

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 20 August 1981

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

ESSENTIAL SERVICES BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

PETITION: CRIME

A petition signed by 101 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to increase the severity of penalties for serious crime, especially rape, and grant the Police Department more power to act in such cases was presented by Mr Mathwin.

Petition received.

PETITION: TRAFFIC SIGNALS

A petition signed by 56 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide adequate funding for the erection of traffic signals at the corner of Frederick Road and Trimmer Parade, Seaton, was presented by Mr Hamilton.

Petition received.

PETITION: SWIMMING POOL

A petition signed by 42 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide adequate funding for a heated therapeutic swimming pool at the headquarters of the Western Rehabilitation Centre, Royal Park, was presented by Mr Hamilton.

Petition received.

PETITION: DRIVERS' LICENCES

A petition signed by 113 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to repeal the present legislation for compulsory annual motor licences for those over 70 years of age was presented by Mr Glazbrook.

Petition received.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister of Education (Hon. H. Allison)—
South Australian Government Schools. Enrolment changes, planning and management of facilities. A synopsis of a report, August 1981.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: LIVE SHEEP EXPORTS

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture):
I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: Last week it was reported that 230 people had been retrenched from the Murray Bridge abattoirs of Charles David Pty Ltd because of the shortage of stock. The Australian Council of Trade Unions at its August meeting gave the Commonwealth Government until 7 September, when the A.C.T.U. Congress will meet to introduce a quota of one mutton carcass for each live sheep exported. The A.C.T.U. has already said that, if the Commonwealth does not fix a quota by that date, the council will consider how the unions can impose such a scheme. It says it is taking this action because of the decline in recent years of jobs in the meat processing sector, which the A.C.T.U. blames on the live sheep export trade.

When one considers all the factors surrounding the live sheep trade, the ancillary industries stemming from that trade, and the position within the meat processing industry, considerable doubt arises about the wisdom of the A.C.T.U. proposal. The basic facts that ought to be understood by this Parliament and all Australian's about this subject are as follows:

Live sheep exports expanded from 1 300 000 in 1974-1975 to 5 700 000 in 1979-1980 and 5 400 000 in 1980-1981. Over 78 per cent of live exports for slaughter were destined for the Middle East.

The gross value of live sheep exports in 1980-1981 was an estimated \$157 000 000 out of a total value for lamb, mutton and live sheep exports of \$456 000 000.

In comparative terms, South Australia, our own State, benefits more from the live sheep trade than does Australia generally, as of the 1 900 000 sheep exported from South Australia in 1980-1981, only 1 000 000 were from South Australian flocks. Therefore, South Australia not only obtains the direct benefits from exporting its own sheep but from providing the services (feed, shearing, transport, etc.) for sheep from other States as well.

The processing sector of the meat industry is presently going through a period of low utilisation and low financial returns. This is largely due to a drop in the slaughter capacity utilisation of cattle from 84 per cent in 1977 to only 60 per cent in 1980.

The live sheep trade had a minor effect on slaughtering as producers responded to this lucrative trade which has been developed for our industry. Producers have since increased the ewe portion of their national flock and, seasons permitting as well, have increased the size of the national sheep total. Therefore, the argument about sheep exports having an effect on job opportunities for meat workers cannot be substantiated. In fact, the increase in profitability, and thus flock size, has led to a more stable and viable sheep industry in Australia, as is demonstrated by the following remarks.

In the only detailed study on employment implications of the live sheep trade in 1978, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics concluded that it was doubtful whether 100 additional people would have been employed full-time in the meat industry if there had been no live sheep exports at all in 1977. Conversely, the B.A.E. said 944 to 1 601 extra jobs were created in other sections by the live sheep trade in the same year.

If the quota as proposed by the A.C.T.U. had been in operation in 1979-80, that is, the quota currently proposed by the A.C.T.U., only 1 600 000 sheep would have been exported. As Western Australia has lower transport costs to the Middle East than have other sheep areas, most of these 1 600 000 would have come from that State. Therefore, a quota, as proposed by the A.C.T.U., would have almost stopped live sheep exports from South Australia if it operated in 1979-80. This A.C.T.U. quota proposal, if

continued in 1980-81, would have had a detrimental impact on the very meat workers and other ancillary workers who they are politically and industrially purporting to represent.

I repeat that there is a ghastly lack of public appreciation of this all-important subject. It is a very complicated matter, I readily admit, and as a result I have instituted a considerable research programme into the background and implications of it, and I intend to present to the House the results of that exercise next week and to ask that that paper be printed and made available to the Parliament accordingly. In conclusion, it is worth noting that we recognise that in the Arabian Gulf, in particular, El Hamasi has got a tremendous monopoly over this particular trade and that we, as Australian primary producers, have enjoyed access to that monopoly operation for a number of years.

It is also worth noting and that it is appreciated by this Parliament that even that Kuwait business is currently subject to competition from other areas, involving negotiations that are going on between those Arab countries adjacent and Brazil which could, if effected, lead to erosion of this valuable industry of ours as well. It is difficult enough for primary producers in Australia to go out to seek and obtain and maintain trade of this kind in other countries of the world, but it is more than frustrating to find that our own co-Australians at the local level are causing it to be eroded.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitchell.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Have we now entered into a debate on this matter, or is this still a Ministerial statement?

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order in relation to the debate. However, I was about to draw the Minister's attention to the fact that he sought leave to make a statement, which was circulated. He is now proceeding far beyond the circulated document, which is out of spirit with the arrangement which exists in this House. The honourable Minister of Agriculture.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I take the point, Mr Speaker, and I have no further remarks to make on the subject at this stage.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: STANDARD GAUGE RAIL LINK

The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Transport): I seek leave to make a brief statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The Commonwealth Minister for Transport (Hon. Ralph Hunt) is also making a similar statement today in Canberra. The Commonwealth and South Australian Governments have agreed that the standard gauge line currently under construction between Crystal Brook and Adelaide should include a connection to Outer Harbor. Subject to satisfactory arrangements being concluded with customers, standard gauge service on to Le Fevre Peninsula should be operating by the end of 1982.

The route approved for the connection differs slightly from that provided for in the railway agreement for construction of the main line entered into by the two Governments in 1980. The modified route provides for the link between the State Transport Authority passenger line to the peninsula and the A.N.R.C. controlled freight line that runs along the Port Adelaide River side of the peninsula to be effected from the southern end of the Australian National Railways Commission line at Birkenhead. The line will generally follow an alignment running adjacent to Semaphore Road, finally connecting into the S.T.A. track at a point between the Ethelton and Glanville stations.

This is the route recommended in the environmental impact report prepared on the Adelaide to Crystal Brook project and is the one favoured by local authorities and residents. It is also the economically preferable one. The 1980 agreement provided for the link between the S.T.A. and A.N.R.C. lines on the peninsula to be effected in the Largs North-Draper area, but it also made provision for the route to be varied if necessary. Formal legal documents to ratify the variation, as agreed between Mr Hunt and me, are currently being prepared for our signature.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE REPORT

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report of the Standing Orders Committee, 1980-81, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Ordered that the report be printed.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT: SALES TAX INCREASES

The SPEAKER: I wish to advise that I have received a letter from the Leader of the Opposition stating:

I wish to advise that when the House meets today, Thursday 20 August, I shall move that the House at its rising adjourn to 2 p.m. on Friday 21 August for the purpose of debating the following matter of urgency:

The misleading and inaccurate statement made by the Premier in this House yesterday outlined the effect of the Federal Budget on South Australia and, in particular, the contradiction between that statement and the reported comments of the Minister of Industrial Affairs concerning the effect on South Australian manufacturing industry of the sales tax increases contained in the Federal Budget.

I call upon those members who support the Hon. Leader's letter to rise in their places.

Members having risen:

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

That the House at its rising adjourn to 2 p.m. on Friday 21 August for the purpose of debating the following matter of urgency: The misleading and inaccurate statement made by the Premier in this House yesterday outlining the effect of the Federal Budget on South Australia and, in particular, the contradiction between that statement and the reported comments of the Minister of Industrial Affairs concerning the effect on South Australian manufacturing industry of the sales tax increases contained in the Federal Budget.

Yesterday the House was given yet another instalment in that series of speeches we have been having from the Premier lately warning South Australians about the magnitude of economic and financial problems which his administration has brought down on South Australia and which are soon to be made very clear indeed in his forthcoming Budget. As is the case with all those statements, yesterday's speech was yet another attempt to shift to some other quarter or direction the blame for his own incompetence and inability to manage the affairs of this State.

The vehicle for yesterday's speech was a Ministerial statement purporting to outline to the House the effects on South Australia of the Federal Budget. It was the kind of statement that we are becoming used to as the State's problems become too much for this Government. The speech was typified by inaccuracies, distortions and plain untruths. Even more that this, virtually as the speech was being given to the House, a major aspect of the Premier's argument was being contradicted by his own Minister of Industrial Affairs. Today, his Minister, who was confirming comments made by the Opposition on the effect of sales tax on South Australian manufacturing industry, was backed up by the head of an employers' organisation in the vital manufacturing and service sections of industry.

The Hon. D. C. Brown interjecting:

Mr BANNON: The Minister of Industrial Affairs was not present yesterday and I think he will be rather surprised when I outline to him the statement that the Premier made, because in this case the Minister seems to be right and the Premier very much wrong. In his statement yesterday, the Premier said that the increase in sales tax 'would not be a specific disadvantage to South Australian manufacturers, and it is irresponsible to say so'. The Premier had been advised that this was the considered view of industry leaders in South Australia. However, that is not so. Neither the facts concerning our economy in South Australia nor the statements of industry leaders (nor indeed his own Minister's statement) support that view of the effect of the Federal Budget on this State.

Let us first put those economic facts before the House. The Premier has failed to understand or grasp them, and I do not think he will understand or grasp them today. About 20 per cent of our work force is employed by the manufacturing industry. That is something like 114 000 people directly dependent for their livelihood on consumers who buy goods made in this State and mainly sold in the Eastern States. We are the third proportionately in terms of manufacturing of any State. In fact, because of our distance from markets, because the problems we have in South Australia's export oriented—

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: Which are the first and second?

Mr BANNON: I will respond to the Premier. The first and second are Victoria and New South Wales, which will be hit by this sales tax, but not as hard as South Australia, because of our distance from the markets and the other cost disadvantages, many of them being heaped on by this Government. That is a fact of life. Let me make the position even clearer. First, the sales tax is not yet a general sales tax, although Mr Howard is setting the basis for this. The sales tax applies basically and only to physical products, not to services such as banking, advertising, legal services, and financial analysts. Essentially, they are directed at the output of manufacturing industry. Secondly, not all physical products are subject to sales tax. Food products and food processing are a major exclusion, and South Australian manufacturing is relatively weak in the food processing area.

We are not suggesting that that should be taxed but, for instance, in comparison with Queensland we have hardly any of that major component, so we have a relatively high proportion of non-food manufacturing, which is essentially the sales tax base. Thirdly, South Australia is heavily represented in the higher tax rate areas levied by the Commonwealth. Fifty per cent of sales tax collection comes from those in the 17½ per cent bracket, which has gone up by 2½ per cent, and principally they are motor cars, so something over half the collection comes from that area.

We can remember 1961 and the impact that those sales tax impositions by the Federal Government then had on South Australia. It was totally disastrous and disastrous for the same reasons as these are today: because our manufacturing industry is concentrated extremely heavily in that sector that is taxed most heavily. Fourthly, South Australian manufactured products are heavily represented amongst those that are responsive to price (that is, those on which tax increases have a direct effect) and, most importantly, those that are postponable (that is, they are not basic necessities). That will hit sales very much more in South Australia.

They are the objective facts of our economy that the Premier does not understand. That is why South Australia is comparatively worse off than any other manufacturing State and, indeed, any other State in Australia. Those facts ignored by the Premier were not the view of his Minister of Industrial Affairs, who on this occasion is much better

informed than his Leader. In this morning's *Advertiser*, under the headline 'Brown: South Australian Industry will be hit', the Minister is reported as saying:

The increased and expanded Federal sales tax on manufactured goods would have a detrimental effect on South Australian industry.

The report continues:

Mr Brown left later in the day for Canberra, where he will have talks on the future of manufacturing industry in South Australia with the Minister for Industry and Commerce, Sir Phillip Lynch. Mr Brown said people in Canberra, and especially the Treasury bureaucrats, seemed to have a 'hang-up' against manufacturing industry. Even though it employed about 20 per cent of the work force and supported an even greater number in the service sector, Canberra seemed intent on denying it growth and opportunity. The increase in sales tax on manufacturing items followed closely talk of across-the-board tariff cuts.

The Budget reflected a paranoia with constraining money supply as a means of holding down wages. It would be far better to use an effective industrial relations policy. Mr Brown said he would discuss the sales tax increase with Sir Phillip and voice objections on behalf of South Australian consumers.

So, at the same time as the Minister was flying to Canberra to put a case to the Federal Government, the Premier was here in this Parliament making this terrible statement, in effect, pulling the rug out from under him.

While the Minister was describing the Federal Government's economic policy as paranoid, the Premier was on his feet in this House trying to play down statements that the increases would cause hardship to our vital manufacturing industries. Why would he do that? He is getting into step with the Prime Minister, once again. He is trying to fall into line with him. The deferral syndrome that is so apparent in the Premier's whole handling of Federal-State relations became very apparent yesterday in his attempt to excuse the Federal Government from the impact of its policies in relation to South Australia.

Whatever the reason, he has now consulted industry leaders and so assures us that the effect will be nowhere near as great as has been predicted. He obviously did not consult his Minister, nor did he talk, for instance, to Mr R. A. Flashman, Executive Director of the South Australian Automobile Chamber of Commerce, whose comments were reported in this morning's *Advertiser*. Mr Flashman made it quite clear that the 2½ per cent increase in sales tax on new motor vehicles would hurt the South Australian economy, especially the manufacturing and service sections of the motor industry. He made an extended statement in which he said that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader has the call.

Mr Langley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Leader does not require the assistance of the honourable member for Unley.

Mr BANNON: Mr Flashman pointed out that in contrast to national trends, South Australia had had just about its worst July for new vehicle sales since 1968. He went on at length to describe the parlous state of the vehicle industry here in South Australia.

What about other parts of the Premier's statement? The comments on the formula for general revenue were a complete and absolute fantasy. I doubt that this information that he gave us had come from Treasury. Treasury officials are probably too worried about putting anything in writing to the Premier in case he sends it out for handwriting tests. The Premier, in part of his statement, blatantly tries to blame a former State Government for the financial formula that was forced on to all States by the present Federal Liberal Government. He is trying to blame a former State Government for Mr Fraser's new federalism, a new feder-

alism which he has consistently supported. At page 2 of his statement yesterday the Premier said:

Another important factor is that the formula for general revenue funding is based on population and State relativities, as agreed to by the previous Dunstan Labor Government in 1976. There is nothing we can do about that. This was an agreement which we inherited from the Dunstan Government, and which cannot be changed.

The facts are that South Australia has lost out because the generous Whitlam guarantee has been abolished. That formula had a betterment factor of 3 per cent built in, which gave us a real growth in funds, and every year since 1979-80 our share of funds has decreased, year after year. Somehow this is then blamed on the Dunstan Government.

The Premier ignores the fact that the Dunstan Government fought against the imposition of that new formula, while he, as Leader of the Opposition, did his utmost to help Fraser institute it. The Premier is on record as supporting that formula in the Appropriation Bill debates in April 1977. He told the House that the federalism policy of the Federal Government would not have the terrible effects on the State that Mr Dunstan had repeatedly outlined. Mr Fraser's new federalism, he said, is in the best interests of South Australia. Now he lamely says that he inherited this agreement and cannot do anything about it.

What about his statement, then, of August last year in the Budget, when he took pride in pointing out that in September 1975 the Liberal and National Country Party issued a paper setting out its support for the concept of federalism and how in Government it was going to support that philosophical approach and urge on the Commonwealth the application of those theories? Those theories are being applied, the Premier does not like it, and he is trying to blame the previous Government for them.

Then he deals with South Australia's population and, correctly, points out that a key factor is the formula that determines our share of funds, but he does not tell the truth about the fact that the outflow of our population did not begin in 1975, as he says. In fact, in 1976 and 1977 there was a net inflow of population. However, in 1978 there was an outflow, in 1979 there was a loss of 5 487 people, and in 1980, the first full year of the Premier's Government, it reached a record of nearly 8 000 people.

So, the Premier has distorted that evidence. Of the period during which he has been in office, about 50 per cent has seen a constant escalation of that population outflow. What are the facts? What are the facts regarding unemployment? The Premier says that there was a dramatic rise in this regard from 1977 to 1981, and that the dramatic rise in unemployment dates from 1975. That is absolute nonsense. Unemployment in South Australia did not begin to rise until late 1977. In 1974-75, our unemployment rate was 83 per cent of the Australian rate. In 1975-76, it was 71.3 per cent, and in 1976-77 it was 87.4 per cent of the Australian rate. In the years since then, it has gone up and up, until it has reached record levels, again under his Administration.

So, we will get no facts from the Premier on our economic status. We have come a long way from what the Premier said to the London Chamber of Commerce in April last year, namely, that our regional economy is responding to the complete turn-about in Government policy and that people and capital have ceased to emigrate from South Australia to other States. It is a long way from those boastings now.

What should concern the Premier is that the Federal Budget was framed against the background of an analysis of the Australian economy that bears absolutely no relationship to what is taking place in this State. Whatever is happening in the rest of Australia, we are more depressed; we are in a much more parlous position; and we will be hit harder by this Federal Budget.

It is proper for the Premier to give an assessment to this House of the effects of the Federal Budget, but it is not proper for him to give the sort of assessment that he gave. The Premier had better stay right out of economic commentary and economic matters. He does not understand them. He has handed over the Budget responsibilities to a committee of three of his Ministers. He has abdicated his role as Treasurer in the formation of our Budget, and he has abdicated his role as Leader of this State in standing up to the Federal Government and doing something about South Australia's disadvantages.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I think the best comment that could be made on the Leader's speech is being made at present by the member for Elizabeth, who is currently waking up. I am grateful to the honourable member for his present attention.

Mr O'Neill: When are you going to wake up? That's the big question.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Everyone in this House knows the difficulties and strain under which the Leader of the Opposition is labouring at present. However, that is no excuse whatever for his cynical and destructive misrepresentation of the effects of sale tax on South Australia, because that is basically what this is all about.

The Leader did talk about financial mismanagement and tried to suggest that the stringencies facing this State were not due to decisions taken by the Federal Government. I can only suggest that the Leader talk to his Labor colleagues in New South Wales and Tasmania, because Mr Wran and Mr Lowe have made no secret of the fact that they are in identical, and indeed worse, positions than the position in which this State finds itself. I suggest that the Leader pick up the telephone and talk to them.

The Leader's whole attitude indicates a degree of desperation which, in other circumstances, would be quite amusing, if his statements were not so damaging to the confidence of the South Australian community. Over the weekend, following the Labor Party's widely publicised difficulties regarding leadership last week, the community was told publicly that the Opposition would come out fighting this week. Sadly, there has been no evidence at all of that so far, and this very latest pathetic attempt to revive the reputation of the Opposition has resulted only in projecting a Party in disarray without effective leadership. Clearly, the Leader of the Opposition is clutching at straws.

I should like to deal first with the so-called contradiction that the Leader alleges exists between the statement that I made in the House yesterday and that made by the Minister of Industrial Affairs. I simply point out that it is quite apparent to anyone reading those statements that there is no such contradiction. I will then show how muddled the Leader has become in his logic when he suggests that South Australian industry has been particularly and specifically singled out by the Federal Government and hurt by the imposition of a 2.5 per cent sales tax. Clearly, that is just not true, although on the surface, without detailed investigation, one could leap to that conclusion. I believe that he has fallen for the three-card trick and taken what has happened at face value, not considering its real meaning. Finally, I will express my very grave concern once again at the irresponsibility of his repeated statements aimed at downgrading our State and its industries in the eyes of potential investors, and doing everything possible to destroy the confidence which South Australians are again building in their own capabilities. It is quite shameful.

Regarding the first of these matters, the so-called contradiction, quite clearly there is none. Twist words and meanings in any way that he will, he cannot substantiate

his childish claims. What is he on about? I do not understand it. He says, first, that in some way we have not consulted. The Minister of Industrial Affairs and I consulted on Tuesday evening, at some length, on this matter. The Minister's statement which he put out and released to the media and which was used on the following morning was in no way contradictory to the statement that I made to the House yesterday. There is no way that the Leader of the Opposition can justify his claim that it is. All I can suggest to anyone who is in doubt is that they should read them both and see whether they can find the contradiction which the Leader has desperately tried to suggest is there.

Yesterday I said, quite properly, that a number of matters were outlined in the Budget that clearly affected South Australia, and that it was appropriate that I take the opportunity to comment on them—and that is what I did. I also at that time regretted the likely effect on employment generally, but I added that South Australia had not been singled out for especially harsh treatment in the Budget.

The Minister of Industrial Affairs, in his statement, said the increased and expanded sales tax imposed by the Federal Budget on a wide range of manufactured goods would have a detrimental effect on South Australian industry—and so it will. It will also have such an effect on the industry in Victoria and New South Wales, but the Minister of Industrial Affairs is speaking as a South Australian Minister, and his comment is very pertinent and apt for South Australia. There is no contradiction. Where is the conflict? We both admitted yesterday that there were effects, that the Budget did affect South Australia, and we outlined those effects, and we did so only after we had consulted together about them. In fact, there is an absolute compatibility between what I said and what the Minister said yesterday, and the only incompatibility is in the Leader's mind. It is wishful thinking. This is what I said, in part, yesterday:

The additional 2½ per cent sales tax on a wide range of goods will have no greater adverse effect on South Australia's key motor vehicle and white goods industries than it will on any other State's industrial or manufacturing sectors.

And that is a fact. I continued:

The tax applies across the board, across Australia. It will not be a specific disadvantage to South Australian manufacturers, and it is irresponsible to say so. There could be a slight dampening of demand generally because of increased prices, but this will be felt by interstate manufacturers as much as it will be felt by South Australian industry. Obviously, there will be an adverse effect on employment, and this is to be greatly regretted. But, generally, these are the considered views of industry leaders, who have assured me today that the effect of the increased sales tax will be nowhere near as great as has been predicted by some people in the last 24 hours.

They were obviously referring to the Leader of the Opposition. Does he seriously suggest, as I think he must be doing, that General Motors or Mitsubishi in South Australia has been more disadvantaged than has Ford, for instance, in Victoria? Does he suggest that Email, Philips and Vulcan have not been disadvantaged as compared with Simpson's in South Australia, because it is in South Australia? What he has not grasped is that the sales tax increase will result in increased prices across the market. Of course, there is no specific disadvantage either to Ford, in Victoria, or to Mitsubishi in South Australia, or to Simpson's in South Australia, or to Email or Kelvinator in Victoria, and Philips in New South Wales.

If South Australia could be said to have been singled out for any special attention in any area at all, it is in the area of wine tax. I am amazed that the Leader has not referred to that. I would have thought that he would be pleased, as are most other people in South Australia, that wine tax has not been imposed and that the wine industry has been basically saved from what would have been a disastrous

result. I believe that between 60 and 65 per cent of this nation's wine is produced in South Australia. The exemption from sales tax has specifically impacted favourably on South Australia. The favourable result applies only where there is no sales tax levied—not where a sales tax has been put on a wide range of items.

I also suggest to the Leader that he examine the list of items on which sales tax has been placed, and that he again refer to his colleague (if his colleague wishes to know him at present), Mr Wran in New South Wales, to see what he has had to say about the effect of sales tax on that State's industries. The fact of the matter is that industries across Australia have been and will be affected by the sales tax. There is no justification at all for the Leader of the Opposition in this State to try to destroy confidence in South Australia by saying that we have been specifically singled out for adverse treatment.

The major question which emerges from this senseless debate—and I do not intend to be very long in answering this childish motion—is not in relation to the effects of the Federal Budget on South Australia; it is whether the Leader has promoted this discussion for the benefit of this House and the people of South Australia or for the benefit of his own chances with his restless back bench. The answer is quite obvious. It is made equally and even more pointed by the noticeable absence now of the member for Elizabeth from the Chamber. There is no way that he will be seen to support the sort of motion which has been put up by the Leader today. The answer as to whether the Leader has promoted this discussion for the benefit of the people of South Australia or for his own perceived benefit is quite clear. He is fighting to regain some of his own political credibility in the face of very marked divisions in his own Party ranks.

The Leader of the Opposition has been dubbed as unfit to lead the Labor Party, and his performance during this week, and particularly this afternoon, has done nothing to alter that view. Indeed, it has been a sad and unsuccessful exercise in political survival mounted by a man cornered and isolated within his own Party ranks. It is little wonder that the former Attorney-General and other members opposite have elected to distance themselves from a leadership which has so much lost direction and authority and, above all, political judgment. The Leader claimed—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable Premier to come back to the motion before the Chair.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Leader claimed that he intended to come out fighting after the upheavals and divisions in his Party last week. This motion today is the last and I think most miserable effort that he has made during this week.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Premier is now defying the Chair. You asked him to return to the motion before the Chair. I thought he agreed to do that, but he has not done so. He is continuing to abuse the Leader.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order. I have drawn to the attention of the House, specifically to the Premier on this occasion, and to all members who will take part in this debate, the nature of the motion before the Chair, and I ask them all to address themselves to that, fully appreciating that in getting to the point members sometimes do stray a little.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The efforts of the Leader of the Opposition last Thursday in trying to win political points on the interest rate issue were really very weak indeed and, certainly, today's exercise on the effect of the sales tax on the people of South Australia has been no better. We are all concerned about interest

rates and the effect of the sales tax on industry across the board. It seems to me that the Leader would be better off trying to support what this Government is doing in building up our industrial base and increasing productivity, investment, and employment. His efforts, his almost wishful thinking and dedicated attempts to tear down and destroy South Australia's reputation, will do him no good at all in the long term.

Members in the Leader's own ranks are showing quite clearly now that he lacks judgment and certainly impact in delivering his salvos against the people of South Australia, their confidence and their potential development chances. Today's opening salvo has been no better. Obviously, the Leader feels that the only way in which he can restore some of his lost credibility is to try to ridicule the growing business, industrial and investment confidence in this State and attack the very heart of South Australia's employment and industrial base—motor vehicles and the whitegoods industry. There is no excuse at all for his trying to drag down with him South Australia's confidence and reputation.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): What a remarkable speech we have just heard from the temporary Premier: surely, after that speech, he must be temporary. I have no argument about the Premier's delivering written speeches, because I believe that he delivers a written speech much better than he delivers a verbal speech. There is no doubt about that: I suppose that is what we all do, for that matter. I do not object to the Premier's reading his speeches, but I do object to his reading abuse written by some public servant. If the Premier wants to abuse the Opposition, that is his right, but I do not believe it is the right of any public servant to be under instructions from the Premier to write the piffle that the Premier has read out today. I do not believe that the Premier has won many friends on his own back bench for doing it.

We have just been subjected to the usual huff and puff of the Premier, not attempting to answer the allegations and the facts put by my Leader. There was no attempt to do that. There was a misuse of the motion. The Premier wandered all over the place, and came in with a speech prepared before anyone had heard the Leader. It was quite obvious that the Premier had no intention of answering the allegations, and had no knowledge to do so. One of the interesting things about the Premier's reply was that he made the point that he had had consultations last night with his Minister. I do not often agree with Minister Brown—

The Hon. D. C. Brown: He said Tuesday night.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: All right, I stand corrected: it was Tuesday night. I do not often agree with Minister Brown, as most people in this House and in the State would know.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Who does?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Who does, as my colleague reminds me. Not many people find themselves in agreement with him. On this occasion, I certainly agree that his statements were sensible, sane and solid, made from some basis of fact. We heard the contrary yesterday in this House from the Premier.

It is no good for anyone to dispute the fact that there was a contradiction. If the Minister was reported accurately in the *Advertiser*, there were contradictions throughout both statements. I have seen no disputation about the statements in the *Advertiser*, so I take it that that is what the Minister said, and that is how he was reported. If that is the fact, the Premier, quite clearly, is in contradiction with his Minister. Let us find out about that. Either there has been a plot to upset the Minister or no agreement has been reached. It is a simple fact of life. If the Premier comes

out saying one thing and the Minister says another thing, surely either the Premier has tried to unload the Minister or the Minister has tried to unload the Premier.

Mr Trainer: Or they just don't understand.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Or neither of them understands what the other is talking about. It is probably a bit of both. It is surprising to me that the Premier can rise in this House and congratulate the Federal Treasurer, Mr Howard, for not introducing a wine tax. Every year for the past 10 years, South Australia has been under some threat by Governments to introduce wine taxes throughout Australia. I would be the first to support any opposition to that. The Premier knows that, during my Leader's absence overseas, I supported him and other business people in arguing with the Federal Government and protesting about the wine tax. The Premier's startling statement, that it is good of the Federal Government not to tax wine, is like somebody threatening to kick you in the stomach, then not doing it, and then being thanked for not doing it.

Surely there is more in the Budget than just thanking Mr Howard for not introducing a wine tax. I congratulate those business people and all the people of South Australia who opposed that tax in the first place. The Premier has said nothing about the new brandy tax. He clearly and definitely evaded mentioning the new brandy sales tax imposed by Federal Government. We have not heard argument or condemnation by the Premier in that regard.

My Leader has already spoken about Mr Flashman's attitude to what will occur in the car industry. It is estimated by people who are in the know and have some knowledge of this industry that prices will increase by at least \$150 per car, the increase depending on the model and price. I will quote from someone who, I would say, has had enormous experience in the industry and whose job is to represent workers in the industry. I refer, of course, to Jack Bennett, who in this morning's *Advertiser* had this to say:

The Budget was a real kick in the guts to the motor car industry. He described the extra sales tax as a further lash across the back for South Australia's vehicle industry. How can the Premier justify that sort of situation for South Australia? When South Australia is dependent on the car industry and the whitegoods manufacturing industry, how can he say that sales tax is not specifically bad for South Australia? I cannot follow that, and I do not think that even the back-benchers listening now can agree with the Premier in those circumstances. They are facts of life. We are centrally based and are dependent on those industries. The Premier brushes this off by saying that it does not matter that it is no worse for South Australia than it is for any other State in Australia. I think the Premier should stand condemned in those circumstances.

Let us look at what is happening in South Australia and what is being said about South Australia. For quite some time we have been listening to tremendous ballyhoo from the Premier, who has been trying to deceive people in South Australia about investment, about what is happening in South Australia, and about how much confidence is developing in South Australia. For the interest of the Premier, his back-benchers, and the people who read *Hansard* in South Australia, I will quote from a well-respected journal of this nation. The serious problems that the Premier has ignored are now surfacing and being commented on in business journals throughout Australia. The articles I will read appeared recently, and I believe they seriously differ from the situation the Premier was trying to present in this House yesterday. They are in the latest issue of the influential journal, *Australian Business*. This journal describes investment prospects in Adelaide, and I would advise the Premier to listen to this, in case someone does not draw it

to his attention. Maybe he is not interested. He is interested only in the allegations he puts forward: he is not interested in criticism. The journal states:

The prospects for capital gains in the South Australian capital are so remote as to make it a bad risk for investors. Its current growth rate of 0.9 per cent is by far the lowest of all State capitals and compares miserably with the national rate.

This is in complete contradiction to the ballyhoo, the piffle, that the Premier has been pushing in this House and in the press of South Australia for the past 18 months.

The same journal presented a table listing the value of industrial building projects planned in Australian States as at 30 March 1981. Perhaps the Minister of Industrial Affairs will be interested in this. It states:

The \$7 951 000 [nearly \$8 000 000] listed for South Australia is well below the figures claimed for South Australia by the Tonkin Government.

I am not saying that—the journal makes that allegation, and it continues:

South Australia's share of industrial investment projects planned for Australia was a shameful 0.45 per cent.

I am not saying it is 4.5 per cent—it is 0.45 per cent (less than half a per cent), although South Australia has about 9 per cent of the nation's population and 9 per cent of the work force. That listing of planned investment projects was prepared by the highly respected Cordell Building Publications. If honourable members have been unable to read those projections and the survey by that organisation, I suggest that they do so as soon as they can. Yesterday, in his speech the Premier also referred to our declining population. Honourable members should remember that the Premier told the London Chamber of Commerce last year that the mass exodus of South Australians out of this State was over and that our population growth was now charting ascending curves. I am not sure what the Premier means by 'ascending curves', but I remember that statement well, because it rather struck me then to be a unique statement. Members know that the Premier makes many unique statements which can never be substantiated. The facts are that there is a greater exodus of people from South Australia now than has ever previously occurred in our recorded history. There is a simple reason why people are leaving—because this Government has been unable to fulfil its obligations and promises that it has made about development and jobs in this State. When this Government took over, it made all sorts of promises and projections about unemployment. The Government has not fulfilled any of those, and it cannot fulfil them on its present policies, and it knows it.

I wish now to refer to Brigadier Willett, Director of the South Australian Liberal Party. In a confidential memorandum dated 10 March 1981 he indicated that the approval rating of the Premier's performances had declined throughout 1980.

The SPEAKER: Order! I bring the Deputy Leader's attention to the motion before the Chair.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I noted that you did say, Mr Speaker, that from time to time speakers do stray a little.

The SPEAKER: The emphasis was on 'a little'.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I thought you would probably be as liberal with me, Mr Speaker, as you were with the Premier.

Mr Mathwin: Who wrote it down for you?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: It was not you.

Mr Mathwin: It was your research assistant.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader has been given the call to address himself to the motion before the Chair, not to enter into a discussion with the member for Glenelg.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: For the benefit of the member for Glenelg, I indicate that I have a photostat copy in my possession of the document from which I intend to read. That document was clearly directed to the Premier and his performance. I should now like to get back to the proposition before us. It is clear that some contradictory statements have been made by the Premier as opposed to those made by the Minister of Industrial Affairs. That is clearly the concept of this motion before the Chair.

The Hon. D. C. Brown interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The Leader has done that quite adequately. The Opposition is concerned that there is no unity among those on the benches on the other side of the House and that for some strange reason the Premier has decided to unload his Minister. Everyone in South Australia has been aware for a long time of the Minister's ambition to be Premier. We are all aware of the opportunity he had three or four years ago, which he reneged on; it has done him a great deal of damage.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: No doubt ever since that time there has been some feeling. On this occasion I feel quite confident that the Premier, because of his statements contradictory to those made by the Minister, has decided to embarrass the Minister. There can be no other reason: it is either that, or they are having two bob each way. It certainly could have been a plot. I am not quite certain whether it is a plot or not, or whether, at the consultations, no agreement could be reached, in which circumstances the Minister came out and made one statement which completely contradicted that of the Premier, and the Premier then comes into the House and unloads the Minister. I am sure when the Minister replies he will advise us about what really happened, but what I would like him to admit to this House is whether or not he is correctly reported in the *Advertiser*.

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

The Hon. D. C. BROWN (Minister of Industrial Affairs): Desperate men make stupid mistakes!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Hear, Hear!

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Just in case members opposite did not hear me, and I refer especially to the Leader of the Opposition, I repeat, desperate men make stupid mistakes. When one looks at the enormous blunder made by the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon in putting forward this motion, which I will refer to shortly, one sees just how desperate the Leader of the Opposition really is. It is fascinating that the whole thrust of both the Leader's and the Deputy Leader's speeches this afternoon has been that it is the Government that is divided, that there is an apparent split between the Premier and his Minister of Industrial Affairs.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: There always has been, and you know it.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I ask all members—where is the split? What have the papers been reporting on? The fact is that the Leader of the Opposition's own Party is fragmented. The Leader has had a shadow Minister resign; a shadow Minister has no regard for him; he has questioned his integrity. If ever there was a Party that was fragmented, split and shattered, it is the Labor Party of this State.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Let me now refer to the motion put forward by the Leader of the Opposition—that desperate man. First, he accuses the Premier of making misleading

and inaccurate statements. The other main thrust of his motion is that the Premier's statement contradicts what I apparently said in my press release.

Mr Keneally: You are not sure what you said?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Yes I am, and I shall read the entire press release to the honourable member in a moment. Let us look at the relevant parts of the Premier's speech which related to my press release, and let us look at those areas which apparently Opposition members are questioning. I refer to the second paragraph of the Premier's speech in this House yesterday. He said:

A number of matters outlined in the Budget clearly affect South Australia, and it is appropriate that I take this opportunity to comment on them.

The Premier was the first to say that there were aspects in the Budget that had a direct adverse impact on South Australia, and the Premier went on to give a speech outlining what those adverse impacts were.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Where, in fact, is there any misleading or inaccurate statement? The Leader of the Opposition himself has agreed with that statement and certainly no-one could in any way describe it as misleading.

Let us look at the relevant parts of the speech where it deals with sales tax exemptions. It states:

One of the predictions of doom and disaster has been a suggestion that South Australia has been singled out for especially harsh treatment in the Budget. This is demonstrably false. The additional 2½ per cent sales tax on a wide range of goods will have no greater adverse effect on South Australia's key motor vehicle and white goods industries than it will on any other State's industrial or manufacturing sectors.

Just so that people know exactly what I said yesterday, and to indicate that there was no contradiction in what I said I will read the entire press release which my press secretary put out yesterday morning. I dictated it to him over the phone and it was released yesterday morning, and the *Advertiser* was very accurate in its reporting. I shall read verbatim from that press release:

The increased and expanded sales tax imposed by the Federal Budget on a wide range of manufactured goods would have a detrimental effect on South Australian industry, the Minister of Industrial Affairs, Mr Dean Brown, said today.

He made this assessment as he headed to Canberra for talks on the future of manufacturing industry with the Minister of Industry and Commerce, Sir Phillip Lynch.

The people in Canberra and especially the Treasury bureaucrats, seem to have a hang-up against manufacturing industry, Mr Brown said.

Even though it employs around 20 per cent of the workforce and supports an even greater number in the service sector, Canberra seems intent on denying it growth and opportunity.

The increase in sales tax on manufacturing items follows closely talk of across-the-board tariff cuts.

The Budget reflects a paranoia with constraining money supply as a means of holding down wages.

It would be far better to use an effective industrial relations policy.

Mr Brown said he would discuss the sales tax increase with Sir Phillip Lynch and voice objections on behalf of South Australian consumers. The main purpose of the talks is to discuss the future of the motor vehicle industry during which Mr Brown will explain in detail South Australia's proposals for a balanced programme of local content plan, market sharing, export facilitation and a phased reduction of duty on imported built up units over a prescribed period.

The Hon. J. D. Wright interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader has had the call and I ask him to be silent.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I can understand why Opposition members are interjecting: it is because they have made such fools of themselves this afternoon in suggesting that there was any conflict between what I had said and what the Premier had said. I read out earlier that the Premier had said that there would be adverse effects on

South Australian industry, and that is exactly what the thrust was of my entire—

Mr Keneally interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Stuart has said enough.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: That was exactly the thrust of my press release. I repeat the first sentence:

The increased and expanded sales tax imposed by the Federal Government on a wide range of manufactured goods would have a detrimental effect on South Australian industry.

I did not say that it would particularly hit South Australia worse than the other States, as the Leader of the Opposition tried to imply. I said that it would have an adverse effect on South Australian industry. It will also have an adverse effect on Victorian, New South Wales, Tasmanian, Queensland and Western Australian industry. As the Ministers of Industrial Development are going to meet here in Adelaide tomorrow, no doubt in unison we will be putting our objections to Sir Phillip Lynch. They will be taking up the very point that I put to Sir Phillip last night when I had very lengthy discussions with him on a wide ranging number of subjects relating to manufacturing, particularly the South Australian automobile industry and its future and also the imposition of the sales tax.

Let us look at the evidence because, if we were going to accuse that Budget of being particularly harsh on South Australia but not harsh on other States, one would suppose that, in regard to the new line of sales tax (because there are a number of items where sales tax was imposed for the very first time), those new items would have come from South Australia and not from other States. Let me read through the items that were included in sales tax for the first time and let us examine whether or not they were specifically directed at this State because this State concentrates in that area.

The first area was clothing. This State has very little in the clothing industry. It has a couple of very successful jeans companies, but certainly one would not say that this State is a major manufacturer of clothing in Australia. Footwear: we have one footwear manufacturer of some significance in South Australia, but we certainly are not the major manufacturing State of footwear; that is Victoria, we all know that. Drapery: there is a little bit of drapery manufacturing in this State. There are a number of companies that make soft furnishings, I admit that, but again one would not say that South Australia is the predominant manufacturer of softwear. Manchester: we have one significant company, but there are other companies involved with manchester in Australia. Building materials: yes, there are some building materials made in this State, probably on about the same proportion as are made in other States, but it is not specifically directed at this State. Hand tools: I doubt whether we have the same percentage of hand tools manufactured in this State, even on a population basis, as are manufactured in other States. Then we have books, magazines, newspapers and wrapping materials. This State probably would have less of those on a per capita basis.

They are the items which are having sales tax applied to them for the first time. If the Federal Government (as the Leader accuses it of doing) is specifically picking on South Australia and trying to damage South Australian manufacturing industry, one would have supposed that it would pick out industries in this State rather than industries scattered predominantly throughout the other States. I think that highlights the fact. Neither the Premier is saying nor am I are saying that the increase in sales tax was desirable, or that it would not have an adverse effect on South Australian industry. Both of us have said that. What we are saying, and I concur entirely with the Premier, is that this tax will not have an effect on South Australia that will not also be

felt in the other States and it is not having a significantly greater effect on our manufacturing industry than it is having on comparable industries in other States.

Mr Langley: What about white goods? Can the Minister explain about white goods?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The member for Unley, I imagine, is rather embarrassed, because his Leader this afternoon has come out fighting, punching away and saying that there is a conflict between the Premier and the Minister of Industrial Affairs, yet he has not produced one skerrick of evidence to substantiate that claim. He has not produced one skerrick of evidence to hold up this entire motion that he has wasted one hour of the House's time on today. I find it incredible—no wonder the press regards the Opposition as a weak Opposition and the Leader as a weak Leader.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Which press?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The press has generally said that. The Opposition has snuffed yet another opportunity to ask penetrating questions of the Government, if members opposite could do so. Apparently, in my absence yesterday, the Premier tells me, they had none, and today they obviously had none and did not want to go through the embarrassing experience of yesterday, so the Opposition decided to put forward an urgency motion.

If there was a major conflict between the Premier and the Minister of Industrial Affairs, one would have thought that the Opposition would bring on a vote of no confidence in the Government. But no, it is an urgency motion. There is no vote. The Opposition wants to quietly slide away, fill in the time of the House and not be too embarrassed. I point out to the House that the Premier and I discussed the effects of the Budget on South Australian industry in some detail on Tuesday night. The Premier indicated that he was going to make a statement in the House, and I indicated that I would raise the matter with Sir Phillip Lynch, whom I was seeing within 24 hours. I raised the question with the Premier on what basis I should take that up. I am pleased to say that at least in our Party we consult, we agree, we confer and we work harmoniously. It is a sad reflection on the Opposition that it even attempts to bring forward such trifling motions to waste what I think is the valuable time of this House by putting up matters about which it cannot produce one single skerrick of evidence. After all, that speaks loads for the Opposition in this House. I retire on that basis.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): I find the Minister's approach in this matter extraordinary. On the one hand, it is obvious from what he is saying that the Minister disagrees entirely with what the Premier said. I cannot understand why it was necessary for two statements to be put out. Why was it necessary for that to happen unless it is that the Minister finds it difficult to go from one State to another without issuing some sort of press statement? This has been an extremely poor attempt to explain away what is obviously a conflict between the Premier and his Minister on this matter.

At 3.15 p.m., the bells having been rung, the motion was withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: Order! Call on the business of the day.

ESSENTIAL SERVICES BILL

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to protect the community against the interruption or dislocation of essential services. Read a first time.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Honourable members will recall that, several weeks ago, serious disruption to the community occurred due to industrial disputation and placed at risk the delivery of vital commodities, including food and petrol. In seeking to respond to the situation with which it was presented, the Government's powers were severely limited, except with regard to petrol, with which the Government could deal under the Petroleum Shortages Act passed last year.

The situation in South Australia is different from that pertaining in other States, where legislation exists to allow the Government to ensure that essential services are not interrupted. Indeed, the Victorian Government took action under its Essential Services Act of 1958 during the recent strike in order to maintain food deliveries, a matter of vital concern for the health and well-being of the community.

In our own State, during the T.W.U. dispute, *ad hoc* arrangements for the maintenance of essential food requirements made between the Government and that union did minimise the worst effects of the dispute. However, the Government is acutely aware that, if an accommodation of this type is not possible in the future, the outlook for the South Australian community will be bleak, to say the least. It is also aware that interruptions to essential services may result from causes other than industrial disputes, the medium to long-term economic and social effects of which are not dealt with by the State Disasters Act.

In these circumstances, the Government believes it appropriate that it should have the power to deal with such situations expeditiously. At the same time, it recognises that such powers must be exercised sparingly and only when absolutely justified by events. The Bill that I have introduced today takes account of these considerations.

The Bill provides that the Governor may declare a period of emergency and that specific essential services are the subject of such a proclamation where, in his opinion, circumstances have arisen, or are likely to arise, that have caused, or are likely to cause, an interruption or dislocation of essential services in the State. 'Essential service' is defined in the Bill to mean a service (whether provided by a public or private undertaking) without which the health of the community would be endangered, or the economic or social life of the community seriously prejudiced.

The Bill provides that such a period of emergency, which in the first instance must not exceed seven days, may be extended by successive periods of seven days up to a total of 28 days. Once a total of 28 days has been reached, no further extensions are permissible for a further 14 days, unless Parliament is recalled and approves a further extension of the period of emergency by a resolution of both Houses. These provisions regarding the length of the period of emergency are identical to those in the Petroleum Shortages Act approved by Parliament last year. It is considered that they strike a proper balance between the need for the Government to act promptly and responsively and the need for the Government to be accountable to Parliament for its actions, even though they can create some difficulty for the Government in an emergency.

During the period of emergency, the Minister may give directions relating to proclaimed essential services generally or to a particular proclaimed essential service. Such a direction may be given to a specified person, or class of person or members of the public generally.

Where such a direction is to a particular person or class of persons and, as a result, that person or class of persons incurs expense in complying with the direction, those expenses may be recovered from the Minister as a debt.

The Bill also provides that the Minister may provide, or assist in the provision of, a proclaimed essential service or provide, or assist in the provision of, a service in substitution for a proclaimed essential service. In exercising these pow-

ers the Minister may employ at not less than award rates such persons as he thinks fit and enter into such contracts or arrangements as he thinks fit. The Bill provides for the application of moneys from the general revenue for these purposes. Thus, any proposed action has to be weighed against its probable costs.

The Minister is also given power to requisition property. In the event that this power is exercised the Minister is liable to compensate the property owners for damage or deterioration to it while it was in the possession of the Minister and for loss suffered by the owner in consequence of deprivation of the use of his property. The property must be returned immediately the proclaimed period of the emergency ends. These powers can only be exercised by the Minister when he considers their exercise to be in the public interest.

Mr Keneally: It is the Minister who worries me more than the Bill.

An honourable member: Another Hitler!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Well, Heil Wran, because the essential services legislation in New South Wales is quite Draconian. The situation contemplated by the Bill—

The Hon. J. D. Wright interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: This legislation, if the honourable member cares to study it, strikes what we believe is a sensible and proper balance to achieve what the Bill seeks to achieve, and that is the flow of essential goods and services to the public in times of approaching crisis. The situation contemplated by this Bill, that is, a major disruption to essential services, may lead to acute shortages.

The Hon. J. D. Wright interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: As I have said, legislation such as this exists elsewhere in several States of Australia, and it has not led to revolution. It helped in the resolution of the dispute in Victoria quite expeditiously. For this reason, the Bill includes a provision enabling the Minister to fix maximum prices in relation to the sale of specified goods or services during a period of emergency to prevent profiteering.

The Bill includes appropriate penalties to ensure compliance with its provisions. The Bill reflects the Government's view that this legislation is required to safeguard the interests of the public in circumstances which we hope will not occur. We believe, however, that, in the light of recent experience in South Australia and in other States, it is necessary to have the ability to safeguard the public in those circumstances. I commend the Bill to the House.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 sets out the definitions required for the purposes of the new Act. I draw attention particularly to the definition of an 'essential service' which embraces any service (whether provided by a public or private undertaking) without which the health of the community would be endangered or the economic or social life of the community seriously prejudiced. It should be noted that a 'service' includes the production, distribution and supply of goods. Clause 3 provides for the declaration of a period of emergency in respect of specified essential services. Such a period is not to exceed seven days but it may be extended by further periods (each not to exceed seven days) until a maximum limit of twenty-eight days is reached. Then no further extension is possible unless authorised by a resolution of both Houses of Parliament. After the expiration of a period of emergency, no further such period is to be proclaimed until at least fourteen days have elapsed, unless Parliament otherwise authorises.

Clause 4 is a general power to give directions in relation to the provision or use of proclaimed essential services (i.e. services that have been declared by the proclamation establishing the period of emergency to be services in respect of

which the period of emergency applies). Clause 5 empowers the Minister himself to provide a proclaimed essential service, or to provide services in lieu of a proclaimed essential service. For the purpose of doing so, the Minister is empowered to enter into contracts of employment and other contracts. The general revenue can be applied towards satisfying the liabilities incurred by the Minister in providing services under the powers conferred by this clause. The Minister is also empowered to requisition property for the purpose of exercising the powers conferred by the clause. The owner is to be entitled to compensation for damage to or deterioration of the requisitioned property occurring while it is in the Minister's possession, and also for loss flowing from deprivation of the use of the property. Clause 6 empowers the Minister to gather information in relation to the provision or use of an essential service.

Clause 7 enables the Minister to fix maximum prices for goods and services during a period of emergency and imposes heavy penalties for profiteering. Clause 8 makes it an offence for a person to impede, by force or intimidation, the performance of a duty related to the provision of a proclaimed essential service, or the administration of the new Act. Clause 9 empowers the granting of exemptions from the provisions of the new Act, or of directions under the new Act. The terms of any such exemption must be published in the *Gazette* or in a newspaper circulating generally in the State. Clause 10 is a power of delegation. It should be noted that no delegation of the power to requisition property or to fix maximum prices for goods or services can be made. Clause 11 prevents actions being taken in pursuance of prerogative writs to compel the Minister to take, or to restrain him from taking, action under the new Act. Clause 12 is an evidentiary provision. Clause 13 provides for the summary disposal of proceedings in respect of offences under the new Act. Such proceedings are not to be commenced except upon the authorisation of the Attorney-General. Clause 14 is a regulation-making power.

Mr BANNON secured the adjournment of the debate.

INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. C. BROWN (Minister of Industrial Affairs) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972-1979; and to make consequential amendments to the Industrial Commission Jurisdiction (Temporary Provisions) Act, 1975-1977. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Government has been concerned for some time that the existing provisions of the State Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act do not require, or indeed allow, the commission to have regard to the current state of the South Australian economy and the effect that the claimed increase in wages or conditions would have on the economy.

The absence of any such requirement is in contrast to the provision contained in section 39 of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Act, which states:

In proceedings before the commission . . . the commission shall take into consideration the public interest and for that purpose shall have regard to the state of the national economy and the likely effects on that economy of any award that might be made in the proceedings or to which the proceedings relate, with special reference to the likely effects on the level of employment and on inflation.

This anomaly was highlighted during the most recent State wage case, which followed the awarding of a 3.6 per cent

increase to all employees under the Federal commission's jurisdiction, based on the wage indexation guidelines then applying. In response to argument by the United Trades and Labor Council that employees under State awards should receive a 4.5 per cent increase, being the rise in the consumer price index in the period under review, without any discounting as provided for in the national wage indexation guidelines, the State Government put forward evidence that any increase in excess of the nationally awarded increase would be detrimental to the State's economy, reduce our competitiveness both interstate and overseas, and reduce employment opportunities as a result. Commenting on the commission's lack of jurisdiction in this respect, the Full Bench in its decision of 3 July 1981 said:

Nowhere is any mandate given to the commission, in relation to proceedings pursuant to section 36, to look outside of the industrial questions raised before it and, for example, frame its decision according to general economic considerations touching upon the community at large. Its prime concern must be directed to the determination of the industrial issues arising between the parties subject to its awards.

We agree with a submission put to us that the South Australian tribunal is not constituted as 'some form of economic committee of enquiry'. Under the Industrial Act our approach must principally be the product of industrial relations considerations. At best general macro and micro economic aspects arise only as peripheral or background facets to the extent that they can fairly be said to be inextricably intertwined or at least closely connected with industrial relations considerations and attitudes.

In the July decision of the Australian commission abandoning the indexation system, Sir John Moore announced that in future the commission would be required to have regard, under section 39 of the Federal Conciliation and Arbitration Act to, *inter alia*, the state of the economy, with special reference to the level of employment and inflation.

The State Government, since its election, has placed prime importance on the need to restore the strength of the South Australian economy by encouraging industrial expansion and investment in the State, which thus results in higher employment and greater community confidence. Our drive has been based on selling the State's comparative advantage to potential investors here, interstate and overseas. These advantages include lower wage and other costs, greater availability of labour and in particular skilled labour, a good supply of industrial land which is close to all facilities and only a fraction of the cost of similar land in Sydney and Melbourne, an outstanding record in industrial harmony, bettered by no other State, excellent transport facilities which link South Australia with all other areas in Australia and overseas, and an imaginative package of industrial incentives provided by the State Government.

The key to the maintenance of this comparative advantage is that South Australia must not have wage increases which are above those occurring in other States. No single factor will be a greater constraint to industrial expansion in South Australia than wage increases greater than those applying elsewhere. It is even more important, now that wage indexation has been abandoned nationally, that we closely examine the impact which all wage claims will have on the State's economy, yet we must rely on an Act which gives no mandate to the Industrial Commission to have regard to the prevailing economic circumstances, even though there is a moral responsibility on the Full Bench and individual commissions when making awards to ensure that their decisions do not have significant adverse effects on the South Australian economy. It is the clear responsibility of the State Government to lay down the legal framework and general principles by which the industrial commission may operate. By the amendments contained in this Bill, the Government is setting an additional principle which has previously applied federally, but not in South Australia.

There is generally within the community an expectation that there will be a wages explosion in Australia following the collapse of wage indexation. The danger is that such an expectation may turn out to be self-fulfilling. To allow such to occur would be to run the very grave risk of returning to the events of 1973-74, when massive wage increases led to great inflationary problems, significant increases in unemployment, and a total loss of international competitiveness by Australian manufacturing industry. The Australian economy, and in particular the South Australian economy, has not yet fully recovered from that disastrous position.

Already there are ominous signs that a general wages push has commenced in South Australia. The State Industrial Commission has before it some 19 applications for wage increases, the bulk of which range from \$20 to \$30 a week. This is over and above the amounts already received this year by all employees in South Australia under wage indexation.

Whilst it is difficult to know just how these claims might be justified by the applicants and thus whether or not all would fall within or outside the wage indexation guidelines, nevertheless their impact on this State's economy will be significant. They are as follows:

Award	Claim (per week) \$
Breadcarters award	20.00
Boarding houses, guest houses	20.00
Bread and yeast goods—two claims	21.30
	20.00
Brushmaking C.C.	30.00
Cafes and restaurants	various from 8.30-15.70
Cake and pastry	21.30
Canteens, dine-ins	28.00
Canteen employees (industrial and commercial)	28.00
Caretakers and cleaners	10.00
Catering and reception houses	20.00
Delicatessens	20.00
	(approx.)
Dental technicians	7.30
	(approx.)
Field officers (Road Safety Council)	5 per cent increase
Fire Brigade officers	23.00
Minda Inc. award	10.00
	(not all classifications)
S.A. medical officers	60.00
	(approx.)
Transport workers (S.A.) award	20.00
Transport workers (S.A. Public Service)	8.00
Teachers Salaries Board	12 per cent

To take one of the claims as an example, the claim by teachers, if granted in full, would cost the State Government, or more precisely the taxpayers in South Australia, an additional \$36 000 000 in a full year. This amount is on top of the 3.7 and 3.6 per cent wage increases which teachers have already received so far this year under wage indexation. This means that teachers in an eight-month period would have had a salary increase of over 20 per cent.

To compound the problem, it has already been foreshadowed by the South Australian Institute of Teachers that the claim is to be amended from 12 per cent to 20 per cent. This would mean, for example, that a senior master, who in January of this year was on a salary of \$20 685 per annum, would, if the 12 per cent claim was granted, earn \$24 888 per annum, an increase of \$4 200 per annum, or \$26 666 per annum, an increase of \$6 000 per annum, if a 20 per cent claim was lodged and granted in full. The total additional cost of teachers' salaries in a full year as a result of these three increases would therefore total between \$60 000 000 and \$87 000 000 per annum.

This enormous increase in the cost of the State's education budget will have absolutely no effect on the standard of education. Ultimately, it can only lead to fewer teachers being employed, despite the already high unemployment rate which exists within that profession. Likewise, the \$60 a week claim by salaried medical officers in South Australian public hospitals, if granted in full, would mean that these employees would have received increases of between 27 per cent and 31 per cent since January this year, at an additional annual cost to the taxpayer of \$6 000 000 in Government hospitals and \$12 000 000 if one includes the Government subsidised hospitals. A further claim in respect of penalty payments for call-outs would cost \$3 000 000.

Members will be aware that in November of last year, the Government announced that Mr Frank Cawthorne, then an Industrial Magistrate in the Industrial Court, had been appointed to conduct a review of the South Australian Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act. Since his release from the Industrial Court, Mr Cawthorne has received submissions from interested parties and individuals on possible changes to the Act to meet current and likely future developments in industrial relations. Whilst it is not anticipated that Mr Cawthorne's report will be submitted to the Government until early next year, the abandonment of the wage indexation guidelines by the Federal commission has necessitated the Government taking these immediate steps to protect the State's economy from any possible wages explosion. Mr Cawthorne has been informed of these proposed amendments.

I must stress that the proposals embodied in this Bill will in no way limit the considerations of Mr Cawthorne or of any recommendations he might make to the Government. The amendments now proposed will still be subject to the result of the review. If desirable, further changes will be made to the sections of the Act now amended in the light of his report. The object of the measures contained in this Bill is to provide a legislative framework in which there is commonality in the processing of claims and consistency of treatment between the Commonwealth and South Australian tribunals. The amendments proposed will provide an avenue through which wage and other claims by South Australian workers can be appropriately processed, in which due regard will be given to equity and fairness, and by which protection will be given to the lowest paid workers and industrially weak unions.

It may be, however, that as a result of the consultations now taking place between the parties to the system, both federally and in South Australia, and the Presidents of the various Commonwealth and State tribunals, a new centralised wage fixing system will be proposed. In this event, the Government will consider whether further amendments to the Act are required.

This Bill thus requires the commission, whether it be a single Commissioner or a Full Bench, to have regard to the public interest in arbitrating a claim or certifying an agreement, and, for that purpose, to take into account the prevailing economic circumstances, with particular regard to the likely effects of its decision on the South Australian economy. In this respect, special regard must be had to the likely effects on the level of employment and inflation. These principles will also apply to all other wage fixing tribunals, such as the Teachers Salaries Board and Public Service Board, operating in the South Australian sphere. I also point out that the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal will come under exactly the same scrutiny. I stress that there will be no double standards. We will subject ourselves to the same standards as we are asking everyone else in the State to be subjected to.

In addition, all industrial agreements will have to be certified by the Industrial Commission as being in the

public interest, using the same guidelines as outlined above. This provision goes somewhat further than the Federal provision, which only applies to Full Bench hearings. However, the Government believes it is pointless to allow a single Commissioner to decide a matter without regard to the public interest and the state of the economy, when there is a general right of appeal to a Full Bench which is required to have regard to these matters.

The effect of such a provision will ensure that the South Australian economy can support any further increases in wages payable to its workers. A high level of wages is possible only with a strong, prosperous economy, without which the whole basis of employment is threatened. Accordingly, this measure seeks to maintain a balance between these two interests.

In the current industrial climate and its associated uncertainties it is desirable for the Minister of Industrial Affairs to be able to intervene in the public interest in all matters, including consent agreements, coming within the jurisdiction of the Industrial Commission, and to be able to have any matter referred to a Full Bench. The inclusion of this provision will enable the Government to have access to the commission when matters of particular concern are under consideration. As representative of the people of this State generally, the Government views as crucial the right to bring before the commission the implications of matters of principle, such as the shorter working week. At the present time, there is some doubt that the Minister of Industrial Affairs can seek a reference to a Full Bench; this provision will place the matter beyond doubt.

This Bill is an important measure which deserves the consideration and support of all members in this place. In any system in which diverse partisan interests and the community are involved, the public interest must always be paramount. This Bill seeks to give effect to that principle to ensure that the industrial relations system in South Australia remains viable and effective. I seek leave to incorporate into *Hansard* without my reading it the Parliamentary Counsel's explanation of the clauses.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 are formal. Clause 4 amends the definition of 'industrial agreement' in order to achieve conformity with the amendments proposed to section 108. Clause 5 gives the Minister the necessary standing to enable him to request that a matter be referred for hearing before the Full Commission. Clause 6 provides for the registration of industrial agreements. Where an industrial agreement affects remuneration or working conditions it is not to be registered except upon the authority of the commission. In determining whether to grant that authority, the commission will of course have regard to the public interest in pursuance of the new Division IA of Part X. A transitional provision covering existing agreements is included.

Clause 7 introduces new Division IA of Part X. New section 146a contains definitions required for the purposes of the new Division. New section 146b is the major provision of the new Division. It provides that in arriving at a determination affecting remuneration or working conditions an industrial authority must have due regard to the public interest and is not to make a determination unless satisfied that it is consistent with the public interest. In determining that question an industrial authority is required to consider the state of the economy and the likely effects of the determination on the economy with particular reference to its effects upon employment and inflation. New section 146c empowers the Minister to intervene in the public interest, in proceedings before an industrial authority.

Clause 8 makes amendments to the Industrial Commission Jurisdiction (Temporary Provisions) Act designed to bring it into consistency with the amendments to the principal Act.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT secured the adjournment of the debate.

COLLECTIONS FOR CHARITABLE PURPOSES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. W. A. RODDA (Chief Secretary) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Collections for Charitable Purposes Act, 1939-1947.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

At present the Collections for Charitable Purposes Act provides for an advisory committee to furnish advice in relation to the administration of the Act. The advisory committee consists of five members and its functions are to consider and advise the Minister on all applications for licences to collect donations for charitable purposes and, if the Minister so requests, to investigate and report to the Minister on whether proper grounds for the revocation of a licence exist. In practice the advisory committee meets infrequently, and much of the work of the committee is in fact carried out by officers of the Chief Secretary's office.

The Government's policy is to abolish statutory authorities where no substantial justification for their continued existence can be demonstrated. The Government believes that the advisory committee constituted under the Collections for Charitable Purposes Act is not necessary to the proper administration of the Act, and should therefore be abolished. The present Bill is designed to achieve that object. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 repeals section 10 which establishes the advisory committee. Clause 4 amends section 11 by removing the provisions under which applications for new licences must be referred to the advisory committee. Clause 5 amends section 12, which provides (*inter alia*) for revocation of a licence. The grounds of revocation, which are presently stated in section 13, are removed to this section. Clause 6 repeals section 13 of the principal Act. This section provides for an investigation by the advisory committee in order to determine whether grounds for revocation of a licence exist.

Mr KENEALLY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 19 August. Page 492.)

Mr EVANS (Fisher): This is a traditional debate during which a member can speak for an hour. Traditionally, not many Ministers speak in this debate. First, I would like to take the opportunity of thanking the Governor for presenting his address to members and putting the Government's programme and policies for the coming 12 months before not only Parliamentarians but also the people of South Australia. I wish to congratulate the mover of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply in this House, the

member for Todd, and the seconder, the member for Henley Beach. I believe that they did justice to the duty that they had. They carried out that duty in the traditional manner carried out by members given that opportunity. As is the case with both Parties, this opportunity is usually given to members serving for the first time, and I congratulate those two members on their efforts.

I have lived in the Hills all my life, as have four generations of my family. We have learnt to know and understand the name Playford and know what it means to the people of the Hills, the people of South Australia, and to some degree the people of Australia.

I wish to place on record my sincere thanks not only to Sir Thomas Playford for what he gave to South Australia while he was with us but in particular to his wife and other members of his family for the sacrifices they must have made to give him the opportunity to serve as he did, whether as a Parliamentarian or in the war. Only those who are Parliamentarians or those who have served in the armed forces (and I have not) can understand what sacrifices a family must make, and in particular I refer to the sacrifices that must have been made for a man carrying the load that Sir Thomas Playford carried when he was leader of this State. I will refer later to Sir Thomas's particular role in one area of the State. However, at this stage I wish to pass on to the Playford family not only my own condolences but also those of my family who have had the privilege of knowing and who have respected the Playford family, in particular Sir Thomas, over many years.

Before I turn to areas of Government policy I wish to refer to one matter that is of concern within my electorate, and it relates to a piece of land at Blackwood upon which a major retailer, together with other retailers, has for some time been attempting to establish a business. The piece of land is referred to as the Coles land, but in fact not only Coles was involved in the project. It was to be developed by a developer together with other people who have an interest in some of the projects that were to be developed. The piece of land is positioned in an area surrounded by Young Street, Waite Street, Main Road and Edwards Street, Blackwood. Part of that piece of land, surrounded by those streets, is zoned residential. Part of it still has on it houses which are owned by private individuals.

When Coles and other interests originally decided that they would like to develop this area, it is true to say that they made application to have the part of that which they owned, which I believe consisted of five allotments and which was zoned residential, rezoned for commercial purposes. That was a particular area that concerned a lot of people in the near vicinity, and in particular a substantial number of people in Waite Street, Blackwood. Also, on the complex to be developed there was a considerable number of specialty shops. This caused some of the small businesses, quite rightly, to be concerned about the effect that those specialty shops might have on their own businesses.

I held a meeting with those business operators, as I understood and had discussed their problems. At that stage I made the point to them that at no time in the past, and in fact up to the present time, have they ever advertised or worked together as a group to promote the Mitcham Hills as a place where one could shop and buy most of one's commodities. It disappoints me that they have not taken up that challenge, and I will refer to that again a little later when I refer to another problem which will cause them greater concern in the future unless they unite.

Subsequently, because of pressures brought to bear, the developers were prepared to develop only the land zoned for commercial purposes and make the other land which was zoned residential available to the Mitcham council for acquisition for development as a park area. It was a great

compromise. Previous to this, a petition had been produced within the community objecting to the original proposition. I might say that many petitions have been passed around within my community, and in most cases people have had the courtesy to make them available to me. They do not have to do so, but people have taken the opportunity to exercise the courtesy to make petitions available to me as local member.

On this occasion I was not given a copy of that petition, but I am led to believe by people who have come into my office since and who have stated that they support the compromise that, if a petition went around now, they would support the compromise strongly. Others who have come into my office have stated that they did not sign the petition even though they have been told that their signature appears on it. I cannot prove that but I do know that, in relation to the petition on the Coromandel Valley dam, when I wrote to all the people whose signatures I could decipher and whose addresses I could decipher, I received back many complaints, in particular from a father who said that although his and his children's signatures apparently appeared he did not sign it himself. It appears that one of his children signed it on behalf of a household and the signatures were not genuine at all.

One becomes concerned when people state that a petition has 7 000 signatures of council electors on it when I am advised by some people that, in the case of the petition over a shopping centre, they were not electors or they did not sign it themselves but that somebody else did; maybe a child or a friend signed their name and gave an address. Again, I cannot prove that, but I would welcome having a copy of the petition made available to me, and I would guarantee that I would trace all the signatures that I could decipher to see whether that was the case.

I could understand the objection originally of the small business operators, because having a large number of speciality shops there would have affected them quite adversely. However, under the new proposal I believe that the small shop operators are unwise if they oppose it (and I will attempt to explain why), except for perhaps one or two categories. I can, for example, understand the concern of an individual operating a shop that sold records and related equipment which Coles is likely to sell. If that shop now operating in Blackwood is a speciality shop, that person would have a real concern about the sort of products and the prices that Coles might charge, as that would make it more difficult for him to operate. I do not believe that it is necessarily the case, because where you have a family-operated business and a personal service within a business a big operator cannot always take away a major part of the business. If people want to buy a speciality item at a discounted rate, they will travel to another shop in the metropolitan area or to the city to get a discounted price if they are not concerned about personalised service.

The other reason that I would like to emphasise on why small operators should be concerned if Coles does not come there is that there is a trend already, particularly amongst pensioners who can travel free of charge, to catch the bus or train to other areas. Coles is still getting the custom from some people from Mitcham Hills because people are travelling by train from Mitcham Hills to Bridgewater. It is a pleasant trip, free of cost, and people can buy at a lower price. If Coles were to build at Blackwood, residents would have four of the major operators such as Woolworths, Foodland, Bi-Lo, and Coles all operating and keeping one another to a real competitive basis.

I make that point quite strongly for the small business people and, more particularly, I advocated it to the small business operators that, if they wanted to get back to Blackwood, those people who do not shop at Blackwood,

who live in Mitcham Hills (and the number is quite substantial), will travel to Blackwood. I meet with a number of service clubs and community organisations, and many people say to me that they will not shop in Blackwood because there is not enough car parking, that the prices are too high or that there is not a big enough variety of goods. Therefore, they shop out of Blackwood.

If the operators in Blackwood, big and small, were prepared collectively to operate a free bus service (and it would not cost as much as a lot of their advertising) to service different parts of the Mitcham Hills on different days at hourly intervals, I guarantee that those operators would recoup a much greater profit than the bus would cost them per year and that they would get people to return to Mitcham Hills more than they have in the past.

One of the problems we have in this debate is that many of the people who are arguing about whether Coles should build in the compromise situation (and I must state that the number of protesters now is very small) have forgotten about one section of the community; they have forgotten about the pensioners, the poor and the low income group.

It is easy for those of us in the middle class, or further up the ladder, to advocate that certain standards should be met within a community and that there should be more parks and open spaces. However, those people forget that those facilities cost a lot to maintain, with interest to be paid on money that may be used to buy the land and the cost of rates and taxes. Those of us who can afford these things find it not too difficult to make a contribution. When I was a boy in Mitcham Hills, if one went from Upper Sturt to the city one passed the McGoughs, the Westcombes and the Hannafords, but there were not many other people there. However, suddenly, somebody wanted to live there. Hawthorndene, Blackwood and Belair have some old developments. People went to live in those areas, and the people who were then living there did not complain about neighbours coming.

People went there because they wanted to live there, so roads, footpaths and cycle tracks had to be developed, and shops, schools, churches, and so on had to be built. As more and more people came to live in the area, the demand for facilities rose. Those people required sewerage and water supply. In other words, those people who live in those areas have created demands that have made a difference to the environment. It is no longer an open paddock. Once 100 houses are built in a paddock, it is different. The only way to return that paddock to what it was would be for people like myself (and my family has lived in the Hills a bit further out than Blackwood for over 100 years) to admit that they should not be there, move out, knock the houses down and grow pasture, native trees, or whatever it may be.

In other words, we have become a selfish society, especially the middle and upper class groups. We tend to forget it is a benefit for pensioners and others to buy at a reasonable rate. I said earlier that I would come back to another competitor which is going to cause problems for the Mitcham Hills. I refer to the Aberfoyle Hub complex, which is already advertising as a group. The hub is known as a centre, as an identity. It does not have much trade yet, but as time goes by it will have an effect upon the Mitcham Hills business, so it is important that the Mitcham Hills operators advertise as a block to offer the best service possible to the area so that people will find it pleasant to shop in Blackwood and find that the service is courteous, prices are down to a reasonable figure, and there is plenty of car parking.

The Mitcham council has done its bit by developing a good library. There is a good community centre with all sorts of sporting facilities available. Good ovals have been

developed, and the Belair recreation park is nearby. It is a magnificent area in which to live. I hope that those people will see the benefit of a compromise coming into being, although I understand in all sincerity why they wish to protest, some because they are against big business and some because they genuinely want a bigger open space area in the centre of Blackwood.

However, I suggest that the vast majority who want the thing settled and over and done with should say to their friends and neighbours, 'Now is the time to write to Mitcham council and support the compromise which I believe is available so that the matter can be resolved and so that the community no longer suffers from all the disquiet that it has had in recent times.' In that way, people will tend to shop locally instead, as they are doing at present, of leaving the district to get the variety of products that they wish to purchase and at the price that they want to pay.

I now move back briefly to the Playford era. Sir Thomas Playford came into Parliament, and more particularly became Premier of this State, at a time when our country and the rest of the world was moving out of a massive depression. Sir Thomas saw the need at that time to develop the authority called the Housing Trust, to which I will refer later. More particularly, Sir Thomas had the opportunity of working in a State that was in an early stage of development. It was moving out of the depression, when there was some movement in the economy. He saw the benefit of our being a low-cost State. I emphasise that, because this was one of the real long-term benefits. Then, Sir Thomas found it not difficult to govern during the years of the Second World War, as everyone had his mind on one goal: to win that war for the sake of the freedom of the free world against a ruthless aggressor.

After the war, apart from the shortage of materials for building and other projects, there was a great opportunity to produce food for export and, at the same time, to create a greater industrial base in this State. Sir Thomas did that and did it well. In a way, those were boom times, and with them was the temptation to find the easy road, spend big and be unwise. However, Sir Thomas Playford was a frugal man who led a simple, happy life. He had the capacity to work hard, and not only did he carry a big work load but also he understood people. He was happy talking with any group of people, regardless of their status. Sir Thomas worked in that area in a very genuine way, taking an interest in people.

We do not live in such stable times now. Indeed, we live in a society which is greedy and affluent and which has learnt to take many luxuries for granted. So, Governments will find it more difficult now, than was the case during the Playford era, to govern for long periods. Each and every one of us, as Parliamentarians, needs to be aware of that, not just for the sake of Party-political expediency but also for the sake of the State.

I now refer to the Housing Trust, which was set up, as I said, by the Playford Government in the 1930s and the main role of which was to help with shelter for the disadvantaged, and, in particular, only while they were disadvantaged. That was the whole intent of that move at that time.

Under this Government, the Housing Trust has returned to its principal and traditional role of providing quality welfare housing for low-income and moderate-income earners and pensioners. It has shifted the emphasis of its construction and purchasing programmes from the fringe suburban developments to the established areas. For example, in the rental field, since September 1979 to the end of March 1981, 9 595 new tenants were housed, and during the six-month period from October 1980 until March 1981 the trust housed a record 2 764 new tenants.

Of this number, 54 per cent received subsidised rent, as compared with 49 per cent in the corresponding period last financial year. Taking the figures a little further, for the financial year 1980-81, 5 868 first-time tenants were given accommodation, the highest number of people in the history of the Housing Trust to have rental accommodation made available to first-time tenants. The trust's construction programme is concentrating more on the provision of urgently needed rental accommodation, and all dwellings now are built by private enterprise. For example, in 1979-80, the number of dwellings commenced for sale (and some of these were later rented) was 976; in 1980-81 it was 410, 270 of which were sold and 140 rented; in 1981-82 the number of dwellings commenced for sale was nil.

Commencements for rental in 1979-80 numbered 573, in 1980-81 it was 1 085, and in 1981-82 it will be 1 000 plus. In other words, the Government has directed the Housing Trust in the direction in which it was originally intended to operate, supplying shelter for those who could not afford to get it in other areas. Housing for pensioners has received greater attention under this Government, and the number of cottage flats completed in the metropolitan area was as follows: in 1978-79 it was 64, or 4 per cent of the total metropolitan programme; in 1979-80 it was 239, or 22 per cent of the total metropolitan programme, and in 1980-81 it was 254, or 35 per cent of the total metropolitan programme. This year it is anticipated that the figure will be 308, which will be 41 per cent of the total metropolitan programme, showing that this Government has a real concern for pensioners and is attempting to take up the backlog that was allowed to occur under the previous Government, which claimed to be concerned about the position of people in getting adequate shelter and which had 10 years to set about this programme but did not take up the real challenge. The present Minister and the Government are to be congratulated on their efforts.

In the past financial year, nearly 200 dwellings have been modified for disabled persons. In future, the doors in all new dwellings will have a minimum width of 820 mm, which will allow people using wheelchairs to use the buildings.

Turning to special interest groups, the trust is taking steps to make available up to 50 dwellings to voluntary agencies providing minimal supervised housing for young people under 18 years of age. To the beginning of this financial year, the trust had allocated seven homes to homeless young people and was considering three proposals from voluntary agencies for an additional five dwellings, subject to local government approval. Three dwellings have been allocated to groups assisting refugees from other lands.

The Emergency Housing Office is now under Ministerial control but is managed by the South Australian Housing Trust. An officer from the trust has been appointed as a supervisor, and a continuation of the Waymouth Street office for a further two years was confirmed in April. The office commenced operation in September 1978 as a pilot project. Its role extended to helping youth and the aged as well as families with children. A staff increase from 10 to 14, and an anticipated budget of \$100 000 are planned for 1981-82. In the area of substandard housing, until 1 July of this year it was always the practice that the Housing Trust should carry out inspections, but that matter is now in the hands of local government. The rent fixing arrangements, where there is a dispute on the lower standard housing available, are in the hands of the Housing Trust.

By passing that inspection role over to local government it will save the trust \$100 000 a year. The Housing Trust no longer carries out the role of providing special financial deals for clients. The trust has ceased to provide special finance for the sale of its new dwellings and has ceased all

forms of mortgage assistance to its clients. Thus, it competes fairly with the private sector. In the area of double units, this Party has always advocated that, where a tenant wishes to buy their own home and they have been living in it as rented accommodation for some time, they should have that opportunity. Tenants of 10 or more years have been given the opportunity to purchase their double unit dwellings. To date, 55 tenants have accepted the trust's offer, and finance is arranged privately. There is no need to use public funds for that area.

In relation to support for the private sector, the Government has encouraged the trust to lease housing from the private sector at market rents and to sub-let dwellings at subsidised rates to trust tenants. This scheme allows for the tenants to be located in preferred areas and it saves the trust high capital costs in buying properties. One hundred dwellings are leased on this basis. It is an innovative approach and one which the South Australian Housing Trust alone in Australia is actively pursuing. Joint ventures are an exciting innovation introduced by the Government.

The arrangement entails the trust sharing the cost of development, and in some cases administrative costs, with councils and/or service organisations. Thirty-five such ventures are currently in various stages of negotiation in both metropolitan and country areas. For example, 169 additional pensioner units have been built as a result of joint ventures with councils. Further, all funds expended on construction, maintenance and upgrading work on all dwellings owned by the Housing Trust are used to employ private contractors. In other words, all of that work is now available to private contractors in line with this Party's philosophy that the private sector is the most efficient, if it has made a contract and tendered for work to carry out that particular work.

In relation to the Government's industrial incentive scheme, the Housing Trust co-operates by making land available for factories or making factories available. If there is a need to negotiate for some short-term benefit to get a particular industry here, the trust works in co-operation with the Government in attempting to achieve that. Likewise, if housing is required for employees, the trust is there to help by making available rental accommodation on a temporary basis until more permanent arrangements can be made; or, if need be, even supplying some on a permanent basis.

The management of the Elizabeth neighbourhood shops and the Housing Trust's other metropolitan shops has been transferred to the private sector. In other words, it is an area where we believe that the Government does not need to be involved and we have passed it over to the private sector where it must compete on a proper and competitive basis. In relation to gardening, up until now much of that was done by the Housing Trust itself. This Government is gradually handing that area over to the private sector. The gardening done by private contractors has increased by 118 per cent when compared to that made available to that sector last year.

This Government has always been concerned about the urban sprawl, and members in this House have heard me talk about this on many occasions when I had the responsibility of housing in my lap. This Government, through the trust, has at least tackled that problem. The trust has shifted the emphasis of its Adelaide house construction programme from fringe and suburban development to one of infill and redevelopment of land in established areas where community infrastructure is more highly developed. The trust commenced 33.6 per cent of all 1980-81 new constructions within the Gepps Cross to O'Halloran Hill sector of Adelaide. Northern suburbs provided sites for 20.9 per cent of the trust's commencements in 1980-81 and

the southern suburbs only 9.4 per cent. In the area of country housing, we must never forget that there are disadvantaged people in the country who need shelter, the same as those in the metropolitan area. In 1980-81, 650 dwellings were commenced, compared to 438 in 1979-80.

This programme will assist economic development outside the metropolitan area of Adelaide. I believe we all realise that the more we decentralise, the less pressures there will be on the metropolitan sector and the greater the opportunity for the rural communities and towns to survive and maintain a separate identity without being concerned about becoming a run-down village or town.

In the area of management and efficiency, work is substantially completed on upgrading the trust's financial and management systems following a review, in conjunction with Price Waterhouse and Associates. The trust is actively limiting staff numbers and at the end of March last year the total number of employees was 1 014, from a peak of 1 142 in September 1978. On 1 May an early retirement scheme was offered to 236 weekly paid and salaried staff aged 55 years and over. The offer remained until 31 July. To date, 111 employees have already accepted the proposal and it is anticipated that the scheme will assist in bringing about a total reduction in excess of 15 per cent of staff members over the three years to October 1981 without retrenchments. The wages that will be saved when this programme is fully implemented will amount to \$1 800 000 a year, which can be used to house those who are disadvantaged.

The trust has rationalised its motor vehicle fleet; the number of vehicles has been reduced from 350 at September 1979 to 280 at the end of May 1981. In the private housing sector, the Government is committed to assisting the private building sector by encouraging home ownership and, in particular, helping first home buyers. We removed stamp duty for the first home buyer on houses to the value of \$30 000, with a reduction of \$580 thereafter. To 30 April 1981, 13 300 first home buyers benefited from this initiative.

The maximum housing loan available from the State Bank has increased from \$27 000 to \$33 000, and all of the loan is contained in a single mortgage at the concessional interest rate rather than a loan being divided, with a second and a higher rate of interest. Loans are available equally for new and established homes and, if required, in two parts, the second part being for additions or renovations to an older home. The Savings Bank has introduced a deferred interest loan or low start loan, which is available for 88 per cent or less of the original valuation of the property.

In recent times, I have been concerned at the attitude that exists within our community in relation to housing and I will take the opportunity to further expand on and reiterate some of the statements I previously made. The tradition in this country has always been that to have control of one's own shelter is the most valuable material asset one can have, and I believe that has been the tradition in most societies. Modern advertising methods and high-pressure salesmanship, which virtually all of our young people have experienced for the past two decades, have encouraged them to become slaves of interest rates and working agents for the moneylenders.

The only possible counter to these questions, so that we can save much of the heartbreak that inevitably occurs because of the trend towards luxuries in early life, is in the hands of government, industry, parents and tutors, but I do not put them in order of priority—they all have equal responsibilities. Governments spend millions of dollars on advertising the benefits that are available after people hit skid row or when they are on their way towards it.

Industry whinges because interest rates are too high or the cost of buying a home is outside the monetary funds available to the purchaser. Parents complain because their sons and daughters face a difficult future in buying a home. Each and every one of these three groups could alter this trend if they felt strongly enough about it instead of blaming someone else.

I will come to the tutor's role later. I have advocated to industry and different Governments for years that it would be quite proper to start an ongoing advertising campaign pointing out the benefits to people, in particular the young, of putting money aside to build a home and showing them that the benefits of staying home with mum and dad in the accommodation that mum and dad have got is quite immense.

Perhaps I could point out to mum and dad that it would be better, where the family tends to be really strict, to give a little more freedom to the older teenagers even if it means changing a window space to provide a door, than to have them leave home, paying rent for flats and home units, even if sharing, and thus pouring down the drain money that could be of vital benefit in future home purchases.

For example, if young persons leave home at 17 years (many leave before then), they float around from flats and home units until 22 years, or some other age around that, even paying on average half the normal rent for a mediocre flat, which can be \$15 a week or \$4 250 over five years; in some cases they pay the full rent of \$9 500 over the five-year period. If they had that money invested, the amount of interest at 10 per cent would give them another \$1 000 for the \$4 200 or, on the full amount, \$2 000. Add to this the extra cost of furnishing and of independent living away from home over that five-year period of at least \$1 000 a year. In one case, that makes it \$10 000 minimum extra that the person could have available at 22 years or in the other case \$16 000.

Mr Keneally: What would they pay as board?

Mr EVANS: The honourable member asked me what they would pay for board. There are two ways of doing it: mum and dad would charge them either a nominal amount or the proper amount, whichever the family decided. In my particular case, I paid a moderate amount of board and at the time I was married I was given enough money to virtually furnish half the house. I say that it is cheaper to live at home and share the cost with parents than to pay for other shelter. The honourable member cannot disagree with that.

It disappoints me to find that we, as a Government, tend to make it easier for young people to leave home and Government agencies, in some cases, encourage them to leave home. In many homes on odd occasions there have been some hassles. That is part of the process of learning to live together in a society. Once we develop a society of that attitude, that you spend all you get when you are young and then complain if taxpayers will not support you in your mid-20s, we develop a discontented attitude. Many people would carry this attitude for the rest of their life, blaming others for what, in the main, is their own fault and the fault of others who did not give them guidance.

If the Government would spend only 25 per cent of what it spends on Government advertising for people to join the Armed Forces, or to advise on social security and other benefits which are available, and if industry spent 5 per cent of its total advertising budget on educational films and promotion of the benefit of owning one's own home, our young people would then understand and many would think through their values. They are as intelligent as any previous generation and would soon learn to understand the benefits.

Tutors have an important role to play in the process of continually emphasising to young people that we can all

have a thrilling time when we are young in one or two ways, either by spending the money on luxuries and trying to outdo the Jones's, or by creating one's own fun with moderate expenses. In the past schoolteachers were on salaries that were very poor compared to salaries in many other professions, so when the students saw teachers eating cut lunches, arriving in old motor cars or in many cases on public transport (I am not saying some do not today), tutors gave an image of being frugal because they had to be.

With the increase in salaries and teachers marrying other teachers, tutors are enjoying a much more affluent lifestyle. They often have the most expensive cars fitted with all the fancy gadgets such as tape decks, and so on. They talk about the parties they have given, and people they have met. They go on trips overseas and to other States, and talk to students about this. This is accepted as the norm. I emphasise that parents are in the same category. I am not saying teachers are any different from those categories.

They shoot down to the local for a counter lunch, or to a restaurant on special occasions, or sometimes without a special occasion. It is only natural that children believe that when they leave school that will be their norm also. If parents are in a worse position financially than the teachers, children visualise that they will be schoolteachers when they leave school, or will be in other more highly paid professions.

I do not condemn ambition. I encourage it, but with ambition we always have to have in the back of our mind what are the possible realities. Through these processes alone, unless our teachers set out to encourage young people to save for their future shelter, another generation will be led down the path to poverty and dependence upon taxpayers, and that includes schoolteachers who pay a significant tax.

It is to their benefit in the long term that they think about the system. I am not advocating that teachers are any worse than any other section of the society in which we live. Other sections of affluence exist in our society, but I am attempting to look at the areas where there is a direct influence, or where people could have a direct influence upon other people's goals. I know that, as a politician, I am paid a substantial salary upon which I can live very comfortably. Except for my home, I do not believe anyone could accuse me of setting examples that would encourage people to squander, and not save, though some accuse me that my driving around in a 1964 Falcon is a status symbol in reverse.

My goal with a motor vehicle has been to get from point A to point B, just as it was with a horse or push bike, or by walking. It just happens that the Falcon is slightly quicker than all those methods I have used in the past. The only thing slower than those methods is public transport, because one sometimes has to walk, or wait for several days until people go back to work.

Parents have a major role in this field. I refer to the period just after the Second World War, which I remember clearly, the migrants who came to this country achieved their own home or shelter and immediately started to buy a block of land or put money aside so their children could have the opportunity to begin to have their own shelter.

I admit that nowadays parents spend much more in attempting to get a better education for their children, but in many cases they buy other things, such as the holiday shack, the caravan or the boat. I do not deny them those material things, but they must realise that in doing that and not putting something aside to help their children establish themselves, they leave a greater risk of their children having a broken marriage or a sadder life in the future.

Mr Keneally: Do you realise there are many parents who find it difficult to survive, apart from putting something aside for their children?

Mr EVANS: The member raises a good point. I am not advocating that all parents or people can be encouraged to save to buy their own shelter or achieve it more easily. I spoke about the Housing Trust earlier and was making the point that there will always be some such people in the world, through no fault of their own in some cases, or in some cases it is deliberately through their own fault, but without the intent of ending up as they do. There will be some who are disadvantaged through accident, some through an inability to confront problems, and many through sheer bad luck. I do not deny that.

I am trying to advocate that, if we get more people to save for their own shelter in the future (and it will be five or six years before we get the message through) we will have more money to help the disadvantaged. I hope people can understand that, because that is the real message that I am trying to sell.

I wish now to refer to local government. I cannot understand one problem in local government, or perhaps it can be understood if one realises that in the main people serving in local government are middle-class or higher-range people who try to inflict their standards on others.

Mr Keneally: Not all.

Mr EVANS: I said 'in the main'. The problem is this: at one time one could build the front of a house or the back of a house and develop the rest later. If one tries to do it today, local government will deny one the right to do that. Why is that? The structure can conform to the building Act and the materials can conform to the Act and the health regulations, but the council will stipulate that, if one is married and has a child or even no children, one must have two bedrooms built in the house at the start, or that one must have a certain number of square metres constructed. In my view that is unprincipled, and it is a case of the middle class applying its standards to people from all sections of society.

We must be able to cater for the person who is prepared to be a battler, who does not want to become a slave of interest rates, or a working agent for a money lender, a person who is prepared to pay for it, as he goes. We did it immediately after the war, and a few backenders or frontenders that were never finished caused some concern, but in any system there are some failures. Many people who are now mums and dads achieved the desired goal by being allowed to build their property piecemeal.

Councils increase the minimum rate on vacant blocks, because they think the owner of such a block is a developer or something, that he does not live in the area and does not have a vote, and the same applies to a person's water and sewerage rates and charges. I say that it would be quite proper for the Government to allow an individual to own one allotment, and local government could do the same thing, and make charges minimal for one allotment holders. Such owners would have to sign a declaration that they did not hold any other allotments anywhere else in the State. In fairness, this would give people a start in life, and the same arrangement could apply with water rating and sewerage rating. It would not amount to a massive amount of money, because most people attempt to buy a house that has been completed. These days with higher transport costs people are moving to the inner city area. If people doubt my comments about the number of allotments available, they should have a look at the number of allotments, in particular, developed by the Land Commission on the fringes of Adelaide. It is too far for people to travel from those areas, as fuel costs are so high. We have disadvantaged young people and made it difficult for them to buy

their own allotment, to begin the processes of having a home in the future. That is all I wish to say about that matter now, but I will keep on plugging it.

In consultation with industry, the Government has worked in this field and industry has welcomed the establishment of the Housing Advisory Committee, comprising representatives from the Housing Industry Association, the Association of Permanent Building Societies, the Master Builders Association, the Real Estate Institute, the Australian Finance Corporation, and the State Bank. The Secretary of the Housing Industry Association has been appointed to the board of the South Australian Housing Trust, and other new developments reflect private enterprise input at board level. The Government's financial commitment to housing has increased from \$32 500 000 in 1979-80 to \$51 300 000 this year. The Housing Trust has broadened its rental programme and the State Bank has increased its lending. As a Government, we have set out to look after the disadvantaged groups, through the Housing Trust and through the Government agencies that can help in that area.

I would now like to refer briefly to some words uttered by the shadow Minister of Recreation and Sport in relation to the proposed aquatic centre and the moneys to be made available. I do not have the time to say as much as I would like to say about this matter but I will refer to it again on a later occasion. The member for Gilles attempted to stir up a hornet's nest, as he thought, in relation to moneys made available from Soccer Pools, but at no time did he say that he would not support the building of an aquatic centre; at no time did he say that the State Government should have told the Federal Government to keep the \$3 700 000—that the State did not want it; at no time did he say that it was possible to renegotiate the matter, because he knew it was not possible. When the Minister read that the Government intended to provide \$200 000 a year for administrators—a programme recommended by the Sports Advisory Committee—the honourable member did not have the decency to say that the project was a great idea and one that he supported, or that he had hoped the Minister would move towards providing greater finance for the project in the future. Instead, the member for Gilles picked up an article written by an ill-informed gentleman by the name of Geoff Roach, who wanted to stir the possum—that is a journalist's right.

Mr Slater: He was right; he was factual.

Mr EVANS: I will answer the honourable member more fully later in another debate. However, I hope the honourable member will think about what he is saying in that area. It was mentioned that \$650 000 was the most substantial part of the soccer pools money, but I will prove that that is not half of the soccer pools money. The amount of money collected from soccer pools from 16 May 1981 to 1 August 1981 was \$512 738, and that shows that the amount of money a year from soccer pools will be in excess of \$1 500 000. When the first meeting of soccer pools came about we were talking about getting \$1 000 000 a year. Naturally, sporting groups thought that that was all it would be. The Minister knew that there would be more than that coming in. In consultation with Cabinet, and knowing that we had only the once-up offer from the Federal Government, it was quite properly said that the aquatic centre would go ahead, as it was important for the large number of swimmers in this State, whether they swim competitively or for relaxation.

So, there will be plenty of money left to pick up other programmes. However, there will never be enough—it is not possible. There will never be enough money to meet the demands from society. However, one thing is for sure: there is more available than the A.L.P. ever made available

during its term in office. It had the opportunity to introduce soccer pools if members opposite had wanted it, but they refused to do so. When this Government decided to do it, members opposite supported it willingly, and I congratulate them on that. All I ask is a little bit of honesty in that field.

I wish to speak briefly about correctional services. This Government in the June session of this year amended the Offenders Probation Act and introduced the potential for community service orders, which will enable the court to give to people who have offended against our laws the opportunity not to serve in gaol but to carry out service work within the community. It will take time to get programmes set up with advisers and supervisors, but it is a step in the right direction.

Also, of course, we would like to go further in this area, particularly in regard to the Prisons Act, but as we have a Royal Commission sitting (which has been sitting for some time) the terms of reference in that area stop the Government looking at such things as visiting justices, censorship, searching of bodies of personnel, and so on. We changed the parole procedures, and increased the size of the board from five to six. We provided that the Chairman and three others are selected by the Minister. A medical practitioner and a sociologist are still on the board.

Until now the Parole Board had virtually all the say about when people would be paroled. Of course, a small number of prisoners held were considered to be criminally insane. Those people could be released only at the Governor's pleasure, and the Parole Board did not have jurisdiction over them. That situation remains the same under section 77a of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. However, the important change which has been made and which will be appreciated by the community is that we now have conditional release. A person can, with the superintendent's permission and with good behaviour, accumulate up to 10 days a month. At the end of two years of a three-year term, if he has gained his full credit for good behaviour, he can be released and he is a free man.

However, if that person offends again within the 12 months that would have been the normal term that that person was serving, and appears before the court and is found guilty of a subsequent offence, the court can sentence that person to serve not only the sentence for the new offence but also the balance of the previous sentence, or the sentences can be served concurrently. That means that many habitual criminals will never get out of the system. I think that solves one of society's concerns. There will still be the opportunity for people to be paroled, as there was under the old system, and those people paroled will still be under the watchful eye of a parole officer.

The other difference is that it is now obligatory upon the court, when a gaol sentence is more than three months, to stipulate a period of time that must elapse before a person can be considered for parole. In other words, we do not have an *ad hoc* situation whereby certain people put up an argument that gains sympathy and convinces somebody that they should be considered for parole. Prisoners must now serve a set term designated by the court before they can be considered for parole.

In relation to the Mitchell Report, the Labor Party did nothing about it, even though it had it for six years. Following that report, this Government has set up the Correctional Services Advisory Council, which consists of six people to advise the Minister. In the case of the Parole Board, the Police Commissioner may attend or send a nominee, and the Police Commissioner and the Director of Correctional Services must be notified who is appearing before the Parole Board. That is the duty of the Secretary of the Parole Board.

I conclude by saying that this Government has taken many initiatives. The people in the community know that this is not a buoyant time, but they accept that what the Tonkin Government is doing is for the betterment of the State. They know that the Premier stands up for the State, and they are prepared to accept that times are tough and that, if the trends continue as they are, the Government may be forced into an area of retrenchment. I know that that is not Government policy, but I believe that if demands keep coming from certain sections of those people who are using public money as wages the Government will have no alternative but to bring about a change of attitude and retrenchment. I do not want to see that happen, and I hope that people will take a moderate approach in life and think about their fellow man, so that we can create more jobs for others, instead of trying to bleed the system.

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

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD (Minister of Water Resources): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr SLATER (Gilles): If South Australia is ever going to achieve its share of the tourist market, it needs to substantially lift its game and provide a more co-ordinated and comprehensive plan to sell South Australia. It would appear that to achieve our share of the tourist market we need an overall plan and an overview of the industry that is not now available from the Department of Tourism. The only way in which I believe we can lift our game to provide this co-ordinated and comprehensive plan is to set up a South Australian Tourist Commission. I have given this matter my considered attention, and it would appear that some sort of authority or tourist commission is the ultimate answer to this co-ordinated approach to tourism.

At present, we have a very unco-ordinated *ad hoc* approach, and the Minister of Tourism and the Government of which she is a member have been more promise than performance in this field. We have had a number of tourism launches and media campaigns, and I take it that all of us are invited to another of these media campaigns next Thursday. I have an invitation to attend the preview of the Department of Tourism's media campaign.

An honourable member: Will you be there?

Mr SLATER: Yes. I have accepted the invitation, and will be attending. It would appear that we are spending another deal of money on private consultants to launch this campaign. However, I did not wish to express any criticism of that campaign until I saw what it was all about.

We have had a number of these campaigns in the past, as well as reviews into tourism, and so on. We have also had the setting up of the Tourist Development Board, and the change of name from the South Australian Tourist Bureau to the South Australian Travel Centre, all of which pale into insignificance when we see the approaches made by and the achievements of some of the other States.

Let me give an example of the Northern Territory, which is the present boom State in tourism. The Northern Territory Tourist Commission came into operation in January of this year after being set up under the Northern Territory Tourist Commission Act of 1979. Its charter is to encourage and to foster, inside and outside the Northern Territory, the development of tourism. Amongst the commission's responsibilities is the establishment and operation of tourist

bureaux. It is also responsible for advising the Northern Territory Minister of Tourism on tourism matters.

Mr Oswald: Your last Minister wasn't interested—

Mr SLATER: For the interest of the member for Morphett, and to confirm my point, the Northern Territory Tourist Commission will open an office in Perth in October this year. In addition, I notice (and this may have been influential in this respect) a statement in yesterday's press headed 'New T.A.A. tourist link'. That report states:

T.A.A. plans to run a new Boeing 727 jet service from Perth to Townsville, via Alice Springs, from the end of October.

T.A.A.s general manager, Mr Frank Ball, said yesterday the new route, to operate every Saturday, would provide the first direct link between Perth, Alice Springs and the North Queensland coast.

It also would provide a new route between Perth and Darwin as the flight would connect at Alice Springs with services to the Northern Territory capital.

This is an example of the initiative that has been taken by the Northern Territory Tourist Commission through its bureaux. I might mention also for the information of the member for Morphett and other members that the Northern Territory Tourist Bureau, right across the road in North Terrace, writes \$1 000 000 worth of business annually. This proves the point that the Northern Territory is the boom State in tourism. It is taking business in the tourist industry from right under our noses in this State.

I make the point that this is the sort of approach and enthusiasm needed, and that we need to do the same and sell South Australia. However, that is not happening at present. We can have all the reviews and media launches that we like. However, we must have the enthusiasm, plans and overview of the whole situation.

Mr Oswald: Your Government did nothing in tourism.

Mr SLATER: That is not so. There are plenty of opportunities, of which advantage is not being taken, to sell the State. This indicates the initiatives that can be taken if there is the necessary enthusiasm. A few weeks ago, I had the privilege of meeting the Chairman of the Northern Territory Tourist Commission.

Mr Oswald: Where?

Mr SLATER: At Alice Springs. I was impressed by the way in which they were going about the business of selling the Northern Territory throughout Australia, and even overseas. The plans for the area around Alice Springs are tremendous for the future, and the Tourist Commission certainly is selling the Northern Territory. We are not doing that. We have nothing more than lip service being paid to tourism. Last year, the Government sponsored a private consultancy firm, Rob Tonge and Associates, in conjunction with the Public Service Board, to undertake a review of tourism. One of the major recommendations of the review was the setting up of a tourist authority. It was probably one of the few sensible recommendations that came out of the report, but evidently it was not acceptable to the Government, because it is not acceptable to its philosophy, and it was completely rejected by the Minister and the Government. I believe, however, that it was one of the few sensible recommendations from the report that could have been considered by the Government. The efforts that are being made are petty and trivial in our tourist industry compared to what is happening in the other States.

Mr Oswald: What about the successful VISA campaign?

Mr SLATER: That campaign has not been maintained. It was not a good seller in the other States, and there are plenty of opportunities to do much more. I am comparing that campaign with the enthusiasm that exists in the other States, and there is no comparison; we are not getting the results. If we are to sell anything, we must have the necessary enthusiasm to sell it, and we have not got that enthusiasm here; it is all lip service, not real. Before we can sell anything, we have to sell ourselves, and we have

not done that effectively in the Eastern States, where the majority of people come from to visit this State as tourists. The VISA campaign was not the success it was expected to be.

I shall be interested to see, at 12 noon next Thursday, when we attend a new media launch on tourism in South Australia, just what will happen. I will not pass criticism on it yet, because I do not know what it is all about, but I expect that it will be a similar situation to that which existed in the VISA campaign, which showed some promise, but did not live up to expectations. I believe it did not achieve the results it should have achieved, because it is necessary to have a prolonged campaign. It started with a great deal of enthusiasm which was not sustained.

Mr Oswald: It's an improvement on your Government's performance.

Mr SLATER: I am not sure that that is quite the case. Tourism has not been a priority in this State for years. I agree that to some extent we probably did not make enough effort in endeavouring to sell tourism in the 1970s. I will not deny that we should have done more, but I say that this Government has not done any more than we did in the 1970s. The results are still the same, and South Australia is still the Cinderella State of Australia in tourism. I think a comparison with what has been suggested for the Northern Territory proves the point.

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

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I could not help but feel a little taken aback by the cynical remarks of the previous speaker in relation to my Government's performance in promoting tourism in South Australia.

Mr Slater: It's not cynical.

Mr BECKER: I got the impression that it was. I am sorry about that, because the tourist industry could be one of the great growth industries in South Australia in the short term, and therefore we should look at ways of boosting it. The honourable member knows my point of view that we should live with the real facts of life. Tourists will come to Australia, and more likely we should be encouraging South Australians to see South Australia, not pinning our hopes and spending millions of dollars on trying to catch one or two people from overseas.

The only criticism I would make of the previous campaign—the VISA campaign—was the idea of wearing a badge on one's lapel. Fortunately, I have not seen too many of them. I say 'fortunately' because, when I went overseas recently, if one was spotted as a tourist one could be in jeopardy as a security risk. I thank the member for Morphett for providing me with one of these badges. I will put it straight into the wastepaper basket, because I think it is one of the most dangerous badges that I have ever seen. The reports that I read in Europe, England and America stated that every day two, three, or four visitors or tourists were being robbed or mugged in various cities around the world. It was not isolated to any one country. Tourists were at risk because they had cameras and travellers cheques and were considered to carry a considerable amount of money. That is one of the problems that the tourist industry faces at the present moment.

As much as I do not like the credit card system, at least it provides some security. However, at the same time, we must be realistic and face the facts of life. If we are going to encourage tourism, I would like to see more effort in the local tourist industry promoting such things as the whispering wall, for argument's sake. That is something that has never been promoted, yet there are only three of them throughout the world. We still do not read very much promotion about that wall. That is an example of the

isolated unique benefits of South Australia. Certainly, we would like to see this State promoted as a place for a safe, pleasant, family holiday. Of course, we also have the advantage of having convention centres.

Mr Slater: Families can't afford to travel. You've got to get the old dears.

Mr BECKER: The honourable member said that families cannot afford it, and that is true. He knows as well as I do what is crippling the tourist industry in this State, and that is penalty rates. I do not know how to get over that. It is very easy to suggest the abolition of those rates, but we also have to consider people employed in this industry.

In the time left available to me I will refer to an article in this evening's *News* on page 9 headed 'Housewife leads mortgage "strike"'. The article states:

Housewife Glenys Lane has a simple message for all people feeling the mortgage pinch: don't pay!

An angry Mrs Lane, of Reynella, hopes to organise a nationwide no-pay month as a huge protest against the rise in home loan interest rates. She said today: 'It's about time that somebody tried to make the Government take notice of the plight of ordinary people.'

'I've been heartened by the response so far. My phone hardly stops ringing, and everybody seem to be in favour of my idea,' she said. 'What I would like to achieve is some kind of undertaking that people can buy their homes on a fixed contract like any other form of hire-purchase.'

'We've got our house on the market at the moment. We can just afford the repayments as it is—and I don't think we'll be able to sell the place for the price we need to get out of it ahead. There are plenty of people worse off than us. All the Government wants to do is take, take, take.'

That is a tragic article that demonstrates the current situation which, unfortunately, faces hundreds of people. It is also tragic because it will lead to a lot more problems if this campaign gets under way. I think it is about time that honourable members apprised themselves of the situation and its cause. It is regrettable that the Federal Government finds it necessary to allow lending institutions to increase their current interest rate by 1 per cent. It is regrettable that the demand has been such that institutions which provide housing finance have had, to be able to get that finance, to increase their rates all around. It is inflationary, and that is something which is beyond the control of the Federal Government. The real cause of the problem goes back many years when building societies and credit unions were allowed to spring up in this country willy-nilly without any effective control.

At least the credit unions in this State are covered by legislation, and the State Government acts as the lender of last resort. Those who contribute to credit unions know that their funds are reasonably safe and that the institutions come under at least one form of Government scrutiny. The building societies do not. They caused the problem by offering higher interest rates to attract money away from the trading and savings banks. The savings banks were the only lenders of long-term mortgage money. The building societies then found that they were recovering far more money than they could lend and, to compete with the banks, introduced a system of financing 90 per cent of the purchase price of a property. That is where the problem started.

The deposit gap has always been a problem for any young married couple or any person purchasing a home. Under the banking system of some 12 years ago, there were three valuations—the purchase price, the market value, and the forced sale value. The Reserve Bank required the savings banks and institutions involved in the Australian banking system to lend not more than two-thirds of the market value. There was a difference between the purchase price and the market value, the market value sometimes being 10 per cent to 12 per cent less. The forced sale value was the real value that the bank believed it could obtain if the property had to be sold. In effect, the person buying a

house through the banking system might have had to put down between one-third and 40 per cent as a deposit, which constituted a very high deposit and made it very difficult for a lot of people to purchase homes. The reason for that very conservative first mortgage was to prevent what is happening today.

The tragedy is that we now find that many young South Australians and many Australians, because of the uncertainty of their economic future and their unstable employment situation, are being forced to give up their homes. There is no way that the mortgage payments could be extended, because by doing that we would not be doing these people a favour. The properties must be put on the market. Because their mortgage borrowings have been so high and because of the pressure of land agents (the super salesmen of any industry), the ruthlessness of the lending institutions and the encouragements of first, second and third mortgages, and, now, other fringe financial arrangements that enable people to purchase furniture, floor coverings and everything else to go with the house, we find that the people are so heavily mortgaged that the forced sale value of the house will not cover the mortgage. We have done nothing to help these people, who should not have got into that position in the first place. The great Australian dream is in jeopardy. Everyone should have the opportunity to purchase a home. Through the Housing Trust and the State Savings Bank we made that possible, but we did not channel sufficient funds into the State Bank housing scheme at low interest rates, which should have been done not last year or the year before but should have been done for the past 15 years. A huge bank would have been available for these people.

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

Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): I wish to comment on the report that the Minister of Education tabled in this House this afternoon entitled 'Enrolled changes, Planning and Management of Facilities. A Synopsis.' The Minister had promised, through the media, that this report would be tabled yesterday, but something held him up and it took him until today to finally get it here. I am a little disappointed in what has finally arrived in this House. I understand that the fact that this report has come to the House this week at all is a result of pressure put on the Minister by Cabinet, which wanted some data base on which to justify the Draconian cuts that the Premier foreshadowed in his address to the primary principals conference at the weekend.

The result of that was that this report, which has been some time in the generation, was suddenly rushed forward at full speed. I understand from information available to me that some of the data provided in the report is considered quite inaccurate, and the method used to gather the population projections was not the most accurate. That is one of the criticisms I have of the report. I feel the report should be sent back to the department for redrafting of the population projections, and the reconsideration of those figures. The other criticism I make of the report is that it at no time pays significant consideration to the educational and social implications of some of its findings and some of its suggested options. That becomes serious and significant, because this is one of the prime base points upon which I believe the Premier is basing his justification for cuts within the educational sphere. Those cuts, which were announced on the weekend, clearly indicated that education would suffer a cut in real terms. The fact that population numbers at schools in South Australia would decline was used as an excuse for that.

We have had an ongoing debate that resulted this week between the South Australian Association of School Organisations and the Institute of Teachers with the Government over whether or not schools would be closed. I do not believe that the Premier has answered that debate properly. He has not specifically said whether or not schools will be closed. He has merely said that 72 schools would not be closed. He has merely picked on the figure 72. He has not stated specifically whether or not there will be school closures. I think he owes it to the community at large to state exactly whether or not schools will be closed. If so, will there be consultation with the communities involved? Also, will those closures be used to reduce total staff numbers, or will they be used to assist in the reallocation of staff numbers from the closed schools to other schools that still quite clearly have very important needs?

On the matter of how serious a consideration the report gives to education at large, I draw the attention of the House to the fact that, out of 41 pages (much of which is centred around population projection figures), some nine are related to financial costs of the education system. I would have thought that, if it was worth while having nine pages focused on the financial implications, it would be equally worthwhile having nine pages focused on the social and educational implications of what is going on. This is very important, because the report acknowledges the significance of those factors. On page 30 of the report the following points are made:

Important considerations would include: first, the educational needs of children served by the school; secondly, special characteristics of the area and of approved educational programmes which could not be realised in an alternative setting; thirdly, availability of alternative school accommodation; fourthly, accessibility of alternative schools, distance, transport and safety; fifthly, the nature and condition of the facilities at the site; sixthly, socio-economic factors—

At no time are there any tables in the report anywhere related to admittance in any schools in South Australia. It further says:

Seventh, reduction in recurrent costs by consolidating into approved space entitlements; and eighth, costs of the particular schools concerned, given the variability of costs among schools of the same size.

It is that eighth point, to which nine pages of this synopsis are devoted. One of those eight points entitles nine particular pages of this report. The other seven rank either not at all in the report or they receive the most scant regard. By 'scant regard', I would indicate that sometimes that mention is of one sentence or one line only.

What are those other aspects that are worthwhile considering? They are such things as the impact of school retention rates at the senior school level. Certainly, the senior school level retention rates have had an effect on the student population in recent years and will continue to have an effect in the years ahead. It is true that, if resources are not made available to education in this State at adequate levels, we are in danger of seeing a downward spiral brought on by the fact that senior school retention rates will dwindle.

In their dwindling they will make less viable that education system and thereby bring upon themselves a further cut in education resources, and stimulate a further fall in senior school retention rates. Another factor that is significant in the student population numbers that has a social impact, or an impact upon the general interpretation of the quality of education, is the relative proportion of students enrolling in the non-government sector, as opposed to the Government sector.

That is merely noted in the report and is at no stage analysed. Then, of course, the effect of dezoning is at no stage adequately analysed. There are some references about why dezoning may have resulted in changes of student population between schools within the Government system. They raise important points such as the fact that certain schools are perceived by the community to be offering a better educational programme than others, and people are, therefore, choosing to vote, so to speak, by going to schools where they feel they are more satisfied.

These are important aspects affecting student population, not only in the total but in the Government system in particular, and certainly in individual schools in particular. There is nothing wrong with the dezoning, I am not making that point. I am merely saying that it is an important consideration in analysing what the future projected student numbers are going to be in the years ahead. It is very important, yet it received scant consideration in this report.

The only consideration that is adequately given is to the question of financial implications of what the cost cuts would mean. It is clearly stated that the school closures that would possibly come about as a result of this document would only result in cuts to the total education budget if, in fact, they were used as a means of attrition of staff. In that regard it is most important that the Premier come out and say exactly what is going to happen.

I accept the point that the Premier made in his press statement on Wednesday that the mooted closure of 72 schools was the worst option; I accept also the point that the Government is not going to consider that worst option. What is not stated is what middle-of-the-road option between the worst and the best is going to be considered. To what extent does the Government consider the closure of schools an important element in its policy? Does it consider it to be important? If it does, how does it rank the impact on the financial level of the closure of schools along with the social impact of those closures in line with the points to which I have just referred?

First, on the basis that the data that has been included in the report and the suggestion that the data is not the most accurate data that was available to the Minister or the Government and, secondly, on the basis that the report spends insufficient time analysing the social and educational impacts of the information, it is most important that the report be withdrawn and sent back to the department for reconsideration and further analysis, because the subject is worthy of further analysis and greater attention. This report does not give it that worth.

It has been merely brought forward this week to help bolster up the Premier's indication that cuts should be made within the education system. The whole point of whether or not cuts should be made within the education system, in either real terms or relative terms to other aspects of the Budget, is one that tests the whole community's mind. I believe all people in the community should be involved in a debate on the role of education, as to what priority education has in their eyes. We need to analyse exactly how the community perceives the social impact and social ledger, not just the financial ledger.

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

Motion carried.

At 5.15 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 25 August at 2 p.m.