempted to justify that dismal, supine lack of negotiation. In fact, it has been said it was initially suggested to Mr Fraser that he might give the State, instead of matching grant, some sort of lump sum.

They wondered why the Prime Minister seized on that eagerly. Of course he did, because it allowed him to screw up that hospitals agreement, to do away with the benefits that we could have held him to, and to introduce Acts and changes which are not just going to affect South Australia's health adversely, unfortunately, but the rest of Australia as well. That was given away by this Government. If that is the way it behaves with the Commonwealth then heaven help poor South Australia, which is totally dependent on support from the Commonwealth Government to maintain its economic viability.

So, after two years of office, this Government is becoming recognised as a Government of indecision, of inaction, and of failure. It has had enough time to put its promises into effect. It has had opportunities to see its policies working. We are now at the beginning of the third session of the forty-fourth Parliament. In a few weeks we will have the Government's third Budget, this horror Budget that the Premier is prophesying. So, the opportunity is there. I think we had better take stock of its record.

Mr Oswald: Yes, there are more jobs.

Mr BANNON: The judgment is a damning one. We will look at more jobs, too, for the honourable member for Morphett's benefit. They are not being created in his electorate. Our economy is lagging behind the rest of Australia. Our employment growth for the year to June is the lowest for any State. Our unemployment rate is the highest in the country. Our building industry is in crisis. Approvals continue to decline from 1979 and 1980 levels. New motor vehicle registrations are falling, whilst they are increasing in other States. Our manufacturing sector, the main job-providing industries, are under threat, both as a direct result of Federal Government policy, and indirectly due to

the repercussions of the unplanned resource development going on at the national level.

On its own record, the Government has turned a surplus in its accounts and massive reserves into a record deficit. The Government has cut into the State's Loan funds.

Mr Ashenden: Yes. We have had to pay for Samcor and Riverland Cannery.

Mr BANNON: The member for Todd would claim some sort of financial expertise in the business world. I would like to know how many of the companies he has been involved with use their capital loan account to prop up their day-to-day expenses. That is what the South Australian Government is doing because of its problem. It is a Government that is engaging in publicity stunts instead of getting down to hard decisions to solve our problems.

Notice what the Premier was saying about his economic strategy. He said that things will be all right soon, with our resources development at the end of this decade. What are we going to do for nine years? What are we going to tell the 48 000 people currently unemployed in this State about what they are going to do for 10 years? I will tell you what they will do. They will join the mass emigration from South Australia. They will leave this State. Young people, particularly, will go east looking for jobs, or they will go west looking for something in Western Australia. By the time of the next election, South Australia's population will have fallen to being the lowest of all the mainland States. That is a nice record for the Tonkin Government to have presided over! Whilst the Premier is trying to bolster himself up with exercises such as the lift-out advertisement that appeared, at public expense, in the newspapers some time ago—

An honourable member: Good reading!

Mr BANNON: It is good reading indeed, very interesting reading, particularly if one tries to line it up against the Government's record. This report is little more than political propaganda. It is full of distortions. It has some outright untruths in it, and perhaps even more interesting were the many omissions.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr BANNON: I suggest that the member for Mallee listens to this. Let us take a few of the claims it makes. Under the heading 'New investment', we are told that in less than two years, which is the period being considered, there is a great list of companies which apparently are moving to South Australia or announcing significant expansion. No details are given, but there is a list. Indeed, no details could be given, because the list is virtually the same as that produced by the Premier 12 months ago. It is almost exactly the same, but there are one or two additions, thank goodness. If there were not, there would be nothing to compensate for the closures that we have been reading about in brickyards, building firms, and so on. But what about those that are in there? I refer honourable members to my Address in Reply speech last year, in which I analysed those various companies. I detailed the timing of investment decisions. To look at a few names: Dairyvale Co-operative, Rubery Owen, Sapfor, Mitsubishi, Facon, Seeley Bros., Australian Bacon, John Shearer, I.C.I., General Motors-Holden, Safcol, Omark and Simpson-Pope. I gave specific details, chapter and verse, from company annual reports which showed that in those cases the bulk of this list of new investment decisions were made before the change of Government. Yet, the Government persists in saying that there was stagnation under the previous Government, and proves it by using projects started under us to demonstrate how that stagnation has gone. What outrageous hypocrisy! Here is the Premier trying to say that there is no investment.

A very interesting addition to this list was the Northern Power Station. Suddenly that has been discovered as a major project of the State. One can recall before the last election (and I imagine the honourable member for Todd used this in his election propaganda) that that project was omitted from the list of investment projects as supplied by the Federal Government in order to try to make us the lowest in Australia in terms of investment. It reappeared magically when the Government took office; suddenly it rediscovered that vital project. The Government is consistently claiming, even two years afterwards, the achievements of its predecessor.

Just lately we have been subjected to the rather unholy sight of the Premier and his Deputy suggesting that, by our critical analysis of the economy of South Australia, by our realistic appraisal of it, we are outrageously knocking the State. He is shocked that the Opposition should be doing it. That is extraordinary coming from the man who coined the phrase 'the leper colony' for South Australia and who ran around the Eastern States warning business men off, saying that everything was dreadful and that they should take their money out of the place. We have never done that. What has he got to boast about? The records of the previous Government!

Interestingly enough, he also said that the promotional literature of the previous Government was so outrageous and extravagant. I have an interesting and worthwhile publication headed 'South Australia—a pattern of progress', which was produced by the previous Government and which is dated 1979. It is about the South Australian experience, and it deals with economic development, with the State of South Australia, the greening of the brown land and the state of the arts. It begins with an interesting quotation describing South Australia under the Dunstan Government of the 1970s, and states:

An area of strong contrasts . . . a city described by the American magazine *New Yorker* as 'possibly the last well-planned, well-governed and moderately contented metropolis on earth' . . . a land that forms . . .

It goes on describing the sort of State that South Australia is. That is very fine indeed, but it was a publication that was no doubt rejected. It was somewhat a surprise—

Mr Ashenden interjecting:

Mr BANNON: I would listen to this if I were the member for Todd. It will haunt him in his district. He will not have long to listen to speeches in this House. One can imagine the surprise of constituents of the member for Hartley and persons of Italian extract going to church in the area and finding under the windscreens of their cars when they came out one Sunday night a publication in Italian headed *L'Australia Meridionale*, which means 'South Australia' in Italian. It is a splendid publication indeed of the present South Australian Government. However, it is suspiciously like the publication that I have just described. In fact, one finds in the middle page an identical map of South Australia in the same colours, showing the same developments as in the previous pamphlet. South Australian population statistics have been replaced with a large picture of the Premier himself looking somewhat like a godfather, and a message from him and the London representative, Mr Rundle.

There is one difference; the previous publication had no picture of Mr Dunstan, who we are told constantly boosted himself to the detriment of the State. This was a straight publication of facts and figures. However, here the Premier is not backward in putting his face and figure somewhat largely into the scene. That is all right; I am not complaining about that, and I am not complaining about this publication. Indeed, I thought it was very good when I read the opening remarks. I thought, 'That is odd; it looks

familiar'. I cannot read Italian, so I asked someone to translate it for me. The translation was:

An area of strong contrasts; deserts where one can travel for days; a city described by the American magazine *New Yorker* as possibly the last well planned, well governed and moderately conceived metropolis in the world.

That is the message of the modern Government. That is interesting, indeed. Not only does he use our previous industrial developments but he uses our previous promotional literature, unchanged, to promote his Government.

Mr Becker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Hanson that interjections are out of order, particularly when the member is out of his seat.

Mr BANNON: Returning to this promotional item of 9 July, the taxpayer funded Liberal Party advertisement, I am still waiting for Brigadier Willett to send to the Treasury, the cheque I have requested of him, or to at least give me the courtesy of a reply to my letter, but no doubt it has been discussed in Liberal Party circles. Let us look under the heading 'Financial Summary', which does not figure too largely in the report. There are certainly good reasons why the Government does not want to draw attention to its record in this area. It tells us:

It has required extremely good management to restrict the deficit to only \$8 000 000 on the combined accounts.

What an extraordinary statement! There is an example of the omissions and an admission of failure—a deficit of only \$8 000 000 from a Government which was scandalised when in Opposition at the thought of any sort of deficit. I must admit that the Premier has recently discovered that State deficits are not a bad thing.

Dr Billard: What about Whitlam's deficit?

Mr BANNON: I am saying that in Opposition the present Government thought deficits were absolute heinous crimes. We have never said that. We have recognised that at times they are a very necessary part of public policy, but not through bungling, and this one was bungled. There is the first admission: 'We are only going to have an \$8 000 000 deficit on combined accounts'. The Premier does not tell people what that means. He does not tell them that that is a \$40 000 000 deficit on the Revenue Account, the ordinary running total of Government's expenses, and that the money has been pillaged from the Loan section of the combined account in order to restrict that to a \$8 000 000 total deficit, so that is left untold.

The Premier does not say that he inherited a Budget surplus of \$500 000. He does not say that there were massive reserves set aside for a number of major projects that no longer exist. And he does not detail the money that he has shuffled into the programme at the last minute in order to try to bolster it up—a totally dishonest piece of financial chicanery. Nonetheless, there is the stark admission: 'We have kept the deficit to only \$8 000 000.' I hope the South Australian people treat that with the sort of contempt that it deserves.

How has that surplus been turned around so quickly? We say it is the result of bungling, incompetence, and pure bad financial management. Inveigh as he may against the Federal Government, let us face the fact that we have not yet felt the full impact of Federal Government cuts; they are coming; that is in the next financial year. We are talking about what has happened under this Government and under its direct management. That is where that deficit has come from.

Let us detail where some of these savings have been made to restrict the deficit. Principally, this has been achieved by massive cuts in public works expenditure. In 1979-80 the actual amount spent from Loan funds was \$226 000 000. In 1980-81, out of a budgeted \$211 000 000,

the actual expenditure will be only \$190 000 000. Just look at the impact that that is having on the construction industry in this State.

I attended, as I do annually, the dinner of the Federation of Construction Contractors this year, where normally the Government gets an extremely enthusiastic response, where the Premier reminded them he had been given a platform to help launch his 1979 election campaign. I can assure the House that on that night this year, there were some very quiet and sober looking construction contractors. In fact, there were somewhat fewer there than usual. One or two of them were struggling with financial problems and going into liquidation, and they are doing it largely as a consequence of this Government's cut-backs in public works expenditure. They have recognised that the health of the public sector is vital to their health in the private sector.

Mr Mathwin: You were giving all the work to the P.B.D.

Mr BANNON: We gave 20 per cent to the P.B.D., and about 80 per cent went to private contract. They are the figures and facts, so the honourable member should not interject on that basis. The member for Glenelg will enjoy what I am about to say, because I know that he likes a joke. The President, standing to respond to the Premier, said that, on listening to him about the future of the State and the great prospects for us, it reminded him of that definition of an optimist—a man who has had no experience.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I am quite sure that the Leader does not need any assistance from either side.

Mr BANNON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. You are quite right. The brutal facts are that this Government has crippled the construction industry, from which it drew so much support prior to the 1979 election. This Government has learnt a very hard and bitter lesson in that respect, and the Premier's lack of experience in terms of public administration is shown up very acutely indeed in that area, and his bungling of finances is at the back of it. We are faced with a major crisis in terms of the relativities agreement and the outcome of that.

What was the reaction of the Government? Was it, under this Playford tradition to which the Premier refers, to take the people of South Australia into its confidence, tell us we were in trouble and had to make a united concerted effort to put pressure on the Federal Government to ensure that we were not disadvantaged, that we had to join Tasmania and Western Australia to fight for our rights? Not a bit of it. The first and gut reaction of the Premier was to blame the previous Government, to suggest that Mr Dunstan was at fault, and that it was the railways agreement. He had not read his documents, did not understand the nature of the problem and, in fact, he had completely misconceived the history of the railways agreement. What was at stake? The Premier said that the agreement was not valid. By saying that, he was virtually inviting the Commonwealth Government to deny us the very substantial benefits that we had been enjoying from the transfer.

Let us examine the question of the validity of the agreement. The State Labor Government at the time had no doubts about the standing of the agreement. When Mr Fraser became Prime Minister, he and his Minister for Transport signalled quite clearly that they were going to get out of that agreement if they could. Mr Nixon made the famous comment that Dunstan had taken him to the cleaners and he was going to do something about it. He tried to get out of it and failed, because the agreement was legal, valid, and watertight. What was this nonsense the Premier was talking about? Why did he not look at the documents of the day and some newspaper clippings? Premier Dunstan was reported in the *News* in May 1976 as

pointing out that agreements were not written on the basis of being taken to court: they were written on the basis of honour as between Governments and that Government-to-Government negotiations took place through an exchange of letters. Let me tell you the Federal Government's reaction. Was it the reaction of members opposite? No, indeed. Mr Nixon said:

The Federal Government wants to end its rail take-over agreements in South Australia and Tasmania but is unable to do so.

He added:

The deal signed by Mr Whitlam is watertight.

The *Advertiser* carried a similar report. It stated that Mr Nixon had been advised by the Federal Attorney-General that the agreement was legal and valid. The *Advertiser* carried an editorial that I suggest the Premier look up. It was headed 'Humbug over railways', and it concluded:

... it is disquieting that the Fraser Government should even contemplate dishonouring a valid agreement entered into by its predecessor and subsequently ratified without opposition from the Federal coalition parties.

That is what they did. They ratified it by an Act of Federal Parliament. Where is the humbug? It did not end in 1976. The Premier's performance following the publication of the Grants Commission report demonstrated how we are being subjected not to a Government that knows the truth and analyses it but to one that wants to put on stunts. The Premier dashed off to Canberra at the last minute to avoid the questioning that he would have received here in Parliament. He had a 10-minute meeting with Mr Fraser over a cup of tea and then got himself stranded in Sydney. That sort of farce continued for the next couple of days as people were totally confused about the realities of the Grants Commission and its implications for South Australia.

Look at the nonsense that is talked about in the Government's area of activity: I will move away from financial bungling for a moment. The Government cannot make decisions; it cannot do anything substantial. However, it tries to give an impression of activity. Every minor amending Bill is included in the advertisement of how much legislation is going through Parliament—71 Bills last year and 199 Bills this year. The Government has even included in its programme for this session Bills that have not been drawn up. One should look at His Excellency's Speech and compare that, too, with the statement issued by the Deputy Leader in relation to legislation that was being introduced this session.

A new Workers Compensation Act was announced. That was a great surprise to the insurance industry, which had not been consulted. It was amazing to the United Trades and Labor Council, which had been promised that it would be consulted if such legislation was to be drawn up. However, those who received the greatest surprise of all were the officers of the Department of Industrial Affairs who were meant to be actually drafting the legislation and who knew very well that they had not even got past the report stage.

Another Government advertisement also describes a fully-functioning manpower forecasting unit. The truth is that it does not exist; yet it was announced. What absolute nonsense! The Premier believes that he can claim credit for proposed water filtration for the Spencer Gulf cities. That northern filtration scheme has been delayed for two years, because Labor's 1979 plans were scrapped. They were rejected by the current Government and were only revived hastily at the last minute in the face of the amoebic meningitis scandal which was brought out in this Parliament.

Mr Max Brown: And we still don't know what they are.

Mr BANNON: It took a tragedy, that very real tragedy, to force a reappraisal. As my colleague from Whyalla points out, in the House on Tuesday, some seven months or so

after that scandal and the announcement by the Government that it was going to try and do something about northern water filtration, the Minister still could not give the member for Stuart an unequivocal undertaking on the construction times for the project. Instead, all he did was to repeat an earlier announcement: he had let a contract for conceptual and design plans. He hedged on the question of whether and when it was actually going to be started. That is a typical example where two years of public works activity has been lost in a vital area.

Credit was also claimed for the standardisation agreement of the Adelaide to Crystal Brook railway line. The Minister of Transport is a fairly honest fellow, and I hope that I do not see him put his name to anything like that. If he did, I would seriously have to revise my opinion of him. No mention has been made that the Act of the Commonwealth Parliament for standardisation was passed in 1972 and in this Parliament in 1974. That is no credit at all to this present Government. Finally, the funds are reluctantly being provided, but that is not a project of this Government or something for it to boast about as its achievement. We did it way back in the mid-1970s. If the Fraser Government had not come into power that standardisation would have been completed today.

There are even more damaging omissions. Where in this piece of propaganda do we find mention of the increased State charges, which have been detailed in this House? The Premier in his address said that, faced with his horrendous Budget problems, he could not possibly raise taxes as he did not want to frighten industrialists away from South Australia. I am not sure how many companies have succession duties imposed upon them, but nonetheless, leaving that aside, the Opposition asks, 'What does the Premier think that the horrendous increase in State charges is doing?' Does he not realise that it is vital in this State for our transport costs to remain competitive, for our power costs to remain competitive, for our water to be cheap, and for all our infra-structure services to be at the cheapest and best rates in the country? It is only then that we could have industrial development.

While the Premier is giving tax concessions on the one hand, he is putting up charges on the other. The effect of that, of course, is to do exactly what he says that he is not going to do, that is, to drive industrial developers away from this State. There is no word contained in his speech of those water, power and other increases.

Other omissions are no less damaging. Water filtration was mentioned, but the Government's action last year was not mentioned. That action led to reductions in chlorine levels, to delay in a vital education campaign, and eventually an attempt to keep the public ignorant about the presence of deadly amoeba in South Australian water. What was the Premier telling us a minute ago? He said that that great man, Sir Thomas Playford, as one of his features, took people into his confidence. Look at the shabby cover up of the water scandal earlier this year.

We have not read in this document, either, of the Government's failure to honour its education promises and a subsequent dispute which brought about disruption to the education system and strikes in our system for the first time in its history. Growth in employment was mentioned; I will have more to say about that in a minute. However, one finds no reference to South Australia's unemployment, no mention of its increase since 1979.

Mr Lynn Arnold: That's a growth industry.

Mr BANNON: We received figures today that indicate that it is very much a growth industry. Unemployment, on the figures for July 1981, has increased by 3 800, compared with July last year. There are now 48 800 people identified by the Bureau of Statistics as looking for work in this

State—an absolute scandal! Our rate of unemployment is 8 per cent—eight out of every 100 people are job seekers. That figure has increased from 7.5 per cent last July. It is the highest in Australia, and that did not happen under the previous Government in the sort of circumstances that we are seeing today.

Mr Ashenden: At least we are creating jobs.

Mr BANNON: Yes, you are creating all right; you are creating unemployment at a great rate.

Mr Ashenden: Fifteen thousand new jobs we have made.

Mr BANNON: Look at those figures against the natural trend. Since July 1981 Australia's unemployment has fallen by 10 200. South Australia's unemployment rate is rising. We remember the Premier (in fact, the Deputy Leader reminded us at Question Time today of this) talking about using the share of unemployment as the important measure, if we are talking about confidence and performance in South Australia in the economic and industrial sense. Those are his words, use that as a measure. If we use that as a measure, we find that on these figures we have a 13 per cent share of national unemployment—the highest it has ever been in the history of this State, and it is by far the highest over previous years because we have seen a steadily increasing rate; 13 per cent is our share, in a work force that is about 9 per cent of Australia's average.

Mr Oswald: Why don't you talk about the 35-hour week?

Mr BANNON: Is that some sort of record? I can assure the member for Morphett that we will not be considering anything if unemployment rates like that go on in this State. Let us not ignore the Premier's strategy. He spelt it out for us; he said, 'Ignore the 48 800 unemployed—they are a bit unfortunate—we cannot do anything about them at the moment, perhaps something could be done about them in about 1990.'

He said we must look at what has happened in regard to employment, the number of jobs that are being created in this State. There has been some increase, but we are lagging far behind the rest of Australia. More importantly, let us analyse from where these jobs are coming. In the 12 months to May, well over half the new jobs created in South Australia were in the agriculture sector and in services to agriculture. That is fine, but where is the Government's policy involved in that? This area is largely independent of Government policy: it depends on factors such as overseas markets, prices, weather and the seasons. What if we had not had a number of good seasons? That is the damaging part. What if there had not been a drought in the Eastern States during the past year or so? How would we be faring in that situation? The answer would be far more disastrous. We have been very fortunate indeed.

It is no comfort for the Premier to speak of growth in employment, as he told us he will talk about, when he looks at the source of that employment. Employment is coming largely from those seasonal and other factors that a Government cannot control. What about the areas that the Government can control? In those areas, there is absolute and total disaster, most notably in the building and construction industry and in manufacturing. These misleading figures should be included. If we are to have a report from the State (and I understand that the Liberal Party under the guise of the Government will provide more of these reports), let the next one be a little more accurate.

The Premier has told his troops, 'Every time you hear unemployment mentioned, mention employment.' Let us mention it, but let us put it in the true context. The Opposition has consistently urged the Premier to be realistic. Let us come to the main theme of government in South Australia today. Who is the Premier impressing with all these non-facts and this covering over of the state of the economy? I would suggest the Premier is certainly not

impressing the executives of companies that want to make investments in South Australia. Those executives will look at the facts. They will not read hand-outs from this Premier and then make a decision; nor will the trade union executives, whose co-operation and support is vital to the development of the State.

One should look at what the Government has done in creating a totally false climate in this State, which is resulting in a bigger crash of confidence than would ever have occurred had the Premier put the real situation before the people. Let us compare their public statements with what they said to the national wage bench. We have even seen the extraordinary situation of the President of the commission criticising the accuracy of statements made in Government publications. Honourable members will recall that in the recent national wage case both the Government and the employers joined to paint such a picture of the economy as would urge the commission to grant the extra .9 per cent being sought by the unions to give the full indexation rate.

The evidence that was put by representatives of the Department of Trade and Industry, for instance, shows conclusively that what the Government is telling the public and what it is putting around in its propaganda sheets and bulletins is totally at odds with the facts, so much so that the President, on hearing Mr J. B. Donovan, the leading economist, giving evidence for the employers, on his being questioned about levels of foreign investment and saying that he does not understand where the Premier got his figures, was constrained to comment:

I thought frankly that that statement along with a few other statements emanating from State Government publications leave a bit to be desired as to their essential accuracy.

Is it any wonder in the light of that case and that conflict that the bench made the decision it did? On 24 July, an editorial appeared in the *Journal of Industry* under the heading 'A Ticking Wage Time Bomb'. The editorial criticised the Full Bench decision at great length and stated that it was stunned by it, that South Australia was now out of step with the rest of Australia, and that employers on State awards would have to pay more, etc, etc.

I have written to the Chamber about this, because I think the editorial is not only totally misleading but also

ignores the way in which the Government made it virtually impossible for the commission to come to any conclusion other than that to which it came. Some of these statements do not stand up. Perhaps the best way of putting it on record would be to read the letter that I wrote to the President of the Chamber, Mr Michael Perry, as follows:

I have just had the opportunity of reading your 13 July Journal editorial headed 'A Ticking Wage Time Bomb'. I think the editorial overstates the impact of the bench's decision in South Australia, particularly when we recall that a large percentage of South Australia's manufacturing industry is covered by Federal not State awards and, in any case, over-award payments in South Australia do not reach the levels of those in the Eastern States. Therefore, I do not think that firms thinking of moving to South Australia or expanding their investment will be overly concerned.

The editorial in fact stated that South Australian workers would be paid more than those in other States, and yet it is not comparing like with like. It does not give any acknowledgment to the fact that the average weekly earnings in South Australia are \$26 per week less than earnings in New South Wales and \$18.40 less than those in Victoria. They are significant differences in wage differentials, but they are not acknowledged by the editorial. My letter continues:

The editorial says they 'could hardly be blamed if they considered a shift to a better-ordered State'. I would have thought South Australia's record of industrial relations which, so far, even under the present Government, has remained very much better than the national average suggests that things are better here than elsewhere.

In any case, my reading of the judgment and passages of the transcript suggests that the commission found it hard to accept the arguments produced by employers, and more particularly by the Government, because they ran so contrary to other public statements they had made. The case presented by the Government, in particular, was so much at odds with its other public pronouncements about our economy that it is hardly surprising the bench broadly chose to adopt the arguments for the unions.

I will be very interested in the Chamber's comments on that. In view of the revelation that it has already taken a deputation to the Premier expressing its concern and disquiet, perhaps we will get a response fairly soon. The hard facts of the economic position of this State must be faced. They were put out very starkly indeed, not in the latest Government publication but in the Commonwealth Banking Corporation's economic newsletter under the heading 'State comparisons'. As it is a purely statistical table, I seek leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

State Indicators		New South Wales	Victoria	Queensland	South Australia	Western Australia	Tasmania	Australia
Population Growth								
Increase in year to June 1980	%	1.3	0.9	2.3	0.4	1.8	1.3	1.3
Labour Force								
Increase in year to May 1981	%	2.2	2.4	3.9	0.9	3.5	1.4	2.5
Employment								
Increase in year to May 1981	%	2.6	2.2	4.3	0.6	4.8	1.8	2.8
Unemployment Rate								
Average rate for 1980-81	%	5.3	5.9	6.0	7.7	5.9	6.2	5.9
Average Weekly Earnings								
March quarter 1981, seasonally adjusted	\$	291.20	283.60	273.70	265.20	283.10	274.80	283.90
Consumer Price Index								
March quarter 1981 on March quarter 1980	%	9.7	9.7	8.7	9.3	8.5	9.1	9.4
Retail Sales								
Increase for year ended December 1980	%	15.2	13.3	16.1	11.6	13.3	10.3	14.2
New Motor Vehicle Registrations								
Change for year ended May 1981	%	3.5	-3.5	8.8	-2.9	5.0	1.3	2.6
Total Building Approvals—Dwellings								
Change for year ended May 1981	%	8.7	0.6	22.0	-14.7	-4.1	-7.3	7.2
Investment Projects								
Mining	\$M	3 890	1 530	5 990	2 330	8 450	70	23 050
Manufacturing	\$M	3 340	1 240	2 800	310	2 040	590	10 330

Source: Australian Bureau of Statistics, Department of Industry and Commerce.

Mr BANNON: The article shows a table comparing the States and, on every indicator, South Australia is behind the national average. Moreover, on every indicator except

that of retail sales we are the worst of any State—not just below the average—we are the bottom. We are No. 6 in the table, and in the case of retail sales we are only ahead

of Tasmania. Political exercises like that produced in July can only damage this State.

What are the indicators? Most of them are up to the year ended May 1981. Since then, unemployment has dramatically increased. Employment has also increased in South Australia, so an amendment would need to be made to the table but it is still below the national average and below every other State in Australia. The consumer price index position has improved slightly. We are now equal to the national average, but the majority of recent increases in State charges are yet to be included. They will push the cost of living up. Registrations of motor vehicles have increased compared with the same period last year.

It is worth remembering, using the Premier's test of our share, that we are falling behind. Even with the welcome increase of registrations in the June quarter of 1981, our share still continues to decline. That is the realistic picture of South Australia of which everyone it seems is aware except the Premier. Business men do not want to be conned. They do not want to be brought to South Australia or bolstered up here under false pretences. They want a Government that tells them the truth realistically. Every time we do that we are accused of knocking South Australia.

In no way are we knocking South Australia. We believe that, if this Government had adopted different policies, if it had not effectively sabotaged our building and construction industry, we would be in a far healthier position than we are in. We believe, also, that there are factors outside the Government's control that ought to be looked at, and that there ought to be more vigorous promotion of them at the national level. South Australia is in trouble, and let us not cover it up. We know that we have basic strengths here; we know that we have basic advantages. They should be stressed by all means, but not at the expense of the truth, and not in the form of this flimsy propaganda that the Government is indulging in. Realism and confidence are what is needed. If we do not have that, as I say, we will not attract investment because we simply will not be believed.

This nonsense about waiting for the end of the decade must be dispelled immediately. The Premier has a great opportunity to do that. Next Thursday a special conference has been called by the Prime Minister, at which all the Premiers will be present, to discuss the future of national wage fixation. That is a very pressing problem, indeed. I suggest that, if that conference confines itself only to that issue, then it is selling Australia and Australians short. Why pick on a particular sector of the population, the wage-earners, and single them out to bear the burden of the economic problems that we have? The fact is that the reason there is wage pressure and a wage push on at the moment goes right back to the problems that the ordinary

wage-earner is having in simply existing under the present cost of living, interest rates, and so on.

I suggest that the Premier take with him a five-point plan. I suggest that he go into the meeting, thump his fist on the table and say to the Prime Minister and other Premiers, 'All this talk about the wage future is nonsense; let us get down to basics on the economy. Why is this pressure on? Here are the things we should be discussing.' What are the five points he should look at? First, there must be lower interest rates. This matter has to be discussed, because the cost to the ordinary worker of rental, which is affected by interest rates, and indeed, more acutely, the cost to those trying to buy their own home, is obviously putting pressure on the wage packet and obviously that has to be dealt with at a national level. Tax deductibility, or something like that, must be promised by the Commonwealth Government.

The second point is personal tax reform. This should include tax indexation to protect the taxpayers. Let us put more money into the pay packet of the low wage and middle wage-earner immediately in the forthcoming Federal Budget. That would relieve some of the pressure for wage increases. Thirdly, there is the matter of foreign capital control. There is too much money pouring into the country, unrestricted and undirected. Let us get the States together with the Commonwealth and plan the resources boom. Then, I prophesy, we will not have to wait twiddling our thumbs until 1990; something could happen before then if it is planned and directed. The fourth point is national price regulation. There should be a national commitment to regulating pricing policies and not just pressure kept on the workers' wages. The fifth point is a positive job creation scheme, a Federal-State plan to get people working again; that is absolutely vital.

Friedmanite economics will not have a bar of that. Just have a look at what Mrs Thatcher is being forced to do in Britain. It took major riots and social dislocation to make her act. Let Mr Tonkin tell Mr Fraser: 'Learn the lesson of Thatcher and create some jobs and we in South Australia will co-operate.' That is what he has to do next Thursday. If he does not do it, he is shirking his responsibility as Premier, and let us not have another 12 months of him—let us have him out tomorrow.

Mr SCHMIDT secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.50 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 18 August at 2 p.m.