

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 24 August 1983

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

QUESTION

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the following written answer to a question, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

GAOL INCIDENT

In reply to **Mr PETERSON** (4 August).

The **Hon. G.F. KENEALLY**: A prisoner named Byczko attempted to escape from Yatala Labour Prison on the evening of 25 May 1983, but was apprehended within the prison walls and was placed in another cell. He forced open the door of that cell by, presumably, using the bed as a battering ram.

On 27 May, Mr Byczko intimated that one, and possibly two, correctional officers had assisted him in his attempted escape. He refused to elaborate or to give the names of these officers, despite a number of approaches by officers of the Department of Correctional Services and of the Police Department, until Thursday 11 August. A statement was made by Mr Byczko on 11 August which implicated a correctional officer in having assisted the attempted escape. The police are currently continuing their inquiries.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister of Lands (Hon. D.J. Hopgood):

Pursuant to Statute—

1. Lands Department—Annual report, 1982-83.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: GRANTS COMMISSION

The **Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Minister of Local Government)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS**: Yesterday in the House I said that I was aware that certain information had been given, without my knowledge, to the district councils of Strathalbyn and Mount Barker concerning proposed Grants Commission allocations for 1983-84 following boundary alterations to these councils. I also stated that, as I had not received from the commission the full list of allocations to all councils in South Australia, I was not prepared to comment on individual allocations. I have since received from the commission the full list and will be giving consideration to the problems of these councils.

The facts of the matter are these. On Wednesday 27 July, I was informed by the Chairman of the South Australian Grants Commission, Dr Ian McPhail, that figures were provided to the District Councils of Strathalbyn, Mount Barker and Meadows, detailing possible Grants Commission allocations for 1983-84. These figures were given to assist the three councils with budget deliberations during negotiations for distribution of assets involved in annexation proceedings. These figures were made available after the select committee had determined changes to the councils'

boundaries and were in no way provided by anyone as an inducement to the councils concerned to accept the changes. The Chairman also advised me that the figures were provided without the authority of the full commission and were much larger than the councils could normally expect to receive under the commission's existing policy.

This policy is 'that changes in grant levels arising from boundary changes will be introduced gradually over a period of three years as the annual financial statements and other data used reflect these changes'. In response to this advice I raised this matter with the full commission, seeking details of the circumstances and the likely level of funding which these councils could expect to receive this year. This annexation was the most complex boundary alteration so far undertaken and I therefore sought the commission's view in confirming its previously stated policy with regard to boundary changes. The commission advised that its existing policy should be applied in this case and that the likely level of funding would be substantially lower than that previously conveyed to the councils.

The Chairman of the commission has accepted full responsibility for the release of the figures and, accordingly, tendered his resignation as Chairman of the South Australian Grants Commission on 10 August. I believe that an error of judgment occurred, an error that may not have happened if the Chairman had not also been the head of the Local Government Department. Such a conflict should not occur again. I therefore accepted the Chairman's resignation from the commission on 17 August and in due course will recommend the appointment of a Chairman not directly involved in the management of the department.

I have accepted this resignation with regret, as Dr McPhail has served the commission since its beginning with distinction and integrity and has made a substantial contribution to the commission's success in South Australia. Having received the full list of allocations to all councils in South Australia for the 1983-84 year, I am able to say that the allocations for these three councils for this year will be in accordance with the Grants Commission's existing policy. I will announce details of all allocations shortly in conjunction with my Federal colleague.

It is unfortunate that the three councils have been placed in the position of having to adjust their budgets to accommodate allocations that are less than the amounts they were led to believe they would receive from the commission. Consequently, I am examining the possibility of providing financial assistance to these councils. I also point out that the effects of the boundary allocations on council funding will be reflected over the next three years by the commission; therefore the councils can expect appropriate adjustments to their allocations in coming years.

QUESTION TIME

WINE TAX

Mr OLSEN: Does the Premier believe that the Commonwealth Government's arrangement for payment of excise on grape spirit used in fortifying wines is fair and favourable and that it does not disadvantage South Australia in a major way? If he does not think so, will he ask the Commonwealth Government to change the arrangement for payment of that excise? The Premier has described the Commonwealth Budget as fair and favourable and one which contains nothing to disadvantage South Australia in a major way. He has also expressed satisfaction that there is no sales tax on wine, ignoring the fact that the Commonwealth Government's decision to reintroduce the excise on grape spirit amounts to another broken promise. In Labor's rural policy speech

delivered on 20 February this year, Mr Hawke said, 'Labor is pledged not to impose a sales tax or an excise tax on wine.'

Therefore, while the former State Liberal Government was able to successfully resist, for three years, the imposition of any tax or excise on the wine industry, the Premier has been unable to convince his Commonwealth colleagues to maintain this position. I have been informed that the impact of the excise on fortifying wine will be very severe for some South Australian wineries. For example, a winery that uses about 1 000 000 litres of grape spirit for fortifying wine each year will face an immediate increase in its annual cost of production of \$2 610 000. This will compound by this amount in future years and will increase automatically because of the Government's decision to index all excises. Another South Australian winery will require additional working capital of \$1 500 000 in the first year and \$3 000 000 a year thereafter.

The arrangements the Commonwealth Government has announced for this excise require that payment be made within seven days of the withdrawal of the spirit from bond for use in the production process. This means that the tax will place severe liquidity pressures on producers. They will have to pay the excise immediately, but will not be able to recoup the cost through sales of the product on which it is levied for anything up to 15 years because of the long maturation process involved. The excise will also result in a drop in sales because it will cause the retail price of an average quality 750 ml bottle to increase by up to 75 cents, and a flagon by \$2. I have been informed that, as a result of liquidity pressures and a drop in sales, labour shedding in the wine industry in South Australia will occur. I therefore ask the Premier whether he is prepared to approach Canberra to have arrangements for payment of this excise changed.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The points made by the Leader have been noted. I think there is validity in a number of them. The problem is that a general wine tax has been with us for a long time. It was imposed for a short period under a previous Liberal Administration in Canberra and was subsequently removed but in recent years the lobbying and pressure for the imposition of such a tax has increased. The argument is one that we have heard many times, namely, a question of equity. If a tax is levied on other forms of liquor and spirits, and in some cases in sales tax terms on soft drinks, there also should be a levy on wine.

The arguments against this which have been set out strenuously and promoted by the South Australian Government and others in the industry over recent months point out that there is a discriminatory effect of such a tax. Unlike brewing activities and other things which are taxed in that respect, ultimately the wine tax comes back to South Australia, because we are producing over 50 per cent of Australia's wine. They are the arguments advanced against it. Fortunately, there is not a general wine tax, but introduced in this Budget is an excise on fortified wines.

As has been pointed out, an excise can create much greater problems than a sales tax in that it is collected effectively at the point at which the fortified wine is added to the product. Because of the nature of the product, ports, sheries and so on, but in particular port, there is a storage period attached to it. All that time, of course, the tax having been paid, the maker is bearing the cost until eventually he gets his product on the market. That creates major difficulties, and I certainly will be taking that matter up.

In fact, I am meeting with the President of the Wine and Brandy Producers Association tomorrow, at which meeting I will discuss with him what sort of approach we might make in this area. The full implications will also be discussed with the industry. I point out that fortified wines over quite a period of time have a declining market share of the wine

industry and, in fact, an overall decline by volume. At the moment they represent on 1982-83 figures about 14 to 15 per cent of the total market, so that we can certainly say that a large part of the industry has been left unscathed by that, and just as well. But, in finishing, let me stress that there are very strong and substantial interests involved in this question; indeed, I even heard the Leader of the Australian Democrats, Senator Chipp, adding his voice to those interests urging a wine tax. It means that in producing our case of opposition we must have detailed figures and we must constantly keep that case before the Commonwealth Government. We have done so successfully on this occasion and I hope we can continue to do so.

STATE BUDGET

Mr FERGUSON: I ask the Premier, now that the Federal Budget has been brought down, whether he can inform the House of the date on which he will introduce the South Australian Budget.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The State Budget is in the course of being finalised, but obviously the Federal Budget has a bearing on that in terms of precise levels of certain payments and any other implications that it may have. We have done our preliminary study of the Federal Budget. There will be some adjustments needed, and they will be taking place fairly rapidly in terms of the overall casting of the Budget, and we should have finalisation in time to introduce the Budget on Thursday 1 September. According to the schedule that we have established, the House will rise for Show week following the introduction of the Budget, and resume on 13 September. There will be the usual two sitting weeks allowed for the second reading debate and associated grievances. I recall that during the Supply Bill debate last week the Leader of the Opposition asked whether he would be given enough time to analyse the Budget. I can assure him that that programme gives him quite sufficient time. After the introduction of the Budget there will be a little more than a week before he will be called upon to give his reply.

I might add that this year, in line with our policy of providing the community with as much information as possible about the State's finances and economic position, we will take a new initiative in terms of allowing the Parliament and community to understand the Budget. On 9 September the Government intends holding a conference on the broad theme of the impact on South Australia of the State and Federal Budgets. I have invited the Hon. John Dawkins, Minister for Finance, to represent the Federal Government and address that meeting. At this stage I understand that he will be able to be present. Also at that conference there will be representatives of industry, commerce, trade unions and other groups concerned about the future of South Australia.

FEDERAL PROJECTS

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: What action, if any, does the Premier intend taking to persuade the Federal Government to proceed with major construction projects such as the Commonwealth centre in Adelaide, the Alice Springs to Darwin railway line; the northern towns filtration scheme; and a Federal courts building in Adelaide, which were not included in last night's Federal Budget? I remind the House that late last year the Premier wrote to the then Acting Prime Minister, Mr Anthony, seeking immediate commencement or acceleration of several projects, including those mentioned. At the time the Premier said, and I quote:

I am afraid that South Australia has frequently received a poor allocation of Commonwealth work in recent years. However, that simply cannot be allowed to continue.

Mr Olsen: That was last December?

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: That was in November. In last night's Budget, funds allocated for future capital works projects throughout Australia dropped from \$354 000 000, in the 1982-83 Budget, to \$298 000 000, a drop in real terms of 24 per cent. I remind the House of the capital works being undertaken, and I will quote briefly from the Budget papers of the Treasurer (Mr Keating) which state:

We shall embark on a major Commonwealth office construction programme which will stimulate the construction industry and hold down our rapidly increasing expenditure on rental accommodation. Offices will be commenced in Townsville, Thursday Island and Lismore, and in Glenorchy and Bellerive in Tasmania. We shall also call for expressions of interests from the private sector with a view to proceeding with lease/purchase office development, as appropriate, at Parramatta, Newcastle, Wollongong, Dubbo, Rockhampton, Mackay, Cairns, Fremantle, Port Pirie and Devonport.

I ask the question in view of the inevitable detrimental impact on the South Australian construction industry and the subsequent loss of jobs in a State where unemployment has reached the highest level in the nation under the Bannon Government.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader obviously is debating the matter.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: The statements I made, particularly about the Commonwealth construction programme, are statements which I strongly stand by and which are still valid today. It is true that over the past few years South Australia's percentage share of direct Commonwealth construction projects has been very low indeed, being about 1 or 2 per cent of the national programme, which is well below our population share and certainly, I would suggest, below our needs. I have already made very clear in the light of yesterday's Budget announcement that we will be making representations. Already I have had preliminary discussions with the Federal Minister for Housing and Construction to ensure that some of those construction projects are in fact committed for South Australia.

It is interesting that the Deputy Leader raises the matter of a Commonwealth centre in Adelaide. I well recall the Hon. J. McLeay (then Minister for Administrative Services and member for Boothby) making the announcement in 1980, just before the Federal election, that, in the 1980-81 financial year, work would commence on that building in Adelaide. It is now 1983, and we have not seen it. We have not seen much of the Hon. J. McLeay who, within a few months of his re-election as the representative of that electorate, disappeared to some position such as Consul-General in San Francisco.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Los Angeles.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Los Angeles—it was somewhere else. I think that it is as well that the Deputy Leader reminds us of that promise, which certainly was not kept. In relation to Commonwealth construction, let us also have a sense of proportion. We do have a commitment and, in fact, work has commenced on the Australian National headquarters building, a major development at Keswick, together with a commitment for the Telecom building which is a multi-million dollar project. We do have a commitment—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: You cannot claim credit for that.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: —in this current Budget for some \$30 000 000 worth of work continuing or to be commenced in this financial year. That is quite a substantial slab of work. Incidentally, my analysis of the figures reveals that, if one excludes the Brisbane Airport upgrading from

the Commonwealth list in terms of total expenditure on projects, South Australia has at least as much if not more than Queensland. Therefore, we are holding our own in that regard. I think that one should have a sense of perspective when talking about it, but certainly the Commonwealth centre is a project of some urgency and, as I have suggested, I have already begun making representations about that. Adelaide is the only capital city in Australia now that does not have a Commonwealth centre specially constructed, and it is about time we had. I am making that very clear to the Federal Government.

WATER CHARGES

Mr Klunder: My question is directed to the Minister of Education. Schools in my electorate have expressed some concern that the recent Government decision to remove concessions for water usage rates could adversely affect their funds. Can the Minister of Education explain the likely impact of this decision on Government schools?

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the honourable Minister, I indicate to the honourable member a flaw in the way in which he put that question, because it reverted to the old procedure of explaining the reason for the question without seeking leave and then putting the question. I know that it was a very simple and technical matter. However, in view of the fact that I will be stricter (as I indicated yesterday), I should pick up these things as I perceive them.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: This is in fact a very important question, and I hope that the member for Eyre will appreciate that it will certainly affect the schools in his electorate as much as those in anyone else's electorate. It is true that the cost of water to schools will now go up to the standard rate for water, and it is true that at one level that will seem to cost the Education Department more money than previously was being paid. However, it will not be costing schools more money. The only schools that will feel some impact at the school-base level are schools in the non-government sector, where the effect is of the order of some \$50 000 extra. However, even that will not be the final sum total of it because if the model standard school formula is adjusted to take into account the way that funding is provided for Government schools, as it should be, then there will be a flow-on of that effect to the non-government schools as well.

In raising those points I want to show my considerable concern about information that was circulated to schools in the electorate of Todd by the member for Todd. I want to share with the House some comments that came to light in a letter which was sent by that member to, presumably, the chairmen of school councils, and which was made available to me. In one paragraph of that letter, the member stated:

I am extremely concerned at this step—

that is increasing the price of water, about which I do not dispute his right to be concerned—

which will remove considerable funds from the budgets of both the Education Department and school councils. This will probably mean that the grant you receive from the Government will be substantially reduced as the Education Department will now be required to pay the Engineering and Water Supply Department the additional cost of the water rates. It will also mean that, if your school uses excess water, your council will be required to pay the increased charges directly.

Additionally, the base allowance for water usage prior to excess being incurred has been reduced. This will mean that all schools will find that excess water usage will occur much earlier than previously. Thus, those schools who already use excess water will have very steep increases in charges, and other schools may find that, for the first time excess has been incurred, and council will have to meet costs not previously experienced.

Mr Ashenden: Tell us the source of that—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I must make some comments about this situation. When an officer of the department tried to find out from where the honourable member came to those conclusions, the member for Todd advised him that it was from a conversation that he had with me.

I want to go through with the House what I believe is an act of dishonesty that I have been subjected to. As is my wont to make myself accessible to all members of the House, I was happy to entertain a corridor conversation with the honourable member outside the front of this Chamber some days ago on this very issue. That is a practice that I have tried to make available to all members, regardless of political persuasion. During that conversation the honourable member raised, very calmly and rationally, his concern about this situation. I share his concern: I understand his concern on that matter. The honourable member asked me whether or not schools would be affected by the proposal. My answer at the time was that in fact this was a cost against the Education Department and that we had applied for an allocation of funds to be a concomitant off-set against that expenditure. I used the non-verbal communication of saying that it was like taking money from 'this' pocket of the Government and putting it in 'that' pocket of the Government. That is the way that I actually described the fact that there was no real extra cost to schools of this State.

Mr Ashenden: Now tell the rest—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The honourable member then raised the issue of excess water, and I mentioned at the time that I was uncertain about the situation. I do not claim to be the knower of all knowledge about the education system.

Mr Ashenden: Rubbish!

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Todd to order.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I undertook to say that I would have that matter further investigated. I also undertook at that time that the Government would have to take that situation into account if in fact there was an excess water situation. The conversation also included the statement that there was merit in having the cost of water billed at the proper commercial rate to schools, because it helped give a proper figure of the costs of education per capita compared with other States. The result of that conversation was the honourable member's comments, as follows:

It will remove considerable funds—

the honourable member stated that it 'will remove'—not 'might', and yet I indicated to him that an application had been made in the budgetary process, on which we cannot comment at this stage until 1 September, to make sure that the off-setting funds were available. However, the honourable member for Todd took that to mean that:

It will remove considerable funds from the budgets of both the Education Department and school councils.

The honourable member then went on to say:

It will probably mean—

I give him that he is adding a cautionary note there—that the grants you receive from the Government will be substantially reduced.

There was no evidence for that in the conversation that we had. He further stated:

It also means that if your school uses excess water—

and I undertook to inquire about that situation—

that the council will be required . . .

on that occasion I indicated that if in fact schools were to be required to pay extra for excess water we would have to look at that situation. This is simply an astounding farrago of things. He commented:

The base allowance for excess water—

Mr Ashenden interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Todd. I ask the Minister of Education to resume his seat. That is the last warning that I will give the member for Todd. Let me add that the honourable member has received a warning. He should remain quiet; otherwise, he knows what the consequences will be. The honourable member does have certain rights: he has been in this House long enough to know what those rights are. The honourable Minister of Education.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: As I was saying, the honourable member then wrote:

The base allowance for water usage prior to excess being incurred has been reduced.

At no stage during the conversation did we even talk about the size of the water allowance. The honourable member then said, as a result supposedly of this conversation:

This will mean that all schools will find that excess water will occur much earlier.

I must say on this occasion that I am gravely disappointed with the member for Todd. It is quite clear that his performance in handling the briefing that was given in the corridor was to distort the message of what was said. I must say that this would have to put me in a new position as to how I handle inquiries from that member, and I would suggest that in future he make formal inquiries in writing, and we will handle any future matters in that way.

The other situation is that members of this House often take advantage of the fact that they can come to see me as Minister, as I am sure they do of all Ministers, to ask questions about certain issues on a non-partisan basis. Other members who want to make use of the information in their electorates get back to me and ask whether they have the information correctly. That situation applies all the time in relation to members on the other side. I appreciate the courtesy and it ensures that we have both understood what the conversation was supposed to have been about. However, this particular member has made this farrago of allegations in this letter, none of which is the case. I indicated to him that I would get back to him on the excess water situation. I am now doing that by advising him that the excess water situation does not apply to Education Department schools.

I have to say that I am considerably annoyed and upset by this situation, because it is an absolute reflection on the information which I gave in good faith to that member and which I hope to be able to give in good faith to other members in this House. However, if members are going to distort the information they receive then quite clearly that makes access to a Minister that much harder. It is a strange use of the privilege of the corridors and lobbies of this House to take points and then distort them. I hope that the honourable member at least does this House the courtesy of giving a personal explanation to this House and that in so doing he goes through that paragraph and relates his comments to every point in the paragraph and indicates where the conversation we had outside this House reflects that.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT FUNDS

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Local Government say why the Chairman of the Local Government Grants Commission has been made the sacrificial lamb for the Minister's incompetence? A clear indication was given by the Minister, as a member of the Meadows select committee, that additional funds would be made available, and that appears in the transcript of those minutes. Further, I point out to the Minister that having accepted the resignation

of the Grants Commission Chairman, no such notification of the resignation appears in the most recent *Government Gazette*.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that there is no difference between a continuing barrage of highly articulate interjections and low growls.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I reject completely the allegation made by the member for Light that the Director-General of Local Government has been made a sacrificial lamb.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I think I have made it perfectly clear in my statement to the House that the Director accepted full responsibility. As for the allegations that I, as chairman of the select committee, condoned, sanctioned or agreed to further allocations being made to the district councils of Strathalbyn, Mount Barker and Meadows as a result of the select committee, I would like to ask the member for Light to produce the transcript showing that I made that statement personally.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: This House will find that when I release, in conjunction with my Federal colleague, the facts, Meadows, Strathalbyn and Mount Barker will be receiving a greater percentage increase than any other council in South Australia.

TELETEX

Mrs APPLEBY: Can the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Attorney-General, who is the Minister responsible for matters concerning the disabled, say whether his colleague is aware of a justifiable reason why South Australian commercial television stations have up to the present made no decision to take up signals through Telecom for decoders such as Teletex? I understand that, although the technology and equipment are available both as regards complete television sets and attachments, deaf people are being denied the use of an aid designed to give them in their leisure time pleasure that those of us who have no such disability can enjoy.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFT: I thank the honourable member for her question, which raises a matter of considerable importance not only to persons suffering as a result of deafness but also to many other people related in some way to persons suffering from deafness. This is a way in which considerable relief can be given those people so that they can enjoy watching television. As I understand it, this matter rests solely with television station managements themselves, and obviously a response is required not only from the handicapped in our community but from the population at large to impress on those managements that this would be a desirable addition to the services they provide. Obviously, this is a matter that the Attorney-General will take up for the honourable member with the appropriate television station managements, and I shall be happy to refer the question to him.

STATE TAXES

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: In view of the crippling additional cost to Australian families of last night's Commonwealth Budget, will the Premier consider withdrawing some of the taxes proposed in the coming State Budget?

The Secretary of the Taxpayers' Association (Mr Eric Ristrom) estimates that the cost, to each family, of the Commonwealth Budget and the May Commonwealth mini-Budget would be about \$16 a week. The cost to the average family of increased charges imposed by the Bannion Government since it took office will be an additional \$6.50, while the proposed State Budget measures already announced by the Premier will mean a further cost to South Australian families of \$6. This burden has been applied at a time when Australian taxpayers are subject to a wages pause and has been imposed by a Government which says it does not believe in indirect taxes but which has now applied massive increases in sales tax.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I would willingly withdraw any number of State taxes and charges if the honourable member could say how we could provide the services which the community requires and which are paid for by those taxes and charges. That is a simple problem. I suggest that the cost to the ordinary person in the community of a collapse of public sector services such as education, hospital and health facilities, road services, public transport, and water and sewerage facilities, as well as other basic services, if we did not have the revenue to subsidise them (because none of these services are able to support themselves on a user-pays principle), would mean that the ordinary man, woman and child in the community would suffer. Certainly, I would very much like to withdraw these charges if it were possible. I point out that no Government likes to impose taxes or charges; no Government does so merely from a feeling of pleasure; and no Government does so in order to be popular. It is a hard fact of life that these charges are imposed in order to provide these public services.

The cost to the community, in terms of the amount of money that we are raising from that revenue package, is more than outweighed by the benefits to the community of the services, of the economic stimulation and of the whole range of projects that, for instance, the member for Davenport was urging us to extend by some millions and millions of dollars in his speech only as recently as yesterday. That is a fact of life.

Equally, I would also prefer not to have to resort to the indirect taxation method. In certain cases we are able to do that, for instance, by means of the financial institutions duty. But, unfortunately, our revenue base is such that we are forced into those areas of taxation—indirect taxes—which do impinge on ordinary levels of consumption. Admittedly in some areas it is a voluntary consumption; I would be much happier, and I am sure many people in the community would be, if there was in fact no use of tobacco in this community, for health and many other reasons, those who wish to avoid paying the tax can readily do so by giving up smoking. We would welcome that. The savings to the community would be great and the personal well-being would be greater if they did. That equally applies to alcohol and one or two other areas. But, the problem here is that we do not have this room to manoeuvre.

I think it is regrettable that the Commonwealth, which has a much greater range of revenue-raising powers at its disposal, is raising revenue in the same areas as the States. I have already said that it is regrettable that, where States are forced into tobacco, petrol and liquor franchise areas, we see the Commonwealth following. But, it is unavoidable, and I cannot control taxation policies of the Commonwealth. However, we are working very actively in concert with the other States to try to ensure a rationalisation of the revenue-raising powers of the Commonwealth. The Premiers' Conference has established a working party to do just that.

A classic example of the Commonwealth intruding into the States area of taxation and its limited base has been the bank debits tax introduced by the Fraser Government and

continued by the Hawke Government. The sooner that is eliminated the better, because that was an intrusion into one of the few areas of State revenue left to us. I was amazed that my predecessor, Mr Tonkin, acquiesced in that decision and simply let that happen without making the firmest and loudest protest about an intrusion into our taxing area. I believe that those problems can be solved over time. Certainly, we must get rid of the duplication. However, I repeat that the taxes and charges we have imposed have been imposed because we have no choice.

FEDERAL BUDGET

Ms LENEHAN: Is the Minister of Tourism yet able to provide the House with an assessment of the immediate impact on tourism from last night's Federal Budget? As members are now aware, the 1983-84 Budget did not contain a tax on table wines which we and the wine-grape industry had rightly feared. My question is asked not only about the impact of not having a wine tax on table wines but also because it is possible that in the enormous amount of data that was included in the Budget there may be other significant impacts for tourism in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This is yet another example of a further question being added in the course of an explanation. It will cut both ways. It can be said that as from tomorrow, when that situation arises, it may well be that the Chair will simply withdraw leave, and I think that that will solve the matter very quickly. The honourable Minister of Tourism.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I have not had time to look at the Budget in detail, so there are many aspects of it as far as it impacts on tourism of which I am not aware at this stage. In relation to the tax on table wines, I am surprised at the reaction of members opposite. It seems that they are disappointed that there has not been a tax on table wines.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The Premier has explained to the House the attitude of this Government in relation to the excise that has been placed on fortified wines, and what action it will take in relation to that matter. However, it is pleasing to note that there has not been any tax on table wines, which are an integral part of the tourist industry in South Australia. But what has come out of the Federal Budget is a clear indication that federally tourism is in very good hands: a 75 per cent increase in the funds made available to the Australian Tourism Commission; a 75 per cent increase over that which was provided by the honourable member's colleagues federally, the Hon. Mr Peacock and Sir Phillip Lynch, the two previous Ministers for Tourism, I understand, although there are few people in Australia who are aware of that. So, the Federal Minister for Tourism—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:—who was subject to a fair bit of criticism from the shadow Minister and his colleagues, has come up trumps. There has been an increase—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:—in Australia's capacity to promote this continent as a prime tourist destination of 75 per cent. That increase is unparalleled and this State and all of Australia should be thankful for that because that money will be directed at encouraging overseas tourists to come to this country to enjoy themselves in the form of

holiday making. It is our responsibility as a State Government and the responsibility of the private entrepreneurs within the tourist industry to take advantage of that input, which will inevitably result because of this increased marketing that the Federal Government will participate in, to encourage those tourists to come to South Australia and spend their money. This will benefit our economy, provide jobs and do those things that we know tourism is so very good at achieving for a State's economy. South Australia has done very well federally in the area of tourism and I personally would like to congratulate my Federal colleague on being able to achieve such a plus.

Also I am pleased that, as a result of a motion that I moved at the recent Tourist Ministers Conference, asking for the exclusion of commercial cruise vessels from the definition of pleasure craft for sales tax purposes, that has been agreed to. The Fraser Government (two Budgets ago) introduced that tax and it had a disastrous effect on the construction of cruise vessels in Australia, because those cruise vessels are now being constructed in Korea with Australian labour. They have gone off-shore to South Korea to produce cruise vessels for the Australian tourist industry. Thankfully the Federal Minister has been able to impress upon the Treasurer the need to withdraw that tax so that those cruise vessels can be constructed in Australia with Australian labour, and that is another plus that we need to congratulate my Federal colleague on.

There are always some minuses, and I note that the Federal Treasurer has provided \$1 000 000 assistance to the Queensland Government to assist in diesel fuel expenses for servicing the off-shore islands. I took up that matter at the Tourism Ministers Conference in Sydney and made a very strong case that I thought was accepted by the Federal Ministers, and the Tourism Ministers Conference made submissions to the Federal Government as a result of that motion. I am disappointed that that particular advantage has not been provided to remote tourist areas in South Australia, such as Kangaroo Island, the Flinders Ranges, and the cruise vessels on the Murray River, so I sent a telegram to my Federal colleague (Hon. J.J. Brown) the Minister for Tourism, which states:

I was concerned to learn that South Australian off-shore and remote tourist resorts were excluded from the special funding for subsidising diesel fuel use as announced for Queensland's off-shore tourist islands. Press reports in Adelaide indicate that \$1 000 000 was made available for this purpose in Queensland and you will recall the strong case that I put to you at the Tourism Ministers Council earlier this year. The South Australian Government believes that an equally strong case exists in South Australia as it does for Queensland. I would therefore ask that further consideration be given to the cases for Kangaroo Island, Flinders Ranges and the Murray River cruise vessels.

The purpose of my telegram was not to complain about assistance given to Queensland (because the motion I moved at the Tourism Ministers Conference was to support all tourist facilities of a remote nature that needed to use diesel fuel for power generation), but to encourage the Federal Minister to look once more at the needs of South Australia and isolated tourist resorts, with a view to providing this State with the same advantage that has been provided to the Queensland tourist off-shore facility.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT FUNDS

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Why does the Minister of Local Government, in his Ministerial statement delivered to this House earlier today, only mention the possibility (and 'possibility' is underlined in that statement) of providing extra funds this year when the councils (and I refer to the Mount Barker and Strathalbyn councils) have been given undertakings that they would receive specific funds? When

will the councils be informed whether or not they will receive extra funds and what amounts they will receive, as it is necessary under the Local Government Act for councils to determine their rates by 31 August? I point out to the Minister that the Mount Barker council, for example, has already framed its 1983-84 budget around this financial position, including the specific financial undertakings given to it following the annexation of portions of the Meadows council to the Mount Barker council.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Yes, I did say in my statement that I was investigating ways of meeting the shortfall that was not coming from the South Australian Grants Commission. I think that the whole point of my statement was that those councils were misled into believing that they would receive far greater amounts. However, one of the unfortunate things is that those councils—especially Mount Barker and Strathalbyn—were aware that they had been misled by certain people and that I, as Minister, was trying to resolve the situation. Yesterday, the member for Alexandra breached the confidentiality of certain members of the Mount Barker and Strathalbyn councils, and I understand that some members of both councils are quite upset with the member for Alexandra, who was more interested in political point-scoring than worrying about me being faced with the situation—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:—of officers of the Grants Commission giving information to those councils which the Grants Commission could not meet. I was trying to resolve that situation. However, the member for Alexandra chose to breach confidentiality of members of those councils. I understand that the member for Alexandra spoke to a member of one of those councils on Sunday and, with that information, he came into this Chamber yesterday and asked me questions. Now, that places me in an invidious situation.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: Good enough for you.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Alexandra to order.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I will do all I can to help those councils. However, the member for Alexandra has to live with his conscience.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

NATIVE VEGETATION

Mr PLUNKETT: Is the Minister for Environment and Planning aware that in its Budget the Federal Government announced last night that the tax concession for land clearance is to be eliminated? Will the Minister explain to the House what impact, if any, this will have on the recently implemented vegetation clearance regulations in this State?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: As members of the House well know, those vegetation clearance regulations stopped short of being a prohibition. It is possible for people to get approval to clear land and, indeed, they have been obtaining that approval in certain usually negotiated circumstances. The House would also be aware that the Government is extremely concerned about the very small amount of remnant native habitat that is left in South Australia, which is the reason for bringing down these regulations. Nonetheless, it is true that where people can get planning approval for clearance there is a quid in it for them, because there is a tax incentive to do so. In view of the situation with our environment in this State and, indeed, nationally, I have always considered that it was inexcusable that this tax concession should still be available. The Whitlam Govern-

ment nibbled at it in 1973 or 1974, and provided that it could be written off only over 10 years. However, the incentive was still there.

It is now about to be removed (I am not sure whether legislation is required for that or not). In any event, a clear statement of intention has been made. I congratulate the Federal Minister, Mr Cohen, and the Treasurer, Mr Keating, on this step. There is no case, whatever one might think about controls on clearance, for maintaining a taxation incentive for clearance of native vegetation, both in terms of the protection of our natural environment and in terms of the impact on the productive resource of the farmer from over clearance, which is something which we have been suffering for a long time.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT FUNDS

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Believe it or not, Sir, my question is directed to the Minister of Local Government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is not a question of whether I believe it nor not. The member for Alexandra.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Will the Minister of Local Government give a clear undertaking to uphold not only the commitment given by his officer or officers to the District Council of Strathalbyn but also to uphold the commitment implicit in his remarks made to the select committee as early as April this year when he stated to the committee, of which I was a member and at a meeting at which I was present, that additional funding would be granted to the council as a result of acceptance of annexation of a portion of the District Council of Meadows?

During the committee hearings on the subject of distribution of portions of the District Council of Meadows, which subsequently led to the annexation of those portions to the councils of Mount Barker and Strathalbyn, the subject of additional funding for the recipient councils was raised, and it was raised specifically with the Chairman of the committee (the Minister of Local Government). Incidentally, this was done in the presence of his Director of Local Government who, we have been told, subsequently resigned as Chairman of the Grants Commission. At the time when that subject was raised (and indeed it was raised on behalf of the councils in question) the Minister gave a clear undertaking that the additional funds would be forthcoming.

Subsequent to the Minister's remarks, which are recorded in the records of the committee hearings, an officer of his department, in the presence of a clerk of one of the recipient councils, was advised of the specific amount that his council could expect to receive as a result of acceptance of the annexation measure. Accordingly, subsequent to that meeting between that District Clerk and the Minister's own officers, a call was made to the other recipient council whereupon that council was advised of the specific amount that it would receive. My question to the Minister today is to seek to obtain from him an honourable undertaking to meet that commitment, irrespective of the sequence of events that has occurred in the interim period dating back, as I now understand, to 10 August when his Director cum Chairman of the Grants Commission tendered his resignation from the commission.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: First, if I were a district clerk in any area covered by the member for Alexandra I would not speak to him about confidential matters, because he just ignores confidentiality.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I have yet to see the transcript from the select committee which shows that I

stated to the councils from Meadows, Strathalbyn or Mount Barker that there would be significant increases. I have said in my Ministerial statement that I am looking at the possibility, now that I have received the final allocation from the Grants Commission, of making some money available from my department to meet that shortfall. I have made that commitment to this House—

An honourable member: Is that a threat or a promise?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I hope it is a promise; we are trying to find the money. As the Minister, I regret that this situation has arisen. It seems to me that although the Chairman of the Grants Commission took the honourable decision and said, 'Yes, the responsibility is mine, it is my fault so I shall resign', members opposite cannot recognise when a person is being honourable. I have stood in this House and said that I was not aware of the situation, but the Opposition says that I am incompetent and I have sacked my Director as Chairman of the Grants Commission. That is not true and the members opposite know that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Yet members like the member for Light make those accusations in this House. I have all the facts and they assure me and members on this side that I have acted honourably, as did my Director when he resigned from the Grants Commission.

WATER FILTRATION

Mr GROOM: Can the Minister of Water Resources report to the House on whether the Federal Budget announced last evening contained provision, and, if so, what provision, for funding of water filtration programmes in South Australia?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I am pleased to advise the House that, contrary to the opinion expressed by the Leader of the Opposition in today's press, there is a provision for water filtration.

An honourable member: How much?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: If the honourable member is patient, I will tell him. The Commonwealth Minister for Resources and Energy has offered South Australia \$10 350 000 in financial assistance for South Australian water projects in 1983-84. This is \$3 750 000 more than was made available by the Fraser Government in 1982-83, and represents a 57 per cent increase in Federal grants. Together with the necessary State matching funds of about \$12 000 000, this will allow the South Australian Government to plan an accelerated programme of water projects approved for funding under the national water resources programme. In 1983-84 these projects include the construction of the metropolitan and northern towns water filtration plants, including Happy Valley, Little Para, and Morgan, and preliminary design work in respect of Stockwell. It also provides for Murray River salinity control projects including the completion of the Noora scheme, the continuation of certain comprehensive drainage works, investigations for the lock 2 and lock 3 salinity control project, and further salinity investigations. It also provides for the Torrens River flood mitigation project and a water resources assessment programme.

Negotiations to allocate State and Commonwealth contributions between the various projects are still to be finalised. Arrangements have been made for Commonwealth and State officers to meet next week with a view to making recommendations to the Federal Minister and to me in regard to this matter. I will be giving the highest priority to the water filtration programme. However, it is quite clear that the advised Commonwealth funding will also permit good progress to be made on Murray River salinity and Torrens River

flood mitigation works. I expect to be in a position to announce the precise allocations early next week.

FOOTROT

Mr RODDA: My question is directed to the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Agriculture in another place. Will the Minister of Agriculture report on the policing of the provisions of the Stock Diseases Act as it applies to the notifiable disease of footrot particularly in relation to adjoining landholders? A flock of 370 sheep on a South-Eastern property was discovered recently to be infected with footrot. The sheep were shorn and arrangements were made for the diseased animals to be transported to the Noarlunga meatworks. They were inspected by officers of the Department of Agriculture, but unfortunately there was a strike at the meatworks and some delay occurred in the transporting of the animals.

The owner had to be absent on business and arrangements were made on the day of dispatch for a stock agent to yard the sheep so that they would be ready for collection by the stock transport. In due course the transport arrived, and the transport operator proceeded to load the sheep. When he did that, as is the case in the South-East at the moment, the vehicle became heavily bogged and he could not move it. He had to enlist the aid a grazier who obtained a contractor with a large tractor to get him on his way. He learned from someone assisting him with the animals that they were diseased with footrot and that no notification of that fact had been given to the stock transport operator. As I understand it, he had returned from delivering another load of animals and consequently had not been to the office, so no-one had advised him, as required by the Act, of the condition of the diseased animals. That should have been done on the prescribed form.

The other complaint arising is that only two adjoining owners were notified that the diseased animals were on the property. I spoke to the owner just before coming into the House and he has expressed some concern about the situation. He told me that when he discovered that the animals showed signs of footrot he notified the Department of Agriculture, and two officers visited his property. They diagnosed the disease as being footrot, hence the shearing and the provisions being made to take the animals to slaughter. I understand that the department should be responsible for notifying adjoining owners of the disease. This can be done easily because land in the settled areas is clearly identified with section numbers and with adjoining owners' names. This is a very serious matter involving a serious disease. It appears that there have been two clear breaches of the spirit of the Act, as I understand it. I ask the Minister to take up this matter with his colleague to see that the provisions of the Act are carried out correctly and that all is well for the rest of the community.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Yes, the matter raised by the honourable member is serious. I will be happy to refer it to my colleague the Minister of Agriculture in another place, first, to have the spirit of the Act interpreted so that the honourable member will know what are the requirements under the legislation of both the department and individual landholders in this regard. I thank him for this question and I will get back to him at the earliest possible moment with a report.

The SPEAKER: I have before me a request from a Minister to make a statement and requests from three members to make personal explanations. As I understand that the Minister of Water Resources does not want the call, we

shall proceed to the personal explanations. I shall call on the three members in the order in which their request came in. The honourable member for Todd.

SCHOOL WATER USAGE

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr ASHENDEN: I was misrepresented by the Minister of Education earlier today.

An honourable member: Rubbish!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ASHENDEN: I shall outline the events leading to the letter referred to by the Minister in the House earlier today. The *News* of 9 August contained a report as a result of a press statement by the Minister of Water Resources, which stated:

The Minister of Water Resources (Mr Slater) today confirmed that schools would pay the full cost of all water consumed after 1 July this year.

As this statement seemed to represent a major change in Government policy, I spoke to the Minister of Education privately and he advised me on certain points. First, he said that the Education Department would be paying for normal water usage in schools and that he hoped that an additional allocation would be provided in the Budget to enable his department to cover the increase in costs. However, he expressed concern to me that school grants could be affected if adequate provision was not made in the Budget. He also indicated to me that schools would have to pay for excess water usage over the normal volume. Therefore, the letter referred to was written by me to chairpersons of school councils in my district. There is no doubt in my mind about the Minister's response to me.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ASHENDEN: So why should I have taken the matter back to him as he suggested today? I was absolutely clear in my mind as to the results of the discussions I held with the Minister. He did not at any time suggest that I refer back to him.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ASHENDEN: I repeat: he stated categorically that excess water would be the responsibility of school councils. With the public statement by the Minister of Water Resources indicating that schools would be required to pay for water usage from 1 July, and with the information given me by the Minister of Education, I wrote the letter containing statements which I still believe were a completely accurate report based on our private discussions. I had previously trusted the Minister of Education, but I feel that my trust has been totally betrayed. Therefore, in future I will conduct all business with him in writing or by asking questions in the House, so that his replies may be recorded for the information of all.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: LOCAL GOVERNMENT FUNDS

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Earlier this afternoon the Minister of Local Government indicated that I had misled the House in framing a question and that I had misrepresented the facts, and he asked that I clarify the statements I had

made. Referring totally to the public record, I refer members in defence of my position to page 13 of the proceedings before the Select Committee on the Local Government Boundaries of the District Council of Meadows. In particular, I refer to a meeting of the committee at which all members but me were present and at which evidence was given by Dr McPhail (Director of the Department of Local Government) and Mr T.K. Bell (Project Officer) on 24 February 1983 (although the record shows 1982), at page 13, where the Hon. W.E. Chapman said:

22. I take it that your departmental staff have the skills and capacity to carry that out within the timetable about which you have talked if the committee, after hearing evidence, were to decide in that direction?

In reply, Dr McPhail said:

Yes. There would be some costs for Strathalbyn and Mount Barker in having records amalgamated and sorted out. They tend to be costs more in staff time than major items of plant or anything else like that. Through the Grants Commission mechanism we usually take this into account and give them a bit extra to cope with that.

It was on that statement that I based part of my statement to this House and my question to the Minister.

Adverting again to the public record (and I can advert to other records if the Minister wishes to descend to that level, as he has descended), at page 183 of the evidence given to the committee on 12 April 1983 by Mr T.E. Marks (Acting State Secretary of the Municipal Officers Association), we find that the following members were present: Hon. T.H. Hemmings (Chairman), Hon. W.E. Chapman, Hon. B.C. Eastick, Mr D.M. Ferguson, and Mr M.K. Mayes. Also present was Mr R.P. Saltmarsh. Throughout that transcript a number of indications are given as regards funds available from the Grants Commission. However, more specifically I refer to pages 199 and 200, where it is recorded that I asked the following question:

543. And further, that if the option taken was to seek additional money from the Grants Commission, because the amount available is a definitive amount, an increased amount going to Meadows would be at the expense of a number of other councils, and I am referring to distribution of that money to some other sphere of local government?

On that occasion, my question depended on other evidence that had been presented. Mr Marks replied:

The other 126 councils could suffer a slight reduction, although there may be situations where there have been amalgamations (such as Port Augusta) where councils receive a higher level of grants to compensate them for the initial changes relating to amalgamation. Those may fall off and then that money can be allocated to Meadows.

The Chairman (Hon. T.H. Hemmings) then said:

544. There is no evidence of that. I would say where there is a stronger council more money would be available?

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will need to seek leave to continue his statement.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I seek leave of the House.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: In reply to that question by the Chairman, Mr Saltmarsh said:

Would not the reverse apply, assuming that those nine people were to go to our rural counterparts, in the sense of the Grants Commission virtually propping up inefficiency? If you are going to carry excess, it must be reasonable to assume that you can put your excess into the highest growth rate area and not into an area where, first, you have an alien environment, and, secondly, there is a fair percentage of chance of becoming redundant. Those rural areas cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to run.

That was an indication of the cost to be incurred by Mount Barker and Strathalbyn. Mr Marks then said:

Another point in respect to financing these people concerns the fact that there would be job turn-over anyway. The nine people are broken up into five administrative people, including a person called a general inspector. There is one building person, one health person, one planning person and one library person.

I have quoted that in its entirety only to point out the fact that discussion on that issue related to the continued employment of all the staff and the guarantees that were subsequently necessary to make certain that all three councils, Meadows, Mount Barker and Strathalbyn, would have the capacity to guarantee those jobs.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: LOCAL GOVERNMENT FUNDS

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Earlier this afternoon the Minister of Local Government spread some wild and irresponsible allegations—

The SPEAKER: Order! I refer the honourable gentleman to Standing Order 137. The easiest way to do it is to read out the pertinent part, as follows:

By leave of the House a member may explain matters of a personal nature although there be no question before the House; but such matters may not be debated.

I hope that the honourable member will restrict himself to a personal explanation of his position and his understanding of the facts.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Thank you for that reminder of the Standing Orders, Mr Speaker. I will seek to observe them rigidly. In explaining my personal position following allegations by the Minister of Local Government this afternoon, I report, in particular, on his allegation that I had broken confidentiality with certain members of local government.

I inform the House that last Sunday afternoon I did meet a senior member of local government in the Strathalbyn region and that he volunteered information on his plight including what seemed to be gross bungling within the Local Government Office. I told that senior member of local government that he need not pursue the details of the subject with me as I was already aware of the problems that the Minister of Local Government was having within his office, and within the office structure of his department, over the matter of funding, which has been widely referred to this afternoon and which was discussed, and confirmed, to my knowledge, initially in February, March and/or April this year.

I can also explain to the House that, other than my discussion on Sunday with that particular member of local government and until raising the matter with the Minister in this House yesterday, I had not discussed with any other staff member of local government, or any other council in South Australia, the Minister's problems in respect of the funding of these recipient councils.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Alexandra has sought and obtained leave.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. In exercising that leave, I would like to explain to the House and to the Minister that his allegations are wild and off the mark. They are clearly unfounded and untrue. I am not and cannot be responsible for the wide knowledge of his plight during this saga of events.

The SPEAKER: Order! That is totally out of order and I withdraw leave.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MEMBER FOR TODD

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The member for Todd has repeated some allegations and assertions that earlier this afternoon I sought to refute. I again refute those reflections upon me and my honesty and integrity. To substantiate my claim for the veracity of my assertions earlier this afternoon. I advise the House that I will tomorrow, when the corrected typographical version of *Hansard* is available, repeat that answer I gave today outside the confines of the House for the honourable member to take whatever action he may feel is reasonable to prove his claim that he is telling the truth and that I am not. Also, I indicate that I will take this matter up with you, Mr Speaker, to ask privately what protection is available for members who have conversations in the confines of this building and to ensure that they receive protection concerning the words they use, and that those words are not misused by the members with whom they may be speaking.

FENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 23 August. Page 433.)

Mr BAKER (Mitcham): Before we adjourned last night I had been developing the theme about what was happening economically in overseas countries and what was happening in Australia. I hope that members opposite took some notice of the information provided, because it illustrates why Australia is doing poorly on the world scene. It is not useful to refer to the problems without looking at the solution areas and seeing whether we wish to embrace answers or to wander along as we have been doing. It may be amusing for members opposite sometimes to talk about wage pauses. They may feel that it reduces the ability of people to receive a sufficient income to live at the standard to which they have normally been accustomed, but it is quite clear that in recent years wage demands have been excessive.

The inflation rate that Australia has experienced is far in excess of that of our major trading partners. We are well behind in terms of our productivity. Our interest rates are far higher than in those countries which are now coming out of the recession. Unless we attack these problems at the heart we will continue to face problems for many years to come. Whilst the rest of the world starts to rationalise its employment base and people start to achieve a higher standard of living, Australia will be lying in its own mire.

I specifically refer to wage demands, because this matter is fundamental to Australia's achieving some sort of recovery. It was mentioned last night in the Budget that much of the thrust of the Budget would depend on the ability of the Federal Government to have the wages/income pause work. We all have some reservations about whether that process will work. We have already seen a number of departures from it, particularly by unions which have gone out and obtained wage rises in excess of what has been believed to be the community standard and, in fact, this has occurred during the so-called wages pause.

It is incumbent on this Government at the State level to try to inject responsibility into the union movement, and

members opposite must also show some responsibility, so that they will then at least have made some contribution in this matter. Other areas involve industrial peace and productivity, concerning which there is so much to be done not only in the private sector but also in the Government sector. We continue to look at the cost structure of the Public Service, which has a vast number of employees, and the public sector continues to grow, representing 25 to 30 per cent of the total employed work force.

It is important that productivity becomes part and parcel of that process, and it is incumbent on Ministers to look at their departments and to examine where cost savings can take place and where there is excess capacity. There is excess capacity in every department in South Australia today, as there is in the Commonwealth Government. Having worked for both the State and Commonwealth Governments over a number of years, I understand a little about the processes of Government and how they do not really work. It is very rare for a Minister to understand what is happening within his department, where his resources are being expended, and how best he can utilise them. Government Ministers need to pay a great deal more attention to the way that their employees work, and how they can best use them to produce more, in both quality and quantity.

Following the last State Budget and the recent Federal Budget, there has been a significant escalation in the cost of living which will be reflected in the consumer price index over the next six to 12 months. This is against a background of inflation, which has to be brought under control. The 10 per cent inflation being experienced today is some 50 per cent too high and out of kilter with the rest of our major trading partners. It means that we are non-competitive in the world sphere. We continue to make this point, but very little notice is being taken of it.

Then there is the Budget that purports to balance revenue against expenditure, but unfortunately too little attention is paid to the expenditure side of that Budget. Very little attention is paid to the way in which Government can operate more effectively, and to the ways in which Ministers can organise their departments more efficiently. Therefore, challenges exist for the Government to use an excess capacity within the State Public Service.

There is also excess capacity in the private sector, of course, and when I heard the member for Whyalla speak about the problems experienced by B.H.P. Whyalla and about the consequent effect upon unemployment, I wondered whether the honourable member, either at the time or perhaps five years ago, would have gone to B.H.P. and said, 'Look, I know that you're not efficient. I know that you have got excess labour [the figure quoted to me was of the order of 25 per cent] and whilst paternalism ostensibly did not carry any great costs some five years ago, it does today'. If B.H.P. had been efficient at that time, some of the benefits would have been reaped today, and the cost to Whyalla would have been far less. I ask the member for Whyalla whether he has looked at the operation of the iron and steel works. Also affected was the ship building industry, where there was huge excess capacity. It was not fully utilised, and there were enormous costs associated with it. It priced itself out of the market because there was so much poorly utilised labour, partly the fault of B.H.P., and partly the fault of the people responsible, particularly the local member.

Whilst I share the concerns of people on the dole queue, it is incumbent on all of us to look at ways and means of improving that situation, in the area of both Government and large business. Of course the solutions do not stop there. Australia (especially South Australia) has to look seriously at the question and not pay lip service to it, as members of the Government have done on a number of occasions.

The member for Mawson has cried for a real increase in wages so that people can pay their bills. Associated with that measure, of course, is the fact that cost structures have been increased again. In the past 10 years we have not produced sufficient for the wages paid, and at some stage we have to come to grips with that problem and take a little less so that in the future we can all enjoy a higher standard of living.

Another area that the Government can examine, as the member for Elizabeth mentioned, is that of housing. There is a vast housing stock in South Australia which is not utilised at all, and I refer to many of the country areas. I remember about eight years ago being at Whyte Yarcowie, where about 100 houses in reasonable condition could have been utilised for housing with proper support services. In Adelaide much of the housing stock is grossly under utilised. Perhaps the Government can start to think about the relationship between accommodation and the stock available. Instead of saying that more money is needed for the Housing Trust, it needs to look at the large space available in Adelaide, and work out ways to bring those two aspects together, rather than throwing money at the problem continually. I am a little tired of some of the solutions put forward by the members opposite, because they show little sensitivity and understanding. We have to be as lean as possible in these times so that once again we can tread the world stage with some credibility.

In the area of education, much more thinking needs to be given to where we are heading in the 1980s. The solutions the Minister of Education has shown, in terms of senior secondary assessment and other areas, begs the question of where the excellence will be generated from the school system. I refer to countries where it is generated successfully from within the education system. It does not come from without; it starts at year 1 of schooling, and it is important not only that proper teaching be given but that the right atmosphere and the need to strive for excellence be built into the system. So far from the Minister of Education there has been no reference to that at all, and that is a pity. The shifting of resources from private schools can be seen as a result of the changes made in both the Federal and the State arena. It begs the question: why are people willing to set aside a lot of other things to send their children to private school? Why is there an excess demand for private schooling in South Australia? Why is the queue so long? The answer is simple: because there is a demand for that sort of education. There has been a shift away in the secondary sector from the public to the private arena, and that becomes the essential question that the Government needs to address; not how we can shift people back into the public sector but how we can bring the public sector up to date.

We have seen from the Chief Secretary (apart from his comments on the burning down of a few gaols and antagonising the police on a number of occasions) that he stills fails to appreciate that the only fundamental way that the correctional services area will improve (and that includes the area of community welfare) is by the achievement of dignity, by both the people who service and the people who are served by those areas. Once he grasps that fundamental fact, instead of using his size 9 or 10 boot, we may see some real progress in that regard in South Australia.

It is a very simple proposition and the Chief Secretary should address himself to that question (as other countries have over a period of time) rather than waving a flag around and then suddenly producing resources that the Government did not have six months ago to build gaols, because his negligence has led to the burning down of one. It begs the question of whether the Chief Secretary is adequate to handle his portfolio, or whether he is the man to take the correctional services area into the 1980s and not leave it in the 1950s.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: What about the services during the previous Administration?

Mr BAKER: The previous Administration of the Dunstan era was some nine years of neglect. One should understand that, in the three short years we had available to us, a number of changes were mooted and were under way until the Government changed. That is the first thought that had been given to the prison system for some 10 years. Now, necessity has forced a change in direction.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: What direction did you take in your three years?

Mr BAKER: I think that one can see the results. In fact, most of the planning in relation to the concepts now being put forward resulted from what had been done during the previous three years. I think that the Liberal Government could take some credit for the fact that it was at least thinking ahead. Now the Minister has been forced into action.

I now refer to the field of energy. I despair at some of the noises being made by certain members on the other side of the House. As most people would understand, there is a finite amount of energy in the world in terms of the traditional sources. According to various estimates, petroleum may run out by the year 2000 or 2050. However, we can be assured of one thing: it will run out. The same applies to gas supplies: they are all finite. There are probably sufficient supplies of coal (which, of course, is an enormous pollutant) to take Australia and the rest of the world through the next 400 years. However, we must very seriously question the validity of using coal as a source of energy. It has already been pointed out many, many times that pollution from coal is affecting our stratosphere and there are great problems with acid rain in the northern hemisphere. That points to the fact that we have to look at alternative sources.

As most reasonable members opposite would understand, the availability of solar and wind power is not sufficient to provide any commercial form of energy. It may well be that in 100 years the case is reversed: it may well be that the process of obtaining energy from water (hydrogenation) will be successful. However, at this stage, we are faced with a shortage in the world, and we must turn to the one source which is relatively clean, and the dangers of which have been recognised (that is, uranium). I hope that members opposite will understand that uranium could be the bridging fuel between the loss of our traditional petro resources and the generation or finding of new energy sources in the form of solar, wind or hydrogen. However, at this stage, technology has not taken us that far and, as people understand, energy is absolutely critical to our survival on this earth.

I now refer to environment and planning. The Government cannot come to grips with what is the real environment, how to protect the environment and how we live with it. It is unfortunate that the Government again does not understand that in every situation there is a trade-off, and that the same earth which can provide us pleasure also provides us energy and work opportunities. It must bear that in mind at all times before it makes any changes which preclude the use of certain areas if they appear to be intrinsically worth while. We must never destroy what we can never retrieve. However, I believe that in the process the Government has been wrong in the way it has approached a number of things. Its Draconian measures in relation to vegetation are a clear example of its poor thinking on this matter. There are some principles to which I do adhere, but the environment and planning area is one which really needs to be rethought.

I now refer to technology. Again, the previous Government at least got South Australia off the ground and I expected the impetus to increase under this Government. It has not done so and there is no indication that it will do so. When

the report regarding South Australia's future was introduced, I wrote a substantial contribution to that report urging the Government that, if it wanted South Australia to become technologically sound, it had to spend a lot of money and do a lot of things. It was important that this Government took up the challenge and imported people with the expertise who were providing advice overseas. There are very few people in Australia today who have the experience or ability to impart that knowledge to little old South Australia. It is important to me that we become technologically updated. However, until the Government firmly grasps this simple fact, we will again wallow behind. In almost all areas of Government we have to rethink a number of old premises. I have tried to outline a few of the areas, and if people really sit down and think about them, we may find some very satisfactory solutions in what I would hope to be a bipartisan fashion.

I will end my address by commenting on the Federal Budget. It is a total fraud on the Australian community, mainly because it cannot keep within the bounds of the \$8.3 billion deficit which has been forecast. I believe that the figure will approach about \$10.5 billion, which raises further problems of liquidity. It raises questions about what controls will have to be placed on money supply. Therefore, my belief is that the Budget is a fraud because even in the next six months there will have to be a mini Budget to haul back. One thing I can forecast is that interest rates will not fall as they will in other countries. They will have to remain high to soak up the excess money supply generated by the deficit financing. The alternative scenario is an increase in inflation offset by some neat fiddling of the Medicare proposal, but ostensibly inflation will rise to more than 10 per cent until next year when a half-Senate election is due.

I believe that the Budget is a lie. In fact, it will prove to be irresponsible in the long term and it may well be that a mini Budget will be handed down after the Queensland election, which will then tax some of the areas left untaxed this time. I signal those things because I know that no Government can run a Budget of the order of \$10 billion without it having an enormous effect on interest rates and inflation. These are the two major problems that South Australia and Australia face in their competitive situations with the rest of the world. I know that responsibility will eventually have to come to the fore and I expect that within the next six months, if there is not an election to coincide with the half-Senate election next year. Mr Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to speak in this debate. I have spoken longer than I intended, that is, for some 40 minutes.

I suggest that when considering the processes of the House some thought be given to restricting the time allowed for the Address in Reply debate so that the normal business of the House can be conducted more expeditiously. If we need come here only to listen to the Address in Reply we do not need to come at all.

Ms LENEHAN (Mawson): First, I would like to congratulate the members for Unley and Henley Beach as mover and seconder of the Address in Reply for this the second session of the present Parliament. In supporting the motion I wish to discuss two issues which affect the area that I represent and which also affect the community as a whole. I refer first to the question of rape and the anomalies and inadequacies of the law and trial procedures relating to rape. The need to reform the rape laws in South Australia is now widely recognised throughout the community. I take this opportunity of congratulating the Young Liberals on their discussion paper which was released on the weekend. Not only is the community now aware of and recognises the need to reform the rape laws but also the community believes that that must occur because rape not only strikes at the

very heart of our society but because also there is recognition of the injustices of the present system in dealing with rape, incest and other crimes of sexual assault.

I now want to examine briefly the recent background that has led to a call for a reform of South Australia's rape laws. During the 1970s many groups demanded that society recognised the extent to which women's lives were affected by rape. Calls for changes to the medical, legal and police procedures and for the creation of supportive and counselling care were made. In response to these calls the Adelaide Rape Crisis Centre was established in 1976. The social and political climate was also changing, and legally rape was redefined to include men as victims of rape. Penetration of the anus and mouth by the penis could be prosecuted as rape. The victim of rape was required only to appear at committal proceedings if the magistrate felt that there were special circumstances. Past sexual history of the victim could be allowed only in evidence at the discretion of the presiding judge or justice. Under certain conditions a husband could be prosecuted for raping his wife. New services for rape victims were proposed. A special all-female unit was set up within the Police Force to take statements from the victims of rape. Further, a sexual assault referral centre was established at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, staffed by volunteer doctors with clear procedures for the treatment of victims and the collection of medical evidence of the crime.

A Rape Services Liaison Committee was established to co-ordinate the services of the various agencies and to improve the services for rape victims. The most recent development has been a call to re-examine the law that was reformed in 1976 to determine its effectiveness and subsequently to recommend change. This re-examination will now occur under a review of South Australia's rape laws to be conducted under the auspices of the Women's Adviser to the Premier, Rosemary Wighton.

Before discussing the recently announced and very welcome review, I feel it is important for the community and, indeed, for this Parliament to examine what should be the goals of law reform in the area of rape. I believe that three basic goals should be fulfilled. First, the criminal law should accurately reflect a community consensus that certain conduct is so threatening to the general welfare of the community that it should be criminalised so that commission of such offences should result in confinement and deprivation of liberty. A second goal of rape reform would be to establish a scheme to ensure certainty of conviction. Certainty of punishment is the key, the most significant deterrent. Because rape is almost always a furtive, secretive crime, it is usually difficult to prove because of evidentiary rules and judicial interpretations. These existing loopholes should be closed. In addition, certainty of conviction is often jeopardised by overly severe penalties which do not match the societal concern about the criminalised conduct. Juries tend to compromise on the issue of guilt because of a maximum penalty of life imprisonment.

A third goal of rape reform should be to protect the victims of crime from further victimisation by the legal process itself, such as harassment and invasion of privacy at the trial. I believe that the aims of the proposed review of the existing rape law reforms in South Australia completely encompass the goals that I have just outlined. In welcoming the review I wish to congratulate the Attorney-General (Hon. Chris Sumner) for his initiatives in this area. It is relevant to note that the review has followed the recent announcement made by the Office of Crime Statistics, which shows a disproportionately high acquittal rate of people charged with rape. For the period from 1 July 1981 to 30 June 1982, 64 per cent of people who appeared in the higher criminal courts on a major charge of rape were convicted. I stress

the fact that 64 per cent were convicted, whereas 83 per cent of those appearing in the same courts on other charges were convicted. I believe that that is a very significant difference. Those statistics are alarming. I do not believe for one moment that victims of rape are making false accusations, particularly in view of the fact that 79 per cent of all cases go unreported, while the remaining 21 per cent is subject to a very severe screening process by the police.

In announcing the review, the Attorney-General stated that recent reforms in rape laws in other States would be examined, particularly in relation to the corroboration of the evidence of rape victims. While it is not my intention to pre-empt the recommendations from the review or to discuss and canvass all aspects of law and trial procedures to be examined, I wish to discuss two areas that will be examined: first, whether the word 'rape' as used in the legal process should be replaced in favour of differing degrees of sexual assault, and, secondly, the introduction of graded offences, which preliminary evidence from New South Wales suggests would result in a greater number of convictions for more minor offences which frequently go unpunished. Such graded offences would be related to the physical and psychological harm inflicted on the victim rather than relying on a predetermined schedule.

Before concluding this part of my address I want to publicly thank all the groups and individuals who have worked tirelessly towards bringing about change in the rape laws and associated trial procedures. I wish to conclude this part of my address by quoting two short stanzas from the introduction of *Rape Law Reform*, which was edited by Jocelyne Scutt. I believe that this sums up the way that many people in our community feel about the crime of rape. It is as follows:

If we choose to walk alone
 For us there is no safety zone
 If we're attacked we bear the blame
 They say that we began the game.
 And though we prove our injury
 A judge can set a rapist free
 Therefore the victim is to blame
 Call it nature, but rape's the name.
 And if a man should rape a child
 It's not because his spirit's wild
 This system gives the prize to all
 Who trample on the weak and small.
 When fathers rape they surely know
 Their kids have nowhere else to go
 Don't try to forget and don't ask us to
 Forgive them. They know what they do.

I would like to turn now to the second topic I wish to discuss today, and it is another important issue. It is the decision by Flinders University not to offer a women's studies course in 1984. Before discussing the course I would like to talk a little about the history of women's studies at Flinders University. Women's studies was introduced into Flinders University 10 years ago and I believe that was an initiative for which the university should be congratulated.

It was introduced, if you like, at a period when there was recognition that women needed some sort of course in which they could clearly understand their role and position in society, and Flinders took up that challenge and for the past 10 years it has been the only university in South Australia offering women's studies. We now have a situation where the university has made a decision that women's studies will not be offered to the community and, indeed, to students at the university in 1984.

Mr Evans: Are they short of money?

Ms LENEHAN: I will come to that in a moment. I will talk about the content of the course without listing all the areas and topics covered by the women's studies course. Perhaps a summary would suffice. The course covers the role and position of women in society from historical, soci-

ological, political and personal perspectives. Perhaps as of much importance as the content of the course is the methodology which is applied in the teaching of women's studies. Women's studies is taught through a process of group learning which is unique within the university. It develops evaluative skills both through self evaluation and group evaluation which are appropriate to all academic areas.

I now refer to the accessibility of students to the course. Women's studies is unique, both within Flinders University and, as I am led to believe, within any university in Australia, in that it affords access to tertiary education for non-enrolled students of the university. For the past 10 years members of the community have been able to enrol in women's studies and complete the course. It is significant to note that 25 per cent of those non-enrolled students have gone on to complete enrolment and to continue further studies at the university.

In a period when Governments are spending large sums on transition education programmes it is quite significant to note that this course has quietly for 10 years been providing a bridge or, if you like, a transition for members of the community who had previously been denied access to a tertiary institution and afforded them the opportunity to study at tertiary level. I believe that that is one of the most significant benefits the course has for the community of South Australia. What then of the viability of the course? From the figures that have been presented to me, it is noted that over the past 10 years about 75 students have enrolled at the beginning of each academic year in women's studies. I do not think anyone would question the economic viability of courses which were available for such large numbers of students.

There is certainly no argument to suggest that the course would not be academically viable. Why then is it important to the community that the women's studies course at Flinders University continue? I believe, and I know many other people in the community believe, that it is important because we are now starting as a community and, indeed, I hope as a Parliament, to recognise some of the imbalances, if you like, the inequalities that have existed in relation to the opportunities that women have had for access to employment, to education and, indeed, to the many power structures and decision-making structures within our society. Women's studies in some way redresses these imbalances that exist for women both in education and in society. It is significant to note that while Government departments and indeed while many Governments, both State and Federal, have recognised the position of women in our community, and have introduced into many of their departments women's advisers, women's policy units and other initiatives to equalise opportunities for women, we have the Flinders University about to remove the one course that specifically addresses itself to such matters.

It is also significant to note that we should examine what exactly is being asked for at the university. Is the university being asked to make an enormous financial commitment? The answer is, 'No'. In fact, what the Womens Studies Action Group that has been formed to try and save the course is asking for is one full-time lecturer to be made available in the School of Philosophy. That lecturer would run the women's studies course and would quite possibly also convene the course on feminism which up until a couple of years ago was being run in the Philosophy Department at second-year level. Neither that course nor the women's studies course will be offered in 1984 as the situation presently stands.

Mr Evans: What qualifications would you expect that lecturer to have?

Ms LENEHAN: That lecturer would have the same sort of qualification that any other lecturer employed at the

university would have. I think the member for Fisher is raising a red herring at this time. What sort of support do I think this community and this Parliament should give? It seems to me that the community should get behind the action group which is requesting that the Flinders University Council reconsiders the decision that was taken at the last council meeting to make a special case for women's studies within the budgetary situation at Flinders University.

I think it is also important that members of this House support the women's studies course. It is also of importance to note that in the very year in which women's studies looks like being axed from Flinders University the Adelaide University is introducing a postgraduate course in women's studies. One could quite reasonably ask from where are the students for the postgraduate course at Adelaide University to come if we do not have undergraduate courses being offered at other tertiary institutions?

It is also significant to note that the removal of this particular course also takes place when there is increasing demand by not just women, but by men and women, in the community to do such courses at both colleges of advanced education and technical and further education colleges. I have to look only in my own electorate where women's studies is presently being offered at the new Noarlunga TAFE college. One could also ask from where will the lecturers come who are going to run the courses offered in women's studies at colleges of advanced education and at technical and further education colleges or does the university believe that it is not important to train teachers to train people who can go into the community and share their skills and competence and help to develop those skills and competence in other members of the community.

Before closing my speech on the Address in Reply I would like to say that I am very pleased to support the motion for its adoption and that I hope that the two matters that I have raised will be noted by other members. I thank the House for the opportunity to participate in this debate.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I support the motion. In opening my remarks I would like to express my condolences to the family of the Hon. John Coumbe who as a member of this House was particularly hardworking and a man who made a major contribution during the time he had available to him for public life in South Australia.

This afternoon I would like to address my remarks to many of the problems confronting penal institutions in this State as well as our parole system and the problems associated with alternative sentencing. From the outset I would like to make the point that from my observations while visiting prisons in this State that criticisms have been unfairly heaped on the whole of the Department of Correctional Services because of the current unrest that is being experienced at the Yatala Labour Prison. The whole of the service has been tarred with the Yatala brush and this is most unfortunate, especially for those officers who are doing an excellent job in other prisons. That is not to say that Yatala does not contain conscientious officers, but rather that the Yatala problems are not the problems of the overall prison service.

I was delighted to read in the *Advertiser* on 2 August this year that the Minister is considering aspects of the New Zealand penal and parole system and is looking especially at prison reform, work release programmes, bail hostels, and the humanisation of our parole system. Work release programmes are not new. They have my support and, as they operate elsewhere, they will be an excellent innovation in this State. However, they must not be used on their own: they must be incorporated into the whole machinery of the handling of prisoners in South Australia.

If the Government is genuine in its humanisation of the parole system, it will have to come up with a totally new

concept in penal policy which addresses the sentencing of prisoners, including the non-parole period of their sentence, the care and handling of prisoners in gaol, and their subsequent preparation for release back into the community. If we set high goals for ourselves in the handling of offenders while they are in prison, to be successful our training programmes for prison and parole officers must be of an equally high professional standard, the peak of which we have not yet reached in South Australia. The efficiency and proficiency of any uniformed service is only as good as the training of officers at all levels. To this end it is essential that a high level of in-service training be implemented to further the career prospects of officers while at the same time preparing them to become leaders in the implementation of our penal and rehabilitation systems as is expected of them as professionals in the Department of Correctional Services. I shall return to this vital aspect of in-service training in the department.

Members of this House who have spent any time wrestling with the problems of Yatala will appreciate that those problems cover many fields. It is not simply a question of the replacement of archaic buildings at Yatala, although that is an essential part of the overall plan. Nor is it only a matter of a higher level of in-service training for the officers. What is essential is the further enunciation of clear guidelines to deal with the treatment of offenders from the time of their sentencing until, in many cases, well after their release. Coupled with this, there must be a better use of community, public and private based organisations all of which have a role to play in the after-care of prisoners, even to the extent of the State's helping such private sector organisations financially to do their work.

Also, the necessary hard decisions must now be taken on the use of alternative sentencing. Above all, we must see the emergence in both the prison and the parole services of a united team of professionals who have been trained to work side by side with the common aim of rehabilitating those offenders who are capable of being rehabilitated. At the same time we must also revamp the parole system in respect of which we should address the question whether a prisoner should know his release day on the day of his admittance to prison.

I am well aware, as are other members who have an interest in the penal system, that certain offenders in Yatala and in other prisons are habitual recidivists. Among those at Yatala are 30-odd hard-core trouble makers, and there is an urgent need to isolate them from the other offenders. I am becoming increasingly sick and tired of being told by senior prison officers, 'Rehabilitation is a dirty word and we do not use it here in our gaols.' I can understand some officers adopting that attitude over the years, but that attitude must change because it will place the seal of doom on any programme that could be implemented with the intention of providing through-care for offenders from the time of their sentencing by the court until the time of their release back to the community. Such a scheme of through-care of prisoners would require the closest co-operation between prison officers and parole officers within the gaol complex and the highest degree of professional conduct and co-operation. Such a scheme would work so long as it received the appropriate co-operation along with the training of the officers concerned. Along with the co-operation would need to go the good will of all those concerned with the success of the scheme.

Referring to the problems in our penal system as described to me by former inmates whom I recently interviewed at Yatala, there is clearly an enormous lack of uniformity throughout Australia on the treatment of offenders, especially as to the length of imprisonment for various offences, the variation in conditions within penal institutions, and the

social and economic status of those offenders sent to prison. I am sure that most members of the public do not realise that whatever is the length of sentence or whether the offender goes to gaol or serves an alternative sentence has little bearing on the rate of crime. A vocal section of the public advocates harder sentences with longer periods in gaol, and I must admit that there is an expectation in the community that those who transgress against society are expected to face a full and exacting retribution from the public.

However, as legislators we must be ever mindful that statistically the length of sentence has very little bearing on the rate of recidivism. In the meantime we are placing many first offenders in gaol, where they come into contact with re-offenders. Many of these first offenders are not a risk to the life or limb of the public and, if required to serve time in a high-security prison such as Yatala, they will come out mentally scarred for life.

Another aspect that we as legislators must address is the cost of about \$25 000 at the last count to keep an offender in Yatala. This final aspect, coupled with statistical evidence, highlights the need to accelerate the implementation of alternative sentences to prison. For example, the periodic detention and the community work force that are needed for those who are not a security risk to the public and are causing enormous cost to the Treasury in keeping these offenders in confinement.

On the matter of alternatives to a prison system, Mr Justice Kirby summed up the situation in the following words:

It is the fact rather than the duration and deprivation of liberty that is the effective consequence of such punishment.

It has been difficult in the past to sell this plain fact of life to a community that is looking for retribution. But this problem can readily be overcome at the time of sentencing when a judge or sentencing panel—and I think we should look very seriously at this question of sentencing panels which I tend to favour—sets an appropriate period of detention which truly reflects the desire of the community for retribution and which has been carefully balanced against the punitive effect of the sentence and the cost to the community of keeping that particular offender in prison.

Prisoners see the parole service as being confused and having no direction within the department, although it is my personal belief that the parole division of the department is one area in which the decisions and programmes should be developed at the coal face. Ex prisoners often complain that there is little a parole officer can offer but a cup of tea or coffee. He cannot offer those vital things that an offender leaving gaol needs, such as jobs, money, or solutions to social and economic problems.

This, I believe, raises the basic question of the future role of probation officers and the direction of probation services here in South Australia. We have a discussion paper before us, and I would like an opportunity to develop my thoughts on it at a later date. However, prisoners at the moment feel the system of parole is a charade and unjust. Their grievances are related to the lack of rights for prisoners before the Parole Board and a lack of consistency coming from the board itself. They also complain of no representation before the board, no rights to view documentation before the board, no rights to appeal against a final decision, not always being given a full and proper explanation of why parole was refused, and they claim that the board sees itself as the second venue of trial against a prisoner and, consequently, the gravity of the offence often outweighs the performance of the offender whilst in prison.

They claim that model prisoners may be denied parole because of the offence and not because they have tried to redeem themselves whilst in the institution. Prisoners also

believe that the onus should be on the Parole Board to justify why an offender should not be released at the end of the non-parole period. These reasons should be made loud and clear to the offender; that is in the opinion of an offender. On the matter of representation, offenders believe that those who are not articulate are at a distinct disadvantage when appearing before the board and that when appearing they should have the same rights as before a court. This begs the question of removing the visiting justices system and having all cases heard publicly in a court outside the gaol. It is a system which I believe the Government should seriously look at, and a system which may be revolutionary but would certainly mean that prisoners coming up for charges in gaol would be heard before magistrates in an open court situation. The Government should seriously consider that suggestion.

Parole as a system was originated, members may be interested to hear, as a humane endeavour to modify the harsher aspects of punishment and to encourage good conduct in prison. It was also introduced to give offenders hope of an early return to normal life. In talking to prisoners, as I said earlier, it is obvious that the parole system has developed into a part of our punishment system that generates the greatest feelings of unfairness.

In referring to the achievements and failings of our parole system I would like to read to members from the Australian Law Reform Commission Report which summarises the principal defects of parole as currently organised:

- it promotes a degree of uncertainty and indeterminacy in criminal punishment;
- it assumes that later conduct in society can be predicted on the basis of conduct in the artificial world of prison;
- the procedures for parole decisions are currently conducted largely in secret and . . . most parole decisions are simply not reviewable in an open court forum. An administrative decision, largely unreviewable in the courts, affects, in practical terms, the liberty of the subject; and
- parole is, to some extent at least, a factor in a criminal justice 'charade'. A long initial sentence is typically imposed by the judge or magistrate. But they, the prisoners themselves, probation and parole officers and now the community generally all know that the long sentence will not usually be served. Rather a much shorter sentence will be served, the exact length of time depending in part upon the judicial order and in part upon an unreviewable administrative discretion, made in secret, on the basis of material which is largely untested and frequently unknown to the subject whose freedom is in issue.

Any debate which could lead to the abolition of parole in favour of more determinate sentencing must be kept in its true perspective. Quite clearly, there are some dangerous and anti-social offenders where offences can be dealt with only by imprisonment. Also, we must be careful that any move that could result in reductions in the use of imprisonment does not outstrip community opinion too far.

In South Australia we have learnt from experience that a mistake can be very costly to innocent members of our community. This extremely difficult question of whether a prisoner should be released on the parole date, and balancing it against public opinion, can best be assessed from reading an editorial which appeared in the *Sydney Daily Telegraph* and which highlights the good work which can be undone when an offender reoffends after being released at or soon after his non-parole date. I quote from that newspaper, as follows:

All too often, it appears, criminals are released from gaol on parole when they have not been rehabilitated . . . Finding an appropriate sentence for a crime is a heavy burden on any judge or magistrate. To have to attempt also to predict the circumstances that may exist at some future date and decide that parole may be appropriate then is an almost impossible burden. It would not be such a burden if judges knew that the parole date they set would be treated as it was intended—as a minimum time in gaol before release is considered—and not, as is all too often the case, the maximum period to be served before release unless the prisoner

has been particularly difficult while in gaol . . . As the statistics show too many criminals return to crime after serving sentences much shorter than actually handed down. Serious consideration must be given to more judicious use of the parole system and the use of low security prisons—and more effort made to ensure that prisoners are capable of living under the laws set by our society before they are set free.

My comment is that unfortunately we will never really come up with a foolproof system or method to determine whether it is safe to release one prisoner whilst another should be held for the full limit of his sentence. I think that is the dilemma facing the courts and those involved in making decisions in this matter. The fact of life is that probation and parole decisions cannot be made scientifically, and I once again use the words of Mr Justice Kirby, Chairman of the Law Reform Commission:

The most we can hope to do is to:

- introduce greater uniformity and consistency in punishment of convicted offenders;
- reduce the resort to imprisonment which has so many destructive effects on the prisoner and his family and costs the community so much;
- increase, imaginatively, the variety of punishments that are available to judicial officers, including those which require the participation of probation and parole officers; and
- remove the most dehumanising elements of our institutions—many of which were built in the Victorian age and still incorporate features that are silent, persisting monuments to the forgotten theories of forgotten penologists.

There are many offenders in gaol who could serve sentences by alternative penalties to that of being locked up. I refer to periodic detention orders and community work orders. Also, there are offenders whom the community expect to spend a long period in gaol but these offenders should not prejudice the chances of those prisoners capable of rehabilitation. It is of great concern that penalties awarded for offences against the person are, in many cases, less than those for offences against property. This anomaly will need to be addressed before considering any further changes to the parole system.

I turn to the subject of care of offenders, both in gaol and afterwards, by parole and probation officers, and the need to develop a system in South Australia whereby both prison officers and parole and probation officers can work side by side within the walls of Yatala and in our other institutions. I am realistic enough to know that this would be impossible at the moment, but the Government, as a matter of policy, must now set its ship on this course. It was disconcerting to read in the *Advertiser* on both 20 June and 8 August of alleged hardliners in Yatala amongst prison officers. I quote from the *Advertiser* of 20 June, under the headline 'Yatala hardliners', as follows:

The Correctional Service Department policies are consistently being thwarted by a sort of small minority of troglodytes, according to Yatala prisoners.

That is the view of the prisoners. We look at another view, that of Mr Maslen, who had just resigned at the time. In the *News* of 5 August, the comment was this:

Mr Maslen referred to a small group of troublemakers which he could not get at to bring about a change. He did not say whether the group comprised prison officers or prisoners.

However, on 8 August in the *Advertiser* an article by Robert Ball states:

Many prisons and departmental sources said at the weekend that old-guard prison officers were in a position to turn the clock back some 20 years.

It is a shame that that group still appears to be there, and I say that sadly, as we all know that this group resists and will continue to resist change. I am not advocating any relaxation in the need for discipline; indeed, without it there would be chaos in the prisons. It is very obvious that the old principles of man management learnt in the army, the 'three Fs' (firm, fair and friendly, with the emphasis on firm), have been lost. This aspect of man management has

been lost amongst a certain minority which is administering Yatala.

South Australia needs new buildings at Yatala, and new rules and regulations in the handling of offenders throughout the State. The former, the Government must implement as soon as possible; the latter, I believe, should commence immediately. As a short-term measure the Government should proclaim the new Correctional Services Act to help to restore some certainty and authority to the existing role of prison officers. As a second measure, it should start the move and set the scene for the eventual implementation in all institutions of a form of through-care of offenders along the lines currently being implemented in New Zealand. I will refer as I proceed for the next few minutes to the subject of through-care as such, and I will use it as a specific terminology.

For the benefit of members I should perhaps explain what I mean by through-care of offenders. It relies heavily on support and assistance of individuals and voluntary organisations within the community, as well as co-operation of prison and parole officers working together within the prison. Its aim is to preserve and foster an association between an inmate and his community. Clearly, it calls for a greater involvement of welfare and other agencies which provide social, educational and recreational services in prison and out in the community with which the offender can identify. It also calls for a programme of development of the prisoner throughout his term, aimed at integrating him back into the community on release.

Mr Mathwin: What happens if one will not work when he is in there? What do you do with him?

Mr OSWALD: As I said, if the honourable member had been listening to this speech, he would have heard me say that there are recalcitrant prisoners who are incapable of being rehabilitated, but I do not believe that the overall prison population—

Mr Mathwin: What does 'rehabilitation' mean?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr OSWALD: I am happy to accept the interjection. We cannot consider the whole of the prison population and group them among the recalcitrants. There are people in prison capable of rehabilitation, and the State has an opportunity to do something about it. It is rather sad if members believe that there are inmates in prison who are beyond rehabilitation.

Mr Mathwin: What does 'rehabilitation' mean? What is your definition?

Mr OSWALD: The scheme I have been referring to involves the preparation of a prisoner well before his release date and, as I said earlier, the ability to enlist the help of community agencies during the latter part of his sentence under the supervision of officers from the Department of Correctional Services. It involves allowing prisoners an involvement in a release to work scheme, training service and/or supervised repatriation. It also involves the Government in taking a decision to allow a prisoner to split the latter part of his custodial sentence, to allow him to ease back into the community by means of a substituted sentence, such as a periodic detention order or a community work order, for an appropriate period until the normal release date. However, I should like to place on record my thoughts that there should be a statutory time limit of about six months prior to release within which such orders may be made. This will help to emphasise a prisoner's character as pre-release assistance.

The system of through-care is also compatible with recent calls, which I support, for smaller regionalised prisons whose internal structure has classification procedures to preserve the maximum contact between inmates and those who may

help him in the community. I am also looking at a different style of probation service which would be aimed at fostering and using community volunteers and organisations to help support the offender, both during his sentence and upon release. It is important to note that any order would be made by the releasing authority on the basis of a programme recommended to it for the offender to undertake. This programme would continue for up to six months after the expected release date and would replace the existing probation period.

It is not just the department or the Offenders Aid Rehabilitation Society, but the community at large which has an obligation to move to find wider facilities and resources to provide for the after care of ex-prisoners. This is particularly important in times of limited funding. There is also an urgent need for this Government to develop and publish a comprehensive policy which recognises the importance of through-care rather than simply after-care, although I must agree that after-care is an integral component of the whole of the through-care concept. Because it is from the community that an inmate comes and to the community that an inmate will return upon release, it is essential that the through-care policy must be based on a wide range of community sponsors. While I acknowledge that, as a concept, through-care will have to be sold to the prison and parole officers, I believe that the Government should move now to develop, define and adopt a policy that will provide transitional assistance to all offenders rather than a small group of offenders being given after-care as at present.

In general terms, the general concept of through-care, as I see it, is very similar to the after-care services for released offenders, the major difference being that these services should come into existence not only in the last few weeks of an offender's sentence but as early in the sentence as is practical.

It is my view that too often an inmate's period of imprisonment is viewed in a vacuum, as if it were no more than a period of marking time before re-entry into the community. I am looking to the promotion by the Government (and if not by this Government, let it be by the next Liberal Government in two years time) of the formulation and adoption of a comprehensive through-care policy based on intensive community involvement which would constitute a working model and fit in the framework set out by correctional services departments in the United States, even back in 1967. A United States Task Force Report of 1967 states:

The task of corrections, therefore, includes building or rebuilding . . . ties between the offender and the community, integrating or reintegrating the offender into the community life, restoring family ties, obtaining employment and education, and securing in the larger sense a place for the offender in the routine functioning of society. This requires efforts not only towards changing the individual offender, which has been the most exclusive focus of rehabilitation but also the mobilisation and change of the community and its institutions . . .

I believe that that report (which is some 16 years old) should indicate to members how much catching up we have to do in South Australia. This concept, with these aims, would have to involve the Department of Correctional Services and possibly the Department of Community Welfare in identifying, co-ordinating, and, where appropriate, funding private individuals, private groups or agencies in the community which are willing to assist inmates and former prisoners to reintegrate themselves into society.

The major advantage of redeploying our limited resources in this way would be in the provision of transitional assistance to as many as possible, and the continuation of this assistance for a much longer time after release than is available under the present after-care assistance. Remember, through-care is intended to start within the prison and will not work without a 100 per cent commitment by all levels

of administration within the department. In particular, it will be the middle management level in prisons that will make it or break it.

However, I am sure that, with the introduction of on-going in-service training and dedication by officers, it can be made to work. I know that there are teething problems elsewhere, some old hands in prisons being reluctant to work side by side with the probation and parole officers within the prison. These problems are slowly being overcome elsewhere, and I would be extremely disappointed if South Australia could not move with the times, as is being done elsewhere.

Before I leave the matter of through-care, I would like to summarise its objectives for those members interested in following up the subject. First, it is to assess each inmate within three weeks of reception and establish a programme aimed at reintegration, which will be regularly reviewed until the completion of legal supervision; secondly, to provide opportunities for and encourage the highest degree of initiative and personal responsibility amongst inmates compatible with the requirements of security and control; thirdly, to offer inmates training, vocational education and social skills within and, wherever practical, outside the prison; fourthly, to provide regular useful employment for all inmates; fifthly, to preserve, foster and enhance constructive links and, particularly, family ties between inmates and the community as an aid to their reintegration into the community; and, finally, to maintain a high level of communication and co-operation with those divisions in the department and other agencies involved in through-care.

Let me now summarise the points I have made thus far. First, I support any move towards small regional prisons. I would like to see Yatala partially demolished, as per the model which the Chief Secretary has put on display, and a large section of inmates removed to a medium security prison (yet to be constructed) along the lines of the new medium security prison which the Chief Secretary and I inspected at Poremorema in Auckland, New Zealand. Both of us had the opportunity of seeing that structure, and I think that it is an appropriate model at which we could perhaps look. I refer to the medium security institution, not the high security institution.

This should be built in the near country. I do not agree with the distance of 100 kilometres: it is too far away. It should be perhaps 20 or 30 kilometres away at the most, so that visitors, legal officers and prison officers have ready access to the city. Because of funding restraints, I acknowledge that this cannot happen overnight. Therefore, I support moving excessive numbers of prisoners to the temporary prison being constructed at the back of the Women's Rehabilitation Centre.

In the long term, Yatala should be then reduced in size and rebuilt on a smaller scale to house a high security unit which will isolate 30 hard-core recalcitrant prisoners. It will also help in an overall reduction of inmates generally in the gaol, and leave some space for the medium security prisoners to be held within Yatala. In the meantime, the total prison population in South Australia should be reduced by the use of community work orders, and/or periodic detention and release to work programmes.

Superimposed over this new-look prison properties establishment, the Government should then implement the programme of through-care, which I have carefully analysed this afternoon, together with long-term in-service training programmes for officers to enhance the career prospects of the officers and to ensure a better chance of success of the through-care programme once it is implemented in the institution.

During 1980, as a member of the Public Accounts Committee, I was able to obtain first-hand knowledge of the

conditions within Yatala Labour Prison. Since that time, I have taken every opportunity to visit prisons here and as far afield as New Zealand, to talk to prison officers, parole and probation officers, prisoners, former inmates and senior officers of the Departments of Correctional Services in the various countries. I have also listened to the representations on the subject of prison, sentencing and parole by criminologists and members of the Judiciary, including Mr Justice Kirby, Chairman of the Commonwealth Law Reform Commission.

When I first began to address myself to the problems at Yatala in particular, and the Department of Correctional Services in South Australia in general, there were some basic questions to which I sought answers. I would like to share those questions with members in the House because I am sure that, at some time or other, they are questions which have probably been in the minds of members here. These are the questions I asked myself. Was there a need for change in any of the rules, regulations and disciplinary procedures which related to the custodial care of inmates? What are the visible signs of inconsistencies between institutions in South Australia (for example, Yatala, Adelaide, Port Augusta, and Cadell), and amongst superintendents in the use of and adherence to rules, regulations and disciplinary practices? Was there a need to change regulations and procedures to ensure more adequate protection of staff in situations of physical danger? Was there a need for a comprehensive study and review of the behavioural characteristics and treatment needs of inmates regarding their rehabilitation and release?

I further questioned whether there was a need to establish a new formal complaints review procedure for dealing with formal complaints made by inmates against their officers, and who should be represented on any such committee. Also, I asked whether there was any absence of official interest and support for rehabilitation work with inmates both within and without the prison. I have some knowledge of recruiting and training of both officers and other ranks in an army environment and it is with this background that I was interested to compare the recruiting, training and career prospects being offered to prison officers and comparing that with what is offered in another uniformed service.

Some of the matters that I canvassed may be of interest to other members of the House concerned with prison reform. Is there a need for greater selectivity in the future recruitment of prison officers? What training programmes exist, or should be improved upon, to equip existing officers with the knowledge and skills required by a diversification in approach to prison care? Is there a need for more training in interpersonal skills, communication and management? What training exists in self-defence and the development of physical fitness, and should such a course be mandatory? What sort of training unit as such exists, what does it teach, and is there a need for one which will match more effectively the relevant in-service training to promotion levels? What minimum fitness levels, if any, exist for age groups and certain positions? What sort of training is provided for officers in the basic skills of counselling and interpersonal relationships in their careers? Is there a clearly defined career pattern established with periods of early service in a variety of institutions, followed by an opportunity to specialise elsewhere within the service? Finally, what formal training courses are available to officers in State correctional service institutions at our State educational institutions and, if not, what courses should be implemented?

If members think carefully on these questions they will have to agree with my conclusion that we have a long way to go in regard to in-service training for prison officers, particularly in reference to their career planning. I offer a word of warning to the Government: it should not plan on

the reconstruction of new buildings for Yatala as being all it has to do to solve the problems. It is absolutely vital that reforms include revised procedures on recruitment and training, which will lead to improved career prospects as well as the better handling of prisoners.

Having regard to his public utterances thus far, it is quite clear that the Minister has not personally considered any of the questions that I have raised in the manner that they deserve. If the Minister is genuine about solving our prison problems, I would suggest that he take up the questions that I have raised. In the interests of overall prison reform the Minister cannot let these matters go unaddressed and leave them until the Liberal Party assumes Government in two years time. He must act now or the initiative of the new buildings will be lost or, worse still, be negated.

There are other matters in the running of prisons which I know the Minister has not attempted to address, but they will not go away. If the Minister was competent, he would address these matters in his overall plan for prison reform. It is an area that is vitally important for morale and discipline amongst prison officers within the prisons. I refer to promotion policies, the occupational status of prison officers, the interaction between prison officers, their social and family problems, and the effect of prison life on the relationship between officers and their wives and children. This aspect can have an enormous effect on the attitude on the job of many prison officers.

I would like to expand further on some of these more humane aspects of a prison officer's life. The first question to ascertain concerns problems that may exist in the department's promotion policy which are affecting morale and work performance. Also, whether there are long delays for promotion for suitably qualified officers and, if so, how this can be corrected. Does that mean there should be more steps and appropriate pay scales which can take into account specialist qualifications? I wonder whether the Minister has bothered to check up to see whether there is a performance appraisal procedure to facilitate both personal and career development of his officers, and if in fact procedures for promotion take in both qualifications and experience on the job.

Another area which has concerned me during my studies and interviews with prison officers is the occupational status of prison officers and their perceived standing in the community. It is my belief that the public is largely unaware of the importance of the work being carried out by prison staff. I have never seen a list to be able to compare where they rate on a list of social status of occupations, but I imagine it would be fairly low. That is not because they are prison officers, but because the public does not know what the officers do. I would have thought that by now the Government would have seen the urgent need for a public relations unit within the department with the specific responsibility of informing the public of the important and difficult nature of prison work. It is very obvious that the positive nature of the prison officer's role has been played down to the public. I believe that this must be redressed by the Government.

I wonder how many cases exist within the service where the occupational role of the officer influences his personal, family and social life. I wonder how many times problems associated with prison life spill over into the home lives of officers? I certainly have been informed that they have a high divorce rate, although I doubt whether the Minister has ever considered this aspect, let alone conducted a survey on the subject. There are times when prison officers could feel justified in believing they are the forgotten branch of the Public Service and that public sympathy is with the inmates and not with the prison staff. If this is the case, the Government must institute a public education pro-

gramme to redress this position. I pose the following questions, particularly for the Minister's consideration:

1. Is there a need to develop within the department an orientation programme which will include individual and group counselling and a chaplaincy service available to both officers and their wives?
2. Can the system be improved which provides for support after an assault, or when another crisis occurs?
3. Should regular courses on planning for retirement be implemented, for example, on matters covering financial and housing problems, etc.?

I refer to the more personal problems involving the families of officers. Has the Minister ever attempted to assess how much stress is placed on wives due to the ever present fear that their husbands may be assaulted? I wonder whether work in Yatala and the hardening of attitudes because of working with inmates is often carried into the family, thus affecting family life? Is there a system for offering support to the family of an officer after an assault on an officer, or when a crisis occurs in the family due to the work situation? I wonder whether an officer on shift work and call-back spends any lesser time with his wife and children than does a shift worker in any other industry, for example, at G.M.H. If he does, has the Minister addressed this question? I wonder whether the Minister has considered talking to prison officers' wives? I certainly would, if I were Minister, because I would be serious about improving the work status, career prospects and public perception of my officers. If the Minister does not know the types of question to ask, then let me give him a few suggestions which he might find helpful.

First, ask the wives in what way their husband's occupation affects the time their father spends with his children, that is, the effect of prison shift work on the children. Ask the wives about the effect of their children's father's behaviour at home. Ask about the effect on their children of the public's attitude to their father's occupation? Ask them their own attitude to their husband's occupation. Ask the wives whether they feel a concern about any serious difficulties in communicating with their husbands and any sense of increasing distance from them due to their occupations?

Ask them whether prison attitudes and tensions are frequently brought home, or whether they find that officers compartmentalise their working and personal lives and do not discuss their occupational concerns with their wives? Ask them to what extent their social life is affected by their husband's occupation? Ask the wives whether they have to moderate interactions between their husbands and children and whether it is necessary to act as 'solo parents' much of the time and, in fact, more so than wives of shift workers of other occupations? Ask them whether their husband's irregular hours place constraints on their own personal development or occupational opportunities? Ask the wives whether they agree that, while they try generally to be supporters of their husbands, they have to cope with severe occupation related stress? Finally, I suggest that the Minister ask himself whether any professional help is available through the department if they fail to cope with severe occupational related stress.

I believe that, if the Minister has spent some time talking to wives as I have done, he will know that the picture is very revealing of that human aspect of administering a uniformed service. If a Minister takes on a Ministry that includes a full-time uniform service, it is not sufficient to address himself only to bricks and mortar when he is reorganising it. Two of the principles of leadership is man management and maintenance of morale. I therefore submit to the Minister that the areas I have covered in this speech (namely, the training of the officers, their relationship with inmates, the department's promotion policy, the occupational status of officers and family life of the officers) are a vital

part of the reorganisation of prison life and must be addressed at the same time as the Minister is currently considering programmes for the erection of new buildings in which to house prison inmates.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles): I support the motion and express my loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen and to the Governor of South Australia, who represents her in this State. I would like also to express my condolences to the family of the late John Coumbe, who retired from this place in 1977, which was the year I was elected. Consequently, I never served in the House of Assembly with him but I nevertheless knew him as a respected colleague in Liberal circles and as a member who, on his return to the House, always exercised a kindly and courteous interest in the progress of newer and younger members, particularly in the progress of his successor, the present member for Torrens, the Hon. Michael Wilson.

I would like, in taking this Address in Reply debate the opportunity that is provided for all members, to pay a tribute to an eminent South Australian, to discuss matters concerning voluntary services in my own electorate and also to discuss matters concerning the tourism industry. Before doing so, I would like to congratulate the member of Bragg on his election and also on his maiden speech. Listening to the honourable member's maiden speech, I was prompted to recall my own maiden speech and to refer to it to see whether my views had changed or had been modified in any way during my six years in Parliament and in politics. I am pleased to say that I stand by every word I said in that maiden speech, which was not in an Address in Reply debate but actually in a debate on the Budget.

In that debate I had the opportunity to examine the relationship between political freedom and economic freedom and also to analyse the effect of Federation on the distribution of powers in Australia. There is one statement in that speech which I think is as relevant today as it was then and bears restating. I was referring to the major problems that beset democratic nations and engulf totalitarian States as the pervasive feeling that individuals have little or no power to influence events, and they are at the mercy of remote Governments. I went on to say:

This issue is emerging all over the world as the powers of the modern State develop and gather momentum to the point where Governments threaten to become the masters and not the servants of the people who elect them.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: It certainly does bear restating.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Yes. I believe that, since the election of the present State and Commonwealth Labor Governments, that tendency for the Government to become the master and not the servant of the people who elect it has become accentuated. It is demonstrated more effectively in fiscal matters than in any other matter, because the more of a person's income that the Government takes unto itself to decide how it will spend it the less freedom there is for that individual to determine matters that are relevant to his or her life for the expenditure of that income, often hard-earned income. In that light it is interesting, as it always is with political leaders, to go back to the maiden speech of the Premier of South Australia, the Hon. John Bannon. In his speech, which was an excellent speech in terms of its expression of a political view (it is not a view which I share but it was a well-structured speech), the Premier said something which is very revealing about a Labor politician and about his views on representation. He said:

We have our democratic opportunities—

we in the Labor Party—

to argue and take part in the Party's decision-making process itself and the opportunity to explain the views and attitudes of

our constituents but, when the time comes, I am pleased to go out to my constituents and say, 'I know you did not support this, but your Party supports it, the Party that endorsed me there and, therefore, I am supporting it in the Parliament.'

So much for elected representation and the expression of the will of the people in the Parliament by Labor politicians! I suggest that those who are concerned about the trend that this Government is taking should make reference to the Premier's maiden speech, commencing at page 681 of *Hansard* on 3 November 1977, and I invite comparison with the views I expressed commencing at page 435 of the same volume of *Hansard* on 25 October 1977.

I would like to pay tribute to an eminent South Australian who died in May this year and who was widely respected throughout the community, particularly in legal and health circles. I refer to the Hon. Sir Charles Hart Bright, whom I knew as Chairman of the South Australian Health Commission for six months between November 1979 and May 1980. Sir Charles Bright is no doubt best known in South Australia for his role as a judge of the Supreme Court but he had enormous influence beyond legal circles. He was a very distinguished Chancellor of Flinders University from 1971 to 1983 and, in fact, retired shortly before his death. He was Chairman of the Committee of Inquiry into the South Australian Health Services in the early 1970s, and he was also Chairman of the Committee of Inquiry into the Rights of the Disabled.

It was in respect of his work in both those capacities, especially in health matters, that I came to know him. I admired him for his intellect, for his calm and amiable temperament, for his attitude that was both compassionate and dispassionate towards the issues of human conduct and human affairs put before him, and for his great skills in analysing problems and recommending solutions to those problems. His advice to me and to the Government on the restructuring of the South Australian Health Commission was invaluable. I appreciated that advice and tried to implement in accordance with Liberal policy the views that he expressed on the importance of retaining the administrative management of health services at the location where those services were delivered. That decentralisation of management was a central philosophy of Sir Charles and a view that the Liberal Government endorsed. However, I am sad to say that such decentralisation is being dismantled under the present Administration.

During his term as Chairman of the Health Commission and special adviser to the Government on health services, Sir Charles Bright paid me the great compliment and honour of writing to me a series of letters addressed 'To my Minister on constitutional matters'. As a tribute to Sir Charles and so that some of his wisdom can be placed on record, I shall read extracts from those letters to the House. The first letter, dated 8 January 1980, sets out what Sir Charles intended to do: that is, to discuss individual specific topics, namely, the Queen, the Government, the Privy Council and the Executive Council, the Premier and the Cabinet, the role of the Minister, the role of the Director-General or head of department, and the role of the Health Commission.

The statements of Sir Charles about the role of the Queen are pertinent to a debate on the Address in Reply to the Speech of the Sovereign or the Sovereign's representative in opening Parliament. In respect of the Queen, Sir Charles states:

The last century has seen a gradual increase in the involvement of the Monarch in the affairs of ordinary citizens. The Prince Regent would have been incredulous if he had been told what the public involvement of the Queen and the Royal Family is today.

A legal purist might say that the Queen's powers are merely to appoint or dismiss a Prime Minister, to dissolve a Parliament and to affect the voting in the House of Lords by the appointment of new peers. In my view that would be a grossly inadequate 'job

specification'. The present Queen has been in office longer than any of her Ministers, she has tremendous empathy with her subjects in the U.K. and her political influence, in the sense of counselling and persuading, is immense. Whether she has open conflict with any of her Ministers no-one outside her immediate entourage can say. I suspect that she does not, but that she is able to affect public events by subtle and unacrimonious discussion.

It is a truism that the Queen acts on the advice of her Ministers and that therefore they and not she are responsible for those actions. Anyone who has had to advise a good senior executive person knows how the advice can be corrected and modified in an interview. The influence exerted by the Queen, coupled with the strict legal powers of appointment and dismissal mentioned [earlier in the letter] combine to vest in her a very great total political power. This is enhanced by her personal empathy with her subjects.

In relation to Dominions and constituent political parts of Dominions (such as the States of Australia), the Queen's powers are still more subtle. She appoints and can dismiss Governors, but in so doing she acts on the advice of a Minister. She is the Queen of Australia and the Queen of South Australia, but those concepts tend to become tangled up in legal quibbles and mysticism. She is, in relation to some parts of the British Commonwealth, not the Queen. For example, India is a Republic. Nevertheless, India recognises the Queen as Head of the Commonwealth although not as Queen of India.

In my letter on Governors I shall have something to say about their relationship with the Queen. For the present, I merely observe that in Australia her real power is limited to the political consequences of the respect accorded to her by Governors, Ministers and a large section of the public and to the recognition that she enjoys as titular head of Australia and the British Commonwealth.

Much of what Sir Charles had to say in the letter about the Queen is relevant to another letter he wrote dealing with the role of a Minister. Indeed, much of what Sir Charles had to say is relevant to events which have occurred in this Parliament in recent weeks and which I suspect may be currently occurring again. I refer to the onerous obligation on all Ministers to be scrupulous in their dealings with facts, to be absolute adherents to the truth when addressing themselves to this Parliament and, through this Parliament, to the people of South Australia, on behalf of the Queen whose Ministers they are. In his letter on the role of the Minister, Sir Charles states:

Constitutionally a Minister manages a department of State. Long ago he was regarded as a high servant of the Monarch who was regarded as all powerful. Compare the position in the United States today. As real power left the Monarch and vested in the people in Parliament the Minister came to be regarded as a servant of the people, answerable to them for his department. Because a Minister is responsible in Parliament for his department he is entitled to the fullest information about the administration of the department. Traditionally, a Minister may have to resign because of something which has gone very wrong in his department even if he himself is in no way responsible or may be entirely ignorant of the matter. (That is very important.)

There can be more than one view about the extent to which a Minister should actually exercise executive power. The same or a similar problem confronts a part-time chairman of directors. I must point out that a Minister who adopts a policy of becoming his own chief executive officer is living dangerously. He is likely to be directly blamed for anything that goes wrong, he loses the advantage of having information and advice filtered to him by his department and he downgrades and dispirits his Director-General or Chairman. He forfeits 'running room'. Whatever course a Minister adopts, it should be consistent. Nothing could be worse than to pick up and put down the threads of executive action. A department can run for a fair while with a good Director-General and without any Ministerial intervention. It must fall to pieces if the Minister confuses it by inconsistent action.

Public servants cannot, usually, justify or explain their official conduct in public. They expect (or hope) that their Minister will stick up for them publicly even if he berates them privately. There are limits to this. A Minister can get into an inextricable mess by asserting that nothing is wrong when something obviously is wrong. A Minister should give directions in writing, or at least record them in writing, for everyone's protection. The most important duty of a Minister in my opinion is to inspire and lead by positive action and by ensuring that the departmental officers know what they ought to be doing and why.

During Question Time today, I was considering the position of the Director-General of Local Government and former Chairman of the Grants Commission and recalling those

words of Sir Charles that public servants 'expect (or hope) that their Minister will stick up for them publicly even if he berates them privately'.

The next letter deals with the role of a Director-General and head of a department. I do not wish to read it all into the record but these paragraphs are pertinent:

So far as the Minister is concerned he [the Director-General or head of department] must always remember that the Minister is responsible in Parliament for the operations of the department. So he must never knowingly mislead his Minister, he must be astute to detect improprieties in his department for which his Minister might have to answer, and he must be at pains to keep his Minister fully informed. 'Fully informed' does not mean merely reporting when things are going wrong. It also means, especially with new Ministers, an educative process to ensure that the Minister has a sufficient comprehension of what the department does and how it does it. From time to time the Minister is likely to initiate procedures which the Minister may feel may improve the working of the department. The Director-General must not reject such initiatives. The Minister is, after all, the head of the power structure. So any Ministerial initiatives must be given full consideration and the Director-General must give a full explanation to the Minister of why any initiative cannot be implemented or, if it can, whether it is desirable to do so, and if it can be implemented and is not unlawful, how best to do so. If the initiative can be introduced, the Director-General must obey the Ministerial directive after fully explaining his own anxieties about it. And he must not pretend to implement it and nevertheless frustrate it. The Director-General is entitled to written directions in any such case.

Later, the letter states:

What is a Director-General to do when he believes that a Ministerial directive is unwise and should be altered or withdrawn? Various expedients are adopted such as leaking it to the Opposition, or to the press, telling another Minister, and so on. I am old-fashioned enough to believe that all those expedients are wrong. I believe that the Director-General can put his objections and his advice to the Minister in writing, warning the Minister politely but clearly of what he sees as ill consequences. He is entitled to have on his files that piece of paper bearing the Minister's initials. There are not many Ministers who will persist in such circumstances.

I am sure that you, Sir, and all members will agree that they are wise words indeed. I believe that they are particularly applicable in the cases of more than one Minister in the Cabinet at the moment. I hope that they are read, considered and understood, and that the message is reinforced, as it periodically needs to be, that a Minister who betrays the confidence of the people and, in effect, sullies the Crown by being dishonest to Parliament is a Minister who must expect the ultimate retribution to fall upon him or her. That, of course, means losing Cabinet office. It can, in some cases, mean the Government's losing office, depending upon the action of the Leader of the Government in such circumstances, and on the ultimate judgment of the people.

Now, I would like to turn to my own electorate of Coles and pay a tribute to the Athelstone Country Fire Service unit and the role that it played in fighting the Ash Wednesday bush fire. Ash Wednesday, 16 February 1983, saw the Athelstone unit in action for almost two days and nights, supporting the adjacent C.F.S. units in the devastated areas of Anstey Hill, Paracombe, and Slapes Gully, and Skye, then protecting the Athelstone and Black Hill native flora park areas by concentrated efforts in the Castambul, Torrens Gorge and Highbury areas over several days and nights.

The unit was protecting the back door of the city of Campbelltown from the destruction that devastated the Mount Lofty Ranges at that time. It is interesting to contemplate that those disciplined personnel whose unit originally was formed to protect what was then open country now find themselves flanked on the western border of their area by a completely built-up suburban area. They are technically in the metropolitan area, but for all practical and operational purposes that unit is an integral part of protection for the national parks in that area of the Mount Lofty Ranges. I refer particularly to Black Hill, Morialta Park,

Thorndon Park Reserve and to the aforementioned areas of Anstey Hill, Paracombe, Slapes Gully, and Skye, as well as the Torrens Gorge.

The Athelstone Country Fire Service has previously been funded by the City of Campbelltown, but the City of Campbelltown last year quite realistically gave responsibility for its metropolitan fire protection to the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service. That decision has reduced the direct necessity for the corporation to directly finance the unit at Athelstone, and it has placed that unit in some jeopardy. I hope that the Minister for Environment and Planning will very sympathetically consider the submission made to him by the unit providing justification for continued funding of the unit by the Department of Environment and Planning. Indeed, one might almost describe such funding by the department as a self-defence mechanism because, without that Athelstone unit, the very important areas of Black Hill and Morialta (important in both intrinsic and environmental quality and for the capital investment of taxpayers' money that has been placed in them) would be very vulnerable indeed.

The C.F.S. unit certainly has the experience, the location and the ability to provide effective fire suppression and emergency service resources not only in Athelstone and Campbelltown but in adjacent and wider areas, as was graphically demonstrated on Ash Wednesday. If that unit were disbanded it would eliminate the only operational C.F.S. unit for the Hills face and immediate hinterland areas of Mount Lofty Ranges between Tea Tree Gully and Burnside.

I know that the member for Davenport is as concerned for the future of the Burnside unit, which is in a similar position, as I am for the future of the Athelstone unit. The unit has provided over the years a first response capability to many, many fires. In addition to the areas I have mentioned, it has assisted in putting out fires in the Montacute Conservation Park, the Horsnell Gully Conservation Park, Cleland Conservation Park, including Waterfall Gully, Belair Recreation Park, Brownhill Creek Recreation Park, which is well south of Athelstone, and the Cudlee Creek Conservation Park. Additionally, a large number of local fires have been attended. I believe that the dedication of this unit ranks on a par with the dedication of the best units in South Australia.

The unit is ably supported by a women's auxiliary and all members, I think, will know the reliance all such units place on the back-up services that a women's auxiliary provides. I recently had the pleasure of attending the annual general meeting of the unit and was enormously impressed by the discipline, *esprit de corps*, the enthusiasm and the leadership of the unit. I am pleased to place publicly on the record in Parliament my congratulations and admiration to those very brave and able men and women who have protected and I will hope continue to protect the area around Athelstone in case of fire.

Now, Mr Deputy Speaker, I come to the tourism industry and the responsibility that I, as shadow Minister, have to the industry to continue to bring to public notice issues which affect the industry, particularly issues that come within the realm of either State or Federal Governments. The first and most obvious issue today, 24 August, is reference to last night's Federal Budget. My first task is to deplore the wine tax which was imposed in the Budget and the effect that that will have on wine producers, and particularly on grape growers in South Australia, and indirectly and directly on the tourism industry. I have dealt with that matter at some length in this House before. I simply want to again deplore the involvement of the Minister of Tourism, and in my opinion the irresponsible involvement, in entering into a matter which was not within the realms of his Min-

isterial responsibility, in giving unequivocal assurances which could have had an effect on the wine industry and reduced the intensity of its campaign to the Federal Government in an effort to ensure that no tax was imposed. Because of the Minister's unequivocal assurance, which has now proved to have no credibility at all, the industry's pressure on the Government was reduced.

Ms Lenehan: There is no tax on table wine.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: It is incredible to think that members opposite believe that the Federal Government last night did not impose a wine tax. The Treasurer said he was imposing a tax on wine; the headlines say a tax on wine has been imposed; and members of Parliament opposite say there is no tax on wine. Those who have their head in a vat may have it in too deeply to see reality. It was an amazing statement by the Minister of Tourism, and it is an amazing statement by the member for Mawson to suggest that there is no tax on wine. I suggest that the member for Mawson should go to the Riverland, go down to her own electorate and ask the wine makers whether they think there is a tax on wine. She will be reassured that they do believe that there is a tax on wine.

I commend the Federal Government for its backdated exemption from sales tax on the construction of pleasure craft, and I commend the Minister of Tourism for the resolution that he put at the last Tourism Ministers' conference. In so doing, he was pursuing representations that I had made in Government on this matter to the former Federal Treasurer.

I deplore the blatant pork barrelling that is apparent in the Federal Government's grant of \$1 000 000 to the Queensland Government. I regard that as a breathtaking piece of politicking that will arouse a very great resentment in all other States except Queensland, and if members opposite are not resentful, then I suggest that they are failing in their duty to their constituents. I can imagine that the Minister of Tourism (now on the front bench) must have felt very embarrassed indeed when he read of that \$1 000 000. How dearly the operators in Arkaroola, on the Murray River, on the Port River, across to Kangaroo Island, would love to have their rightful share, their equitable share, of that pork barrelling subsidy which has been directed wholly and solely to Queensland.

Here again, the Federal Minister for Tourism demonstrates his lack of appreciation of his role as a Minister in a Federal Government, administering a federal system, where the individual States are competitors amongst themselves in the tourism area. Each State is trying to do its best to attract visitors to its own area. When all other States are disadvantaged because of Federal largesse to an individual State for what is quite clearly a partisan purpose, then I think the Federal Minister for Tourism and the Federal Government stand condemned for their actions. I hope that the Minister, and indeed the Premier, will express in the strongest terms their condemnation of this kind of partisan pork barrelling politics and do their level best to ensure that South Australian tourism operators get some kind of a fair deal in respect of exemption on duty for diesel fuel.

It is not only the Whitsunday Passage that has beautiful islands; the Sir Joseph Banks group in South Australia has simply superb islands, and the operational costs of running those islands as a tourist destination involve at least 10 or nearer 15 per cent of the total operational cost being allocated to diesel fuel. If that huge burden could be reduced, then the profitability of those operations, like the profitability of operations on the Murray River and the Port River, and the ferry and hydrofoil to Kangaroo Island, would be greatly improved, with a resulting increase in employment. However, I suspect that the present Federal Government will continue to put its money where it thinks the votes are and that, at

the moment, happens to be in Queensland. That is very much to the detriment of the industry in all the other States.

The other imposts in the Federal Budget which will affect tourism are the tax on beer, the tax on petrol, the tax on tobacco, and the fact that these taxes are to be indexed. It is interesting to look at the economic logic (if one can call it that) of a Treasurer who decides that taxes need to be indexed to the c.p.i. so that the Government can continue to get its rake-off from inflation. Each of those taxes, by being indexed, will in effect contribute to inflation and to an increased c.p.i., and therefore to an ever increasing rake-off by the Government from private industry. That relates to what I said earlier: the more a Government deprives individuals and corporate bodies of the right to determine how they will spend their income, their earnings, their revenue, their profits (whatever is appropriate in the case), the more political power that Government takes unto itself, because the economic power is synonymous with the political power, and the Federal Government is getting bigger and bigger and bigger at the expense of individuals and businesses in Australia.

The other matter that I want to touch upon while speaking of Budgets is a matter that was raised by the member for Mawson at Question Time in the House of Assembly on 9 August, when she made reference to the slight but measurable down-turn in the major tourism indicators in South Australia for the March quarter. Knowing of the inevitable ups and downs in visitor numbers in the varying quarters, and the reasons for those ups and downs, I resisted what might have been considered a temptation to leap in and say, 'Ha, look, the figures have gone down as soon as the Labor Government comes to power', and I accept some, but by no means all, of the reasons that the Minister gave for that down-turn in figures. I accept, for example (although I think perhaps there could be a question mark over it), that a Federal election can influence the decisions that people make about expenditure and therefore about holidays. I certainly accept that, in the alternate year in which a festival is not held, our figures are inevitably going to be down on the previous March quarter, and it is hard therefore to get an accurate yard stick of comparison. However, I do not accept the Minister's statement that in the months preceding the March quarter there was no television advertising campaign simply because the money allotted by the previous Treasurer for this purpose had run out. It is important that the truth goes on the record.

The Minister knows as well as I do that the reason that the department did not run a television campaign prior to that quarter, when it might have been logical to do so, was not because of Budget considerations, or at least not solely (and I will come to that), but because the department and its new agency, with my knowledge and approval as Minister, decided that it was important that the filming of television commercials should be done in the summer months, when the countryside and the regions were looking their best; that made sense. It was for that reason, therefore, that the interstate television campaign did not get off the ground in time to influence visitors to South Australia in the March quarter, and as much as I respect the Minister for his fairness in examining tourism issues and performances of respective Governments, I do believe that that was a quite unwarranted blow beneath the belt, and the record should be set straight on that matter.

I commend him for extracting from his Cabinet and Treasury an additional \$300 000. Well done! I only regret that that extraction has obviously been paid for by some of the imposts announced by the Premier when he introduced the Supplementary Estimates last week. However, the television campaign has now been launched in Sydney. It is a brilliant campaign, and I would like to pay tribute to the

Department of Tourism and its extremely professional senior officers for a superb presentation of the campaign at the opening of the new Sydney office.

I would like to thank the management of the Sydney office for its hospitality on that memorable occasion, and to commend the department for a subsequent and extremely successful presentation at the Australian Federation of Travel Agents Convention. I did not attend that convention but I heard from other delegates that the South Australian presentation was superb. It outclassed the presentation of all other States, and it was such a success that it is very likely that South Australia will be successful in attracting AFTA conventions to this State in 1986. I wish the department well in the work that it is doing in that regard.

We are extremely fortunate in relation to marketing, regional liaison and research and development. In fact (and my observations of the work of other tourism authorities around Australia support this), I believe that our research support in South Australia in tourism is second to none, and the output of data by that division of the department is of immense value to business. I only wish that more businesses would take advantage of that information that is available to them, and that more members of Parliament would analyse and examine that information to ascertain how it can be used for the further development of tourism in South Australia.

Another important issue is the question of conventions and casinos, and how those two matters will be dealt with by the Government. First, I deal with the question of conventions. In considering that issue, it is important to realise the economic value of conventions to South Australia in direct terms, and the economic value in indirect terms, which is probably barely measurable, even though one can use the convenient calculation of one tourism dollar being worth \$2.62 when the multiplier effect is taken into account.

In 1982, using figures provided by the Adelaide Visitors and Convention Bureau, there were 72 000 delegates to conventions organised by that bureau in South Australia. Those visitors spent approximately \$26 200 000. In assessing those figures, it is important to realise that they do not by any means represent the total of convention spending, because many conventions held in this State are independently organised and, therefore, are not monitored by the bureau. Therefore, the actual figure of convention visitors' spending is likely to be closer to \$40 000 000. That is a very significant amount of the total (when one considers that it is only one sector of the industry) of visitors' spending in South Australia, which was \$720 000 000 in the last measured year, 1981-82.

Of course, convention visitors have the highest aggregate spending of any of the visitor segments. The lowest spending is in relation to people visiting family and relatives. However, the convention visitor invariably has his or her fare paid for by an employer, corporate body or association. Therefore, the daily personal expenditure can be of a slightly more expansive nature than if the visitor had been required to foot the total bill for the visit. If we were to increase the \$40 000 000 on an annual basis of, let us say, 10 per cent (which is quite an achievable goal), it could develop into very big business indeed. When I say that it is an achievable goal, I mean that, although the Adelaide Convention Visitors Bureau and its board are an extraordinarily competent and market-oriented group, in effect, they are working on their own: they are not working within the confines or guidelines of an actively developed Government policy to attract conventions to South Australia. I acknowledge that that is not by any means the sole responsibility of this Government. However, there has been no real convention policy for South Australia, and there should be.

The Liberal Government during its term of office, was actively working, and made an election undertaking to work, for the construction of an international convention centre in Adelaide. In fact, prior to the election we were close to successful negotiations with developers for that centre to be constructed. Many people think that the recently announced so-called international convention centres in Hobart and Sydney provide Australia with its first international convention centres. In fact, despite the construction of those so-called international convention centres, Australia still does not have what is known as a fourth-generation convention centre, purpose-built and necessary to attract a significant proportion of the 6 000 or so international conventions that are held in the world annually. The expected rate of development of international conventions is such that the forecast is that by 1992 that figure will have doubled and there will be 13 000 international conventions held annually. It is very interesting to read the list of conventions. There is everything from the canary fanciers to obstetricians and gynaecologists.

Mr Becker interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Yes. There is no limit to the subjects on which the human mind chooses to address itself all over the world by people getting together to talk about and consider these issues.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Do Ministers and shadow Ministers of Tourism have international conventions?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Not yet, but I think that we could work towards that. Of course, there would be nowhere near thousands of delegates. However, by the year 1992 those 13 000 conventions will represent 12 000 000 delegates moving around the globe and spending money in large sums. As I have said, convention delegates are big spenders. If Adelaide can be first off the rank in Australia with an international convention centre, we will attract a significant segment of that market, because international conventions are always looking for somewhere new, somewhere attractive, somewhere with a stable social climate and with real security—

Mr Klunder: With a casino?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I am coming to that. They are often looking for a place with an English-speaking population. Of course, Adelaide more than fulfils those requirements. It is important to realise that the operation of an international convention centre often needs supplementary funds. The capital funds for construction are so vast that it is very difficult indeed for an operation to be profitable if the capital funds have to be paid off over a period.

That is why I believe, as does the convention sector of the tourism industry in South Australia, that it is very important indeed for the casino licence to be used as a catalyst to attract funds and for the revenue of a casino to be used to off-set the operating cost of a convention centre. It is well known that I opposed, and still oppose, casino gambling. I did my best to ensure that the casino legislation did not pass. However, because it has been passed I now see my role as trying to ensure that the legislation is properly administered in the best interests of South Australians, both economically and socially. There is no way in which a casino licence for either an existing institution or a single purpose-built casino could possibly generate the jobs and the economic development that would be associated with an international convention centre.

An international convention centre would bring hundreds of thousands of visitors to Adelaide each year. Their spending would affect every sector of the State's economy: it would affect rural industries, the hospitality and accommodation industry, the printing industry, and all kinds of technical industries. The entire spectrum of industry and commerce

as well as the professions would benefit from such a centre. There is no comparable benefit that could ensue from a casino simply attached either to an existing hotel or to an existing establishment, or, indeed, to a new purpose-built casino. Therefore, I call on the Government to make it a matter of employment policy, and to make its submission to the Casino Supervising Authority when it is established to the effect that the licence should be granted in conjunction with the development of an international convention centre. It is open to the Government to do that, and one might say that a great deal is hanging on the outcome of such a decision.

I think it would be a tragedy if the unique opportunity that this legislation offers to the Government were to be by-passed because of the difficulties that quite obviously are being experienced. The deadline given to the developers has already been extended at least twice, as far as I am aware through industry sources, and it may have been extended even more often than that. Therefore, clearly it will not be easy to get that convention centre off the ground.

Looking back 50 years to the State's centenary in 1936 it was not easy for the Government of the day to show faith in its future at a time of unprecedented economic depression by constructing Centennial Hall, and yet as an activity and an event to mark the centenary of the State the Government of the day did construct Centennial Hall. It is strange now to look back on that very outdated building, which is still serving a very useful purpose, its function being to provide a meeting place for people to get together and for people to display what the State has to offer, and to realise that it is not far removed in concept from the present proposal to establish an international convention centre as a sesqui-centenary celebration for South Australia, if indeed the project can be off the ground and running by 1986. I certainly urge the Government to do all in its power to ensure that that occurs. I hope that the industry will continue the strenuous efforts that I know have already been made to impress on the Government the importance of that occurring.

I refer to an issue that I mentioned when I commenced my speech, namely, the matter of individual liberty and the political power structures in Australia today. I think that the recently announced moves of both the Federal and State Governments to undertake what they described as constitutional reform, which I would describe as constitutional change but not credit it with the benefits implied in the word 'reform', are going to threaten the political liberty of Australians. I refer particularly to the question of fixed terms, which deprive the leaders of Government and Governments themselves of the opportunity to respond directly to the electorate in times of great need or crisis. I have recently re-read Bagehot's essays on the English Constitution, and despite the fact that those essays were written about 100 years ago much of what is in them is relevant to the current political debates about power in the hands of Government and/or power in the hands of the people. At the time of writing his essays on the English Constitution, Bagehot wanted to compare the English Constitution with that of another Parliamentary democracy, and the only readily available subject with which he could compare the English system was, of course, the American Constitution and the republican system.

Whilst Bagehot was an admirer of that system, he was also a critic of its features and the inflexibility of those features of the system, notably, the matter of fixed terms. I urge every member of this Parliament who is interested in the question of fixed terms to read Bagehot's essays on the English Constitution and the arguments that he puts forward in regard to flexibility and the inherent power that resides with the people. In times of crisis involving national or State trauma the Parliament has the opportunity to dis-

solve and is not obliged by law to limp along to the detriment of good government, having regard to the adverse effect that that can have on the people who are in government.

I suspect that those essays will be as relevant in 100 years time as they are now. Bagehot's comments on Ministerial responsibility are as relevant now as they were then. His ideas about elected leadership of political Parties, that is, the Prime Minister of England, and in our case the Premier of the State, bear examination because of the events that have taken place recently in South Australia. Matters such as Ministerial responsibility to Parliament, and so on, are relevant to that which is considered in the Bagehot essays which, as I have said, make worthwhile reading.

I conclude on a note that was touched upon by the present Governor-General when he was welcomed to South Australia last year. I believe that every member present was impressed by what he had to say. One thing that touched me particularly was Sir Ninian Stephen's reference to the fact that he believed that South Australia had realised its greatest achievements in times of its greatest adversity. He was referring to the great legislative reforms of the late nineteenth century and the very big construction achievements and administrative actions of Governments of that period. Governments of that time were facing enormous economic difficulties as well as social difficulties, but men and women (although the women were not publicly apparent, regrettably, at that time) made wise and far-sighted decisions from which we benefit today. Just as the Parliament in the 1880s made decisions that have served us well into the twentieth century, so too can the Parliament of 1983 similarly rise to integrity and wisdom and make decisions which will stand us in good stead into the years of the late twenty-first century. I support the motion.

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

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

PAROLE ORDERS (TRANSFER) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Debate on motion for adoption resumed.

Mr KLUNDER (Newland): In supporting this motion I must say that it was with considerable delight that I listened to that part of the speech by the honourable member for Coles where she tried so hard and delicately to resuscitate the hoary old Liberal myth about the difference between Labor and Liberal members of Parliament. For those members who have not heard it before, Labor Party members are supposed to be directed by some outside agency on how to vote, whether they like it or not, whereas the Liberals come into this House full of fearless strength drawn from an inner conviction that they are doing the right thing and that they will, in fact, vote only according to their consciences.

Mr Gunn: Tell us about those taxes. Come on!

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Whitten): Order!

Mr KLUNDER: It turns out that the actual situation is not quite like that. I am sorry that the member for Eyre

had too much to drink over the dinner interval, but I will try to ignore him.

Mr GUNN: I rise on a point of order. The member for Newland has made an accusation that I had too much to drink at dinner. That accusation could be made from time to time about a number of people in this House and, if the honourable member would like me to name them, I will certainly do so. However, what he has said is completely unparliamentary.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member should know better than to carry on the way in which he is carrying on at present. He is completely out of order. What is the honourable member's point of order?

Mr GUNN: My point of order is that the honourable member has reflected upon me, and I take the strongest exception to it, and ask for an unqualified withdrawal and an apology from him.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The words used by the honourable member for Newland were not unparliamentary. However, I point out to the member for Newland that, although I cannot rule that he should withdraw his remarks, if he wishes to do so that withdrawal will be accepted by the Chair.

Mr KLUNDER: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. Of course, I made absolutely no mention of any type of alcoholic drink—that is something the honourable member took for granted. If it makes him feel happy, I am willing to withdraw any comment that he has over-imbibed of the good grape or any other such material that might make a difference to how he speaks in this House in his totally illegal interjections.

To return to what I was saying before I was interrupted, Labor Party members are supposed to be directed on how to speak, while Liberal members supposedly come in here with an utterly clear conscience and vote entirely according to their consciences. It is a pity that the reality of these things does not bear out that hoary little myth. What actually happens is that members of the Labor Party, in much the same way that I am sure Liberal members do, meet together outside the Chamber and decide on a particular line, usually by consensus, and we then come in and support that consensus view. I think that to a large extent the Liberal Party does exactly the same thing.

On occasions, the Liberals cross the floor. The only time that they do not cross the floor is when their Government is in danger. I can recall five years under the Sir Thomas Playford Liberal Government and a period under the Steele Hall Liberal Government when there was a majority of only one Government member. I do not recall either of those two Governments falling because Liberal Party members voted against their Party line. There are times, five years at a time, when the Liberal Party for some reason or other tends to think very much like clones. For some reason or other their consciences tell them exactly the same thing and there are no problems with their voting pattern whatsoever. It is only when it does not matter, when the Liberals are in Opposition, that they vary their voting pattern a little: they are let off the leash, so to speak. I intend to spend most of my time in this debate dealing with the Education Department's personnel policy discussion paper, which was published in March this year.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Well, you are a brave man.

Mr KLUNDER: I am perfectly willing to accept that interjection from the shadow Minister of Education. Before I refer to the discussion paper, I point out that the Education Department made it clear when the paper was released and since then that it is nothing more than a discussion paper. It is not meant to put down any prescriptive guidelines; as such, I am perfectly happy to accept it.

I think the department deserves a great deal of praise for being willing to step out and release a discussion paper

rather than a prescriptive situation for its teachers so that hopefully by free discussion we might arrive at an acceptable compromise. Having said that, I make it clear that I disagree with almost everything contained in the paper. In fact, there are very few things in it with which I am happy to agree. It will be difficult to discuss the paper without at the same time spending a considerable amount of effort trying to elucidate for the benefit of honourable members what is actually in it. Therefore, my speech will probably be quite boring for those people who do not have a particular interest in education.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Everyone should be interested in education.

Mr KLUNDER: That is correct.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! It is difficult for the Chair to follow the honourable member for Newland if the honourable member for Torrens is going to continually interrupt.

Mr KLUNDER: So far, the member for Torrens is agreeing with me; while he is doing that I am perfectly willing to let him interrupt. The Education Department has recognised that most of the promotion positions held in schools at the moment are held by relatively young people. In fact, the mean age of primary school principals is 42 years; for seniors in secondary schools it is 36 years of age on average; and for primary school deputy principals it is 37 years of age. Given these facts, and given that the resignation or retirement rate from the Education Department is about 4 per cent, the department quite reasonably concludes in its paper that a number of the people in promotion positions at the moment will still be there in 20 years time.

Another problem pointed out by the department in the discussion paper is that the needs of schools have changed considerably over the past 15 years. At present there are a number of teaching areas where teaching did not exist, at least in their present form, some 20 years ago. For instance, greater consideration is now given to groups of students such as the socio-economically disadvantaged, the gifted, ethnic minorities, handicapped, Aborigines, and girls. As a result, the department believes that it is necessary to make provision for leadership positions in schools for other than the traditional subject areas.

That is perfectly legitimate. It points out that in primary schools relatively few leadership positions are available compared to the secondary schools at the year 12 level, that there is a very great imbalance in female representation in promotional positions, and existing promotional procedures have resulted in a lack of mobility, and that current promotional procedures do not allow for local involvement in promoting people to those positions.

I want to comment briefly on each of those issues. I agree completely that there is an insufficient number of leadership positions at the R-7 or primary school levels. There is no doubt in my mind that the relatively new position of junior primary school principal has helped to some extent in assisting the number of people in promotional positions in this area. However, I could never understand why the old position of chief assistant of primary schools was dropped some 20 to 25 years ago. It was a mistake in my view and it is a mistake for which we have paid since then.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Chief assistant?

Mr KLUNDER: Yes, chief assistant of primary schools. Normal secondary schools of about 500 students would currently have one principal, three deputy principals and perhaps up to 10 senior masters and mistresses. A primary school of the same number has a principal and deputy principal full stop. There is no doubt that that is an imbalance, even though one might well argue that the complexity of the material that is taught in secondary schools is considerably greater than that taught in primary schools. How-

ever, one cannot argue that what is taught in secondary schools is of any greater importance than the work taught in primary schools. In fact, as an ex-secondary teacher, I must admit a sneaking suspicion that it is perhaps the other way round: the original things taught in a junior primary school (reading and writing) are far more crucial than anything else that is taught at any later stage.

The second point made by the document, namely, that there is an imbalance in female representation, is backed up by figures given in the document. I will briefly quote them for members. The document states that only 13 per cent of secondary principal positions are held by women, that only 27 per cent of deputy principal positions are held by women, and that only 18 per cent of primary principal positions are held by women. I need not remind the House that in this Parliament there are six women out of a total of 69 members, so we are hardly in a position to start throwing stones. I do believe, however, that the department has been a little coy in claiming that there is a lack of mobility in the Education Department's promotion system—not so much because it is not true, because it most certainly is; there is a very great lack of promotion possibilities, but I think that to a very large extent this has been the department's own fault. The department's paper states that there are 1 985 persons on the deputy principal's promotion list; that there are 584 people on the secondary senior humanities list; and, before we feel too inclined to feel sorry for the Education Department in having to deal with such ungainly, wieldy lists, I think it is reasonable to ask why people came to be on those lists. For instance, the department tends to promote fewer than 30 people a year to the position of primary deputy principal, while there are 1 985 people on that list. The problem is that the Education Department, through its promotion panels, places those people on those lists.

Quite obviously, the department went overboard in pushing people past the promotion bar. I can understand that: most teachers are relatively competent people. Having been teachers for a number of years and having watched a number of deputy principals, quite obviously most of those people could do the job reasonably well. It seems to me that the department missed the bus somewhere, however, because it should have been possible for the department to insist on far higher qualifications and greater in-service skills from people whom it was even thinking of promoting. Of course, at present nearly 2 000 people have been pushed past the promotion bar that was too low and consequently promotion is now gained by seniority rather than by merit, whereas the original idea of putting names on promotion lists and promoting capable people to the next list was to prevent that.

I also have some very grave reservations about the need to allow local involvement in promoting people, and I am a little afraid that in these cases people who are outside the school system may well use criteria other than the correct educational criteria for placing people on promotion lists. I would think, for instance, that the local footy hero would probably get a vote that reflects purely his ability as a footballer rather than his educational capacity in a school. I may very well be wrong, but at a time when very few people are promoted to positions, I would hate to be wrong even once.

All in all, I cannot argue with the department's realisation that a restructuring of the promotion system within secondary and primary schools is desirable. Having made those statements as to why there should be a different promotion system, the department then considers the features that it would seek in any such scheme, and some quite odd things occur. The first point that the department makes is that it

requires a degree of flexibility, and there are three subheadings in this regard. The first subheading is:

The ability of schools to adapt to the changing needs of students is improved.

Given the earlier comments, that the department now believes that a number of areas are not catered for under the hierarchical system, that sounds perfectly reasonable. What does not sound so reasonable is that, in my opinion, it is also a slap in the face for people who are in current promotion positions, because, by requiring increased flexibility for this purpose, the department is saying that it does not believe that current promotion holders are doing their job properly. The next of the three subheadings under the increased flexibility requirement is:

That options are created for teachers so that they may have a greater variety and satisfaction in their career paths.

That is a beautiful motherhood statement and no-one in his right mind would want to disagree with it. It is also relatively meaningless. The third subheading is rather odd, and states that the department requires increased flexibility so that 'future uncertain demographic trends can be managed more effectively'. I would have thought that one would always have a certain amount of difficulty in managing future trends. Again, it seems to me that, even if we accept that as being perhaps a little unnecessary as part of that statement, uncertain demographic trends are not trends that should be handled within the promotion structure of schools. I would have thought that this was something that must be considered from a central office situation.

After all, in a school one deals with whatever comes. I doubt that each school should be given a chance to manipulate the demographic future of the area around it. I quote another feature being sought under this new scheme, as follows:

... an effective leadership structure that supports teachers' induction and professional development and schools' curriculum policy formulation and implementation.

I cannot help but regard this as highly insulting, and I must admit that it is probably more insulting to secondary deputy principals than it is to anyone else. In relation to secondary schools, the Education Department has appointed deputy principals whose very job is to look after those areas. I refer to areas of teacher induction and development, and curriculum and policy formulation and implementation. To me, it sounds a very large slap in the face for those people who have been doing this for what is now 10 or 11 years. I can only hope that whoever wrote this document was thinking of primary schools rather than secondary schools at the time of writing.

Further such features that the department requires include additional leadership positions of the R-7 levels which, as I have already indicated, are highly desirable; a greater local involvement in the selection of applicants into leadership positions, about which I have already spoken; and, rather surprisingly, appropriate phasing-in mechanisms that protect the interests of the existing competent holders of leadership positions. Odd statements like that tend to give an awful lot away, because there is a statement that competent holders of leadership positions need to be protected. I would have hoped that there would not be any incompetent holders of leadership positions not to be protected. In my experience as a teacher for many years, it was very seldom that the Education Department had the moral courage to say to people, 'You are not a good teacher: go away'. I can recall that happening only half a dozen times in the 18 or so years that I taught, and I think that the department needs its back stiffened in that area.

The document then refers to the proposal that the department wants to put to teachers, that is, to create three bands of teaching positions. The first band is the band of teachers

themselves, and it is subdivided into three levels. Level 1 corresponds to a lesser level of responsibility than applies to present holders of senior master and mistress positions. Level 2 is equivalent to a senior master, and level 3 is roughly the equivalent of a special senior master. Band 2 contains deputy principals and, according to this, there will be only one deputy principal in any given school. I will come back to that later. Band 3 basically deals with principals. In band 2 there will only be one level of salary for deputy principals and, again, that creates difficulties to which I will return later. Band 3, relating to principals is altered almost not at all. There are presently three salary levels within the 'principals' band and, under the new scheme, there will again be three 'principal' levels.

The conditions that the proposal indicates as being possible within the format of the discussion paper are that all teachers would be able to seek appointment to positions in any band. That is a very clear understanding as to what the next growth area in education will be. It will be a growth area for promotion panels because, basically, if one declares vacant a deputy principal position in a primary school, we have 1 985 people who have been declared by the Education Department as being competent to do that job. Life would be very interesting if all 1 985 of them applied for the job and if a few hundred extra people who had not been on that promotion list also decided to apply. It is not inconceivable that 2 500 people could apply for a single job. How one handles that kind of situation with dignity is completely beyond me. How one handles even 500 people applying for a job (which is only one-fifth of those who might well do so) is still beyond me. Merely reading through the applications would be a horrifying affair. That is likely to occur for any position within the Education Department.

A third proposal for discussion in connection with these three bands of teachers positions is that appointments to a band would be permanent, subject to continued satisfactory performance, and that again raises a warning flag. There are currently positions like that in the Education Department. There are Principal A positions, each of which is for five years, after which in theory everybody reapplies for those positions, and the incumbents may or may not get their jobs back. I do not, from my experience within the Education Department, recall a single occasion when a person who had held such a five-year appointment and applied to continue in that five-year appointment did not get it.

This, of course, means that either all promotion positions will be filled by people who will then hang on to them for ever or, alternatively, if there are promotion positions, as these bands indicate, which are for a fixed term—and I should add, perhaps, that the second and third bands are each for five years, but within the first band the three levels are: level 3 for five years, level 2 for three years and level 1 for one year—I suspect that people, once getting into those positions, will be very hard to shift. Consequently, the setting of time limits for people who will hold those positions will be illusory.

But, if we give the department credit where credit is due and accept from it that it really intends to shift people around and give people five-year appointments at band 1, level 3, or one year only at band 1, level 1, we need to look at the arithmetic of that situation. We run into a very peculiar situation. In a large secondary school at the moment, the staff might be one principal, three deputy principals, one special senior master and 10 senior masters.

Mr Trainer: And a partridge in a pear tree.

Mr KLUNDER: And a partridge in a pear tree, as the honourable member, who is not in his seat, is interjecting. Under the new system, such people might well be replaced by one principal in band 3, one principal in band 2, three

officers in level 3 of band 1, seven officers in level 2 of band 1 and five officers in level 1 of band 1.

If we now look at the replacement rate of these people, we find that the five people in level 1 need to be replaced each year; the seven people in level 2 must be replaced every three years or, if you like, on an average 2.3 of them must be replaced each year, and the three people in level 3 would have to be replaced every five years (or .6 of them would have to be replaced each year). The deputy principal and principal would attract a replacement rate of .4 a year. While it is difficult to talk about percentages or decimal points of teachers, there is no doubt that on an average eight of the 17 people would have to be replaced each year to satisfy the requirements of the scheme that the Education Department is putting up. That does not include movement due to compulsory country service, normal transfers, secondments, long-service leave, maternity leave, or retirement. Plainly, if the system operates as it is supposed to, it becomes unworkable.

Before going on I will reflect for a little while on the only reduction that takes place in the system as envisaged by the discussion paper, and that is the reduction in the number of deputy principals. Again, the number of deputy principals, where there are more than one per school, occurs mainly in secondary schools where some very large schools, I believe, still have up to four deputy principals, but certainly a large number of other schools have three deputy principals.

The envisaged reduction to one brings us back to a situation that was worse than the dear old days of the 1950s when, even then, very large high schools had one male and one female deputy principal. The female deputy principal was known in those days as the dragon by almost every secondary school child in South Australia. This situation, under the document, would be reduced to one deputy principal per school. I do not know (and from my reading of the document it is unclear) whether it is envisaged that there will be a promotion to a new deputy principal in junior primary schools. The document does not make that clear and we can leave that out for the time being. It is rather ridiculous to think of a secondary school (and there are secondary schools of 1800 students in this State) having only one deputy principal. It would change the role of deputy principal enormously.

The second point I wish to make is that, under salaries in this document, it is written that there should only be one salary level, namely at the deputy principal or number 2 band level. That, again, makes one wonder. A certain amount of money is saved by demoting the 120 or so deputy principals who will now be superfluous in secondary schools. If, however, primary school deputies are going to be paid at the same rate as secondary deputy principals, all the money so saved will immediately be lost. If the intent is to pay everybody at the primary school deputy principal level, even those very few who have survived as deputy principals in secondary schools will have their salaries lowered. By and large, that is a very unpleasant thing to do to a number of officers who have spent 20 or more years in the Education Department and who are some of the most faithful servants that that department has.

The document then has a section headed, 'Persons unable to gain appointment within their band'. Again, that largely reflects on the deputy principals in secondary schools. A number of clauses are mentioned by which officers who have been employed in a particular band and who have not been re-employed, can be dropped to lower bands. So, even an officer who is promoted under this system from band 2 to band 3 may, at least in theory, not be able to gain re-employment after his five-year term in band 3 and may be dropped back to band 2. It is interesting that a further clause provides that, when an officer has been so dropped

to a lower band, if he is still there three years later, his work quality has to be checked to see whether he should be dropped right back to the basic level of teacher in band 1. It is rather an odd situation that a person who has been considered by the Education Department to be good enough to be promoted to a principal or band 3 officer in a school, five years later may be dropped back to deputy principal and yet another three years later might well be dropped back, according to regulations (which I presume will arise under this document) to teacher. It is rather staggering that the department has so little confidence in its own promotion methods as to request that someone at that level of seniority might well have to be looked at to see whether they could be dropped back to simply being a teacher.

The other problem with which Parliament may be concerned is that, if the system works as intended and if people take their turn at being principal or deputy principal of a school and being in the higher paid position in band 1, according to this document each of those people, upon dropping back to a lower band, can continue to pay superannuation contributions at the higher rate. I need not remind the House of what that would mean eventually in terms of superannuation payouts. There would, in my opinion, be four to five times as many people in higher-paid positions as there is currently, all of whom would have been paid superannuation at a higher level.

The discussion paper then refers to what are called phasing-in arrangements. It is again within the area of the deputy principal band that I find myself in conflict with the paper. Basically, it means that there will be demotions of up to 120 deputy principals in secondary schools. A further statement comes very close to being disingenuous; namely, that 'remaining vacancies after transfers each year would be filled by open positions'. If one is to take away 120 promotional positions, I think we are entitled to ask just what kind of vacancies for promotion positions will be left, especially as we would then have 120 officers overclassified at a lower level with only 12 promotions being made available a year, on average, within secondary schools. In effect it would clog up within secondary schools the promotion structure for 10 years.

I stated earlier that I would again deal with the band 1 level 1 promotion prospects, because that is probably the most ingenious part of the entire document. Basically, it says that there will be a promotional position available to teachers for a year at a time and that this promotion position would allow people who have some particular expertise or some particular interest the opportunity to have a year on a higher pay to try to carry out whatever ideas they have. That sounds marvellous, but unfortunately there is another side to that coin which is not so good. For the first time within the Education Department we would be introducing competition for promotion positions within the same school. Of course, that would bring to schools not only the problems that currently exist in schools because they are large organisations and part of a large organisation but also it would bring all the small office politics, the infighting, the conspiring, and all the crawling (if that is not too strong a word), to get promotion positions from two or three people within the school with the gift of such a promotional position within their grasp.

That would produce tensions, disappointment, and consequent dislikes, which in my opinion would affect adversely the morale and the effectiveness of a school. In effect, we would then have the worst of both worlds, the large-scale and the small-scale problems all affecting the same school. Given the incredible reluctance with which the Education Department has approached the matter of demotion or sacking of teachers in the past, one wonders whether this scheme is meant to be anything other than a dressing up of

a very unpalatable situation that currently exists in terms that would keep people from realising for another few years how bad the situation is.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Do you think it is important that non-achieving teachers should be promoted?

Mr KLUNDER: Without committing the Government to the spending of any money, I will simply say that I believe personally that there should be a promotion structure for teachers outside the hierarchical promotion system. It should be possible for there to be a class of master teacher, if you like, who would be paid at deputy principal or even at principal level, so that it would be possible to be promoted within the classroom. Therefore, one would not have to go into the administration of schools area in order to become more affluent. It will always strike me as being very silly that those people who are brilliant teachers and who like teaching in order to seek extra pay and extra status have to leave the classroom: it is counterproductive. Allowing teachers in the band 1 level 1 jobs to move up has some good points, but it also would have some very bad side effects. I really cannot find very much to recommend this scheme. I do not believe that it opens up the promotions structure or that it could be done without a vast amount of extra money being poured into the system.

The superannuation implications inherent in this document are quite horrifying. It should be reasonably clear from what I have said in the past 40 minutes or so that I am not particularly happy with this document. That is, of course, a totally different thing from saying that I am unhappy that it has been produced because there is an enormous difference between criticising a document and criticising its authors. I believe that the document does not do much for the teaching profession. However, its authors have shown a remarkable degree of courage and ingenuity in trying to cobble together a scheme which has a totally different outlook on the promotion system within the Education Department. I believe that even if this document is rejected it will have a beneficial effect by allowing people to recognise that other systems do exist, that we are not tied to the present system. I firmly believe that over the years there will be a different system of promotion within the Education Department which will probably have originated from whatever happens to this scheme.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): First, I recognise that the document we are addressing in our reply is the Governor's Speech in opening this Parliamentary session. In saying that, I recognise that the words he uttered were not his words but those prepared by the Government to show what its programme will be in the forthcoming 12 months. Therefore, one has to be aware that the points made in that document are, in the main, expressing Government policy, ideology and some of its proposals regarding changes to the law. In the main, I suppose it is expressing the programme which the Government hopes it can implement and which the Parliament might be able to follow so far as the legislative side of its programme is concerned.

I want to take this opportunity of having recorded in *Hansard* my condolences to the family of the late John Coumbe, with whom I had the opportunity of working in this Parliament. John Coumbe was a senior member of the Parliament when I was newly elected to this House, even though he was not then an old man (nor was he 'old' when he passed on during the past 12 months). I place on record my thanks to John Coumbe for the contribution he made to the Parliament, the State and to the many bodies on which he served in this State. I want also recorded in *Hansard* my thanks for the co-operation, friendship and mateship that he showed me when I was a young Parliamentarian, and I offer my further thanks for the guidance

and father-like advice he gave me that was of benefit to me.

I have often said that when I first entered this place I made a statement that I later regretted. I accused a member of the A.L.P. of having communist tendencies. We were working on a by-election in Millicent at the time and I subsequently apologised to that person. I think it is important that new members, on entering this Parliament, recognise there are some areas where it is not good practice to talk about personal issues or to convey to the House information that might have been conveyed to one during a private discussion. I say again, and have said before (because the Hon. Hugh Hudson and other members from both sides of politics have reminded members of this House of this from time to time), that we should be able to have discussions, regardless of what side of politics we are from or how close we are to friends, to have an exchange of ideas without later being confronted publicly with those ideas.

That is all that I want to say about that matter. In the Address in Reply debate a member can talk about whatever subject he wishes, as long as in the main, it refers to the State. I take this opportunity to remind members of that. When a Government is elected, one reads in the newspaper that it has been elected and has a mandate to do various things; in other words, the people who voted for the Party which won Government voted for all of the policies enunciated by that Party before it was elected. In fact, it is hogwash to think that all of the people who vote for a political Party or for an individual who belongs to a political Party endorse all of the policies of the Party or the policies that an individual member supports. I am sure that, if a referendum was taken on each of the issues enunciated by a political Party before it won Government and before its policies were implemented, many of them would be lost.

I think it is about time that we started saying that the majority of people support all of the policies enunciated by any political Party that is elected to Government after enunciating its policies. That is something that we as individual members of Parliament should not forget. We are elected as individuals to represent individual districts. Apart from two members of this House, we all belong to a Party that has more than one member present in this Chamber. One member belongs to a Party of which he is the only representative in this Chamber; the other member is an Independent (Independent Labor, as he says). In all other cases, as we pass laws or take action to alter Standing Orders, and so on, it is important that individual rights and opportunities to speak should not be restricted or retarded in any way simply for the sake of Party political convenience.

I say that because it has become evident in recent years that more and more members who are perhaps Party oriented rather than individual oriented are saying that the Address in Reply debate is unnecessary and should be wiped out or restricted in some way. These members believe that speakers in the debate tend to talk about any subject, whether it relates to something before the House at that time or whether it is about the boy scouts, girl guides or community organisations in their districts. If more members took more notice of community organisations in their districts (members of which participate in many instances on a voluntary basis), along with the effort that these people put in, and gave them credit in this place by mentioning them (even though it may be boring to other members and to the press), I believe that society would operate better and more people would give their time to be leaders and to serve the community, because they would know that they are recognised outside of their own little environments (where they work so effectively) by the establishment, which has the power to make and change laws.

Honourable members are each entitled to speak in this debate for an hour; at one time there was no time limit. In recent years, that practice has been changed and there is now a time limit, because the debate took a lot of time. I am aware of the time that officers of the Parliament may have to remain here, although they do not receive extra pay. I am also aware of the time in which *Hansard* is involved in recording what is said in Parliament and the effort put in by the back-up staff in typing, checking, proof reading, forwarding the Parliamentary debates to the printer, who must print it, put it into booklet form, and make it available to the public. I know that that procedure takes up a lot of time.

Mr Trainer: They never read it.

Mr EVANS: The member for Ascot Park says that the public never reads it. That may be true. However, the member for Ascot Park belonged to a profession that could help to change that situation. We can change that situation, if we so wish. People have an opportunity to read *Hansard*, and that opportunity must continue to exist if we are to have a democracy. That aside, some people read *Hansard*, some members make it available for people in the community to read it, and some people in the community seek to receive information about what is said in Parliament in relation to particular subjects.

Members of the public sometimes seek information on speeches made by individuals to see their point of view on certain subjects. So, although it may be boring to some (and boring to me at times) to listen to others, it is important that we preserve the opportunity for individuals to speak in Parliament. Let us move to what has been happening in recent times, with members having fully typed out speeches, produced somewhere else in the building or outside the building, maybe by officers and not by the individual himself (I do not mean officers of the House but people who may be working for Ministers or whoever it may be), given with a long-term ideological point of view to win. If we go to that system people will not have to come in at all. They need only to post their speeches to *Hansard* and say, 'Put them into *Hansard*.' That is what some people are tending to advocate, and I object to it quite strongly.

Mr Trainer: It might improve the delivery of some of them!

Mr EVANS: That is true. However, I remember a person who belonged to the honourable member's Party, and for whom I had great respect, as I believe most of his Party did (I do not know whether the honourable member did). I refer to Hon. Cyril Hutchens, who said in this House on one occasion—

Mr Trainer: He was a good man.

Mr EVANS: I agree. He said that the ability to speak does not make the person a good or a bad politician, but that the ability to make sound judgment is what counts. It is possible for a dumb person to be elected; they would still be expected to be here as a member of Parliament. I agree that they would have difficulty in orally making their point in the House; it would have to be in writing. If in the long term that is to be the outcome, if all people are to be given the opportunity to be represented and to be elected, I make the point that Cyril Hutchens made: some can talk for a long while and say nothing; others can talk briefly with much meaning; and others will not be able to put their words together to please others, to sound articulate, to use enough adjectives, or to have enough glorification for the press or others to be interested. However, it would be a point of view put by an individual elected by society, and society needs to be represented.

It will not be just the academics who can put a point of view and represent all of the community. We need all stratas of people, from the top in academic ability down to those

who may have only sprung a shovel or a pick, or cleaned the sewer mains. Cyril Hutchens did not use those words, but that was his meaning, and we should not forget that. So, in talking about this debate and the opportunity to speak in this area, I say to individual members, 'Protect it, and do not let the Party point of view become more prominent than the individual opportunity.'

The Party has become important to the community because if we were all Independents it would be difficult. Deep down every individual in the House perhaps would like to be an Independent. At times it crosses all minds, but we all know that in practical terms the system would not operate as it does today, because the people expect those who want to be elected to be a team, to put up policies, a general philosophy, and a programme where it might be able to say, 'That is what we are electing them for; if we vote for them that is the direction they will go.' That has been the trend.

However, I now refer to the present day. The community has become disenchanted with election promises and election programmes, because political Parties do not keep their promises. I will not go into all the promises that were made before the last Federal and State elections and lambaste the Labor Party for what it has not done, but I want to pick up the Premier on one or two things that he was heard to say recently. The Premier said that, if a community had expectations in regard to services, such as hospitals, schools, universities, water supply, sewers, and so on, it must pay the bill, and it should expect to pay.

All the Government can do is raise charges and taxes. The Premier knew that before the last election, and I am sure that he would not deny it. If the Premier denied that, I would say that he was an unwise man before the last election and that he gained his wisdom afterwards.

Obviously, if the Federal Government, the State Government or local government is to provide more services and give in to the demands, it must take from the community and, when a certain section cannot give any more, the Government must take from another section. Therefore, it is false to say that the Federal or State A.L.P. did not know that it would have to take from people to give to some sections of the community. Of course, the A.L.P. knew that, and it decided to make promises, hoping to win. The A.L.P. won, and now it must try to battle through the quagmire it has created for itself. At times we would all like to do certain things, such as buy a boat, buy a holiday shack, extend our house, or sell it and buy another—

Mr Mathwin: Or get a new car.

Mr EVANS: That has never been my ambition, but the member for Glenelg may want a new car. We all have expectations, but we must temper them and be frugal if we are to be successful as individuals. Unfortunately, the Federal Government has moved to impose a means test on those over 70. Some of those people are quite rich, but others are not. Some of those people have led a very frugal life, and we and the generations that follow should take our hats off to them, because they gave us the opportunity to live in one of the most affluent periods that the human race has ever enjoyed (although whether or not we do enjoy it, I do not know).

It is those people who are in old folks' homes or whose families have moved on (they are in their 70s, 80s, or 90s) who have made sacrifices and have had very few luxuries. I am not talking about the millionaires. Many people have struggled to pay off their homes and to put away a few bob for investment, thinking that perhaps their sickness and hospital bills could not be met, wondering what they had to face in the future (and their future costs are as uncertain as are anyone's costs), and knowing that their opportunity to earn has gone. If we are to start means testing those

people and punishing them for being frugal and for the contribution that they made to our society, I believe that we have very poor judgment. In fact, I believe that we are being unkind and rather ruthless. I become a little amazed when people talk about allowing mature people of 50 years of age or thereabouts the opportunity to use the educational system to upgrade their training so that they are better able to cope with the job.

I wonder about the economics of that. Should we be giving those people training with the possibility of getting a job? My answer to that now (with so many young people unemployed) would probably be that that is not necessary. I would prefer to direct more effort towards helping the younger people to be trained to work, because the older people are moving towards pensions and superannuation, or the tab is being picked up by society through unemployment benefits.

In the main, people in that middle-age group have families who have grown up and moved on. We should be looking at helping the younger ones out of work, those who have families or who are planning to have families, although I know that what I have said may sound ruthless. If we are giving people in that age group the opportunity of retraining for self-fulfilment so that personally they feel more confident about doing things within their own environment (even if they do not get a job), then the answer must be, 'Yes, continue it.' There is no doubt that there is a benefit in doing that.

Therefore, let us look at unemployment. There is no doubt that in the main, the only time that the human race has enjoyed full employment has been during wartime or immediately after a war. That has been a fact of life since industrialisation, anyway.

Mr Mayes: That's not true.

Mr EVANS: The member for Unley says that that is not true. I ask him to look back at the period since industrialisation. In Australia, England and elsewhere there was absolutely no unemployment or people seeking work immediately after the Second World War. People came here as displaced persons from other countries in 1948 and during the early 1950s, from Lithuania, Estonia and other captive nations in Southern Europe.

Mr Mathwin: And some very good migrants, too.

Mr EVANS: I am not sure where the honourable gentleman came from, but he says that they are all right.

Mr Hamilton: Was he a good one or a bad one?

Mr EVANS: If I answered that, my mother would also have some interest. We were lucky that, after the Second World War, so many displaced persons and migrants came from other lands. They kept us running. We thought that ours was a land of milk and honey and that we would not have to work very hard. We have natural resources, a beautiful climate and we do not lose as much time in the outside work force as happens in other countries. We could have five weeks annual leave, 10 or 12 days sick leave, 12 public holidays, long service leave, and a 17 per cent leave loading. No other country in the world has those provisions. They may have universities and public buildings 1 000 years old which are still being used, and they may have roads built by the Romans. Yet, here we are with 15 000 000 people (sparsely settled in much of the country), 12 000 000 of whom live in the Eastern States from Tasmania to Queensland and 3 000 000 in the rest of the continent, with telecommunications, power, roads and rail having to be established in such a relatively young country. Suddenly we say that this country is good enough for us all to live on the gravy train, and we are all to blame for the present situation.

We all jumped on it, and suddenly we are not able to compete. Other countries worked harder; some of them

went back to a 44-hour week and were able to achieve greater goals than we were. I do not say that we should take it away, because that is very difficult. Once an individual has learnt to live at a certain standard his whole expectation is built around that standard plus a higher one. One cannot take it away very easily; it has to be a slowing down process, and that also can bring hardship to some people.

There is no doubt that we as a country have priced ourselves out of world markets. I took note of the comments that the member for Elizabeth made in this debate, and some of the points that he made in particular. I do not disagree with them; I think that he was quite factual in a lot of points that he made. I did not necessarily disagree with the member who spoke about Sweden and other countries, and what they had achieved, but they also have had a lot of failures in those countries and he did not talk about those. He also did not make the point—nor did any speaker here that I know of—that if one starts operating around Europe the clientele in France, with its 50 000 000 people, in Germany with 62 000 000, in England with 50 000 000 odd, is great in societies that are reasonably affluent. However, when one comes to old Aussieland—and South Australia in particular, on the bottom of the most southern island continent—and the markets are all thousands of kilometres away by sea, air, road, or rail, South Australia ends up being in a very difficult position within a country that also finds itself in a difficult position because of our greed—and for no other reason.

Geographically, we have nations near us that would be happy to buy a lot of our goods, but they cannot afford to pay the cost of maintaining our standard of living: it is as hard and as cold as that. If we were to build enough homes to house all the people of the world in the standard of housing that we have in Australia and seek to achieve it by the year 2000, we would have to build more houses in the next 17 years than we have built since man first stood up on two legs. Members need to think about that. If we were to house the people of the world, that is the possible work effort involved. The opportunity for clientele is there, but the cost from us Australians is too high.

What about South Australia? We just had an increase in electricity charges; our water charges are high; our sewerage charges are high. In many cases our local government charges are high. So, if one is in industry and is going to produce, for example, artificial eggs to sell to people as part of their diet, and one has a reasonably high cost of production (but less than the real thing from the hen), and 12 000 000 of the Australian population live on the eastern seaboard, will one come to South Australia when the cost structure here is as high and in some cases higher?

In some cases it is lower and in some areas it is slightly cheaper: I admit that. However, in many cases it is higher than, and in many cases it is just as high as, that in Eastern States. Would one come to South Australia? Of course one would not. It would be stupid when one has to bear the cost of fuel. The Federal and State Governments, for every litre of fuel that we use, now take 28c under the extra increases that have just come about.

If one is going to cart goods by road or rail (although the National Railways will not pay all that tax, as it would be exempt from some of it), why come to South Australia when there are 4 125 000 people in Victoria and 5 500 000 in New South Wales who, hopefully, will consume one's eggs? So, when Playford was the father of the State as Premier, many people rubbished him. They said that he was a wower, that he did not allow fair wages, that he kept the cost structure down and that we were disadvantaged. They said that when people were transferred interstate and wanted to buy a house they had to pay a lot more for it and that, when they were transferred back, they had to take

a reduction in wages. People said that it was bad news. That was the very thing that gave us our industrial base. If we wanted to keep it, we had to keep a low-cost structure. That obviously had to be the case.

I take note of what the member for Davenport said last night that one of the major motor vehicle manufacturers will leave Australia by 1986. I also note that G.M.H. at Woodville is having trouble and that Mitsubishi is not doing very well financially. However, if we do not keep our cost structure down and are not prepared to make sacrifices as individuals—whether Parliamentarians, manufacturers builders labourers or whatever, we will not be able to compete with the rest of Australia. The lower production costs do not have to be that. However, all things being equal, it then comes back to personalities in the case of somebody wanting to build a new factory. They may like to live in South Australia because it is a beautiful place to live. They may say that it is the place for them, regardless of the cost because they are producing an article which has the capacity to be carted in large quantities at a reasonable profit margin and does not have a high weight factor. However, if it has a high weight factor the cost of cartage becomes a significant cost to the manufacturer.

So, we are in difficulty with employment throughout Australia and we are definitely in difficulty in South Australia. Mr Bannon, as Premier, now knows that what he promised he will not be able to produce. He also knows that it is very unlikely that he will be able to reduce unemployment to any great degree. He also knows that artificial schemes to try to reduce unemployment do not really work. They solve a few little problems here and there and keep a few people working but do not have a long-term solution. So, if we are to have with us for a long time a significant number of persons unemployed, we need to look at the way in which we are using the money that is now being paid to the unemployed. We need to get something back to the community from those people who are receiving the unemployment benefit, especially from those people who are able-bodied.

With the new rates, I believe that by next June the unemployment benefit will be around \$80 and that they will be allowed to earn \$20 a week, or \$100 a week in total. I do not begrudge these people the little bit that they can earn apart from their benefit. However, there are some dishonest people who earn a lot more than the \$20, although the great majority are not dishonest. They are genuinely trying to find something to do in a difficult society. Is it unreasonable for us to start saying that all the unemployment money should go to local government and be paid back through local government to the individuals registered as unemployed? Local government is then able to say that they are getting \$80 a week and that that is worth \$40 a day. The council can organise a programme where the unemployed clean up the street or pull up noxious weeds.

I was foolish enough to go into the corporate cup run—even at my age. Some of my colleagues said that I would be lucky to get around but I am getting there gradually. As I went around the River Torrens lake, I was amazed to find that we have just drained it to clean it out, and all around the edge for 6ft. to 8ft. is all the litter in the world—cans, bottles, cartons, weeds, slush, slime and everything. When the river was drained and dry a few people could have cleaned the whole lot up; that would have made it aesthetically better. The rubbish would have been removed and out of the way. If I were unemployed I would have been happy to do that sort of work and would not have minded spending my time doing it. It is important for an individual to be doing something productive and worth while.

A person who is receiving an unemployment benefit could well take the view that because he is being paid something

by society he would be willing to work for 40 or 60 hours a week or whatever and make a contribution to society in that way. I realise that such projects have a cost attached to them, and that the Government might have to help with administration and by making sure there is a foreman, and so on, although some of those unemployed people would be capable of taking the role of foreman for a day or a couple of days. Why not pass any money to be used for such a purpose to local government and let it make use of that money for the general benefit of society?

In the district that I represent, for example, many unemployed people spend six or seven days a week in the hotel. I am not implying that they are drinking a lot but they are there because there is nothing else for them to do. What can they do? They can go to the beach, say, but quite often they end up getting into trouble because they are idle for such a considerable time. On top of all that many people in that position have lost the desire to seek work, because every time they have gone to find work they have been knocked back after queuing up with 60 or 70 other people. Some of them may receive a letter or a telephone call to say that they have not been accepted, if they are lucky, but some of them get nothing.

I am sure that if we tackled the problem in the way that I have suggested we would get a better result for the money that is being made available. If we do not take any such action we will simply be encouraging more and more people to use the system dishonestly. I am not referring only to their receiving \$80 plus the \$20 that they can earn from a casual job, but to all the other ways that people can obtain a benefit, whether in regard to transport, hand-outs when they are in difficulty or rental accommodation from the Housing Trust. They are all costs that must be borne by those who are producing in society. Many of those people who are producing have two or three children, a first and second mortgage and a partner who may not be working. Quite often such people are in a worse position than is an unemployed person. I know that all members would know that that is the case. Further, quite often they are in a worse position than are pensioners, to whom I referred earlier. We need to be conscious of that fact.

I refer now to another subject that has been referred to already tonight. I am sorry that the lady members of the House are not here at the moment. Mention was made earlier by the member for Newland of the teaching profession and the method of promotion and the matter of seniority being used as a method of promotion. The member for Newland referred mainly to a document that had been produced by some persons within the Education Department. The honourable member referred to the fact that very few senior people in secondary schools are females and he referred to the large number of people who were waiting to be promoted. He referred to a similar situation when talking about primary schools, although there is a greater number of females holding senior positions in primary schools. However, I am amazed that in all the talk about women getting equal opportunity I have never heard anyone in this place refer to the lack of opportunity for females in the Public Service generally.

How many females in the Public Service are given the opportunity to be a department head or a deputy head of a department, or the opportunity to hold a key position in a Government department? There are virtually none. It also amazes me that in this regard the talk has nearly always come from within the teaching profession, the universities or from members of Parliament. Is that because people have wanted to push a particular philosophy or because they are genuinely interested in the subject that they are talking about, namely, equal opportunity for women? Even in the Police Force there would be greater opportunity for

promotion of women at the moment than there is in the Public Service.

I want now to pick up the point made by some that there is a trend becoming apparent within those groups advocating equal opportunity for women that, if other women are not seeking to be promoted in a profession, job or business, then they are odd-bods. In other words, it is starting to come to the point where it is being suggested that the woman of the world who is happy, contented and satisfied to share an income (and it might not be a high income) with a husband, who wishes to raise children instead of putting them in a child care centre, and who wants to spend more time with them and not hire babysitters (which people thought was the traditional thing in the old days), is an odd-bod, out of the modern trend and that there is no place for that person.

It is important that we as Parliamentarians recognise that those women are as important as any other group. It may be that it can be argued that more and more men are taking a more direct and active role in family raising processes than they did in the past, particularly when their children are young. I accept that, but let us not get into the bind that a wife is not as important if she is prepared to stay home and carry out community voluntary jobs such as working at the school canteen, doing things in the Red Cross and other areas while other men or women are at work. There is still one area which men have been denied and that is the right to participate in child birth (although women tell us that if men had that opportunity they would have one or none and that would be it).

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: That is a very sexist comment from those who say that.

Mr EVANS: I take the point made by the Minister of Education that it is a sexist comment, but some people believe that all men have that approach. When members were talking about equal opportunity for women earlier today the member for Mawson raised the matter of women's studies at the Flinders University. I take up that point and point out that that university has financial problems, as has virtually every other institution in this State, including Government and semi-government institutions. The course referred to today was not the only course that that university has dropped in recent years. I was on the council of the Flinders University until recently and know that the course under discussion was not really an academic one. The university sees itself as being oriented more in the areas of research and academic excellence than in other areas and I suppose that that is why that course was dropped. However, if the Government wished to pick up and promote such a course there are other areas where that could be done.

I ask the member for Mawson and others who support her, before they take petitions around the place rubbishing the Flinders University, to look at that university's record, not only in research but also in academic excellence. If one looks at the success that it has had in medical research one finds that it is one of the best, yet one of the youngest universities in Australia. Instead of making it difficult for this university it should be given credit for what it has achieved, because the Flinders University has been a success story. Because it was a young and a new university it experimented with new courses, especially in the 1970s when money was thrown around as if it came from the printing press and did not have to be honoured. However, people suddenly found out that that was not so and are still paying the debt brought about by that action. The course under discussion was first introduced as an experiment. However, I believe that it is important that this university have a course of women's studies.

I do not think that there is any doubt about that. However, I think there is another way of doing it. If we as a Parliament

are going to tell the university that it is wrong, we should also be telling the Government to find the money to do it. The member for Mawson attacked the university and said that it was wrong, but he should look at the university's problems in relation to its shortage of money and its lack of opportunities.

The member for Newland referred to promotion in the education system. I will not say much about that, except that it is possible in any institution to promote a person above their capacity. If that occurs, there should be a system where such a person can be moved back to his previous position. Apart from the reduced salary content, which is something that the individual will have to live with, quite often a person who is promoted above his capacity is also put under stress and strain which is detrimental to their health and to their family. The over promotion of an individual is of no benefit to a department or a school (if it happens to be a school). If an individual is over promoted there is every reason to believe that he will find it a bit difficult and, in that situation, he should be asked whether he would like to return to his previous position where he was doing his job with ease and with no problems. I believe that there is nothing wrong with that system.

We should come out and say that the present system in the education area is wrong. At the moment teachers are told that if they reach a certain level of seniority they are placed on a promotion list, and that is wrong. To suggest that because people have served so many years and have been reasonably successful as a teacher that they should be placed on a list for promotion (when we know that there are only so many positions at the top and we know it is impossible for everyone to achieve those positions) is ludicrous, because we are building up a situation where expectations cannot be met. I agree with the member for Newland on that point. I hope that the present criteria are changed. I cannot suggest a better system, but we should not be promoting the present system.

Over the years, I have spoken about a particular subject many times and as much as it may bore some members, I will refer to it again. I have learnt that the only way to achieve a goal in this place is to keep talking about the subject until others realise that something should be done. When I raised the matter of the creation of the office of Ombudsman I was told by my Leader, who was the then Premier, that he would not have it because he would not have a super-inquisitor appointed to intimidate public servants. The other Leader at that time, the Leader of the Opposition, said it would be an unnecessary appointment. I am grateful that eventually Ombudsmen have been appointed throughout Australia at Federal and State levels. When I suggested that an Ombudsman be appointed, I was not happy because I was continually knocked and people did not want to listen. However, on this occasion, I wish to raise the matter of identity cards.

At the moment, we are in an era where so many illegal immigrants are coming into our country that we have to have an amnesty every two or three years to allow them to give themselves up. In this era many people are exploiting the taxation system and Governments are suggesting ridiculous forms of taxation, for example, where the principal contract is taken for subcontractors as a straight out percentage, whether or not it is justified, because the subcontractor may be working in an unprofitable area if he has a lot of wet weather and so on in the building industry, and he might work for what one might term below a reasonable salary. In this era, our law authorities are saying that it is impossible to police licensing laws and it is impossible for a publican to know the age of some young people who enter hotels. In this era we as a Parliament are saying that people who drink in hotels must be over the age of 18 years.

However, the same situation does not apply federally in relation to enrolment cards. At the same time, we are not giving people the opportunity to prove how old they are.

It is a time when people are exploiting the social security system to such an extent that they can receive several lots of unemployment benefits, or several pensions or be working and getting a pension and taking money that quite rightly should go to the genuinely disadvantaged or back to the people who are paying tax; in other words, it could go back into the pocket of those who are providing, where it would encourage them to produce more because their end reward would be greater. We are saying that we will not accept identity cards. Why not? If most Australians thought about it they would be pleased to be able to produce a card saying, 'I belong to a club, a club that has the potential to be the greatest club in the world—Australia. It has my name, photograph and identity number on it.' If I happened to be walking in the back streets of Adelaide where perhaps I should not be and a police officer stops me and asks for my identity card, that is bad luck; he is only doing his job. That is about the worst thing that could happen by having an identity card if one is an honest citizen.

I will give one example in this community without naming the restaurant. In 1975, when the amnesty was brought in for illegal immigrants, at that time a restaurateur in the city phoned me and asked if I would go and see him as he wanted to talk about the amnesty which Fraser introduced about the time of coming into power. I went to see that restaurateur who asked if the offer was genuine. I said that as long as the people had no criminal record and were in good health they would be allowed to stay. He asked what would happen if the Government did not honour its obligation. I said he could be sure that that Government would. I went there during a tea break on the Wednesday evening, and he phoned me the next day.

I called in on the Thursday evening on the way home and he said that he wanted me to meet a few people who were around the table having a meal, as it was getting on in the evening. There were five illegal migrants working in that one business and they received permanency. However, I learnt from one of them that they had been working on half wages because they were illegal migrants. The restaurateur knew they could not squeal and, because of their tightness in their ethnic community, they could not afford to squeal.

Why should that happen in society and be allowed to continue? Yet, if that restaurateur was placed in the position of having to inform the authorities that he was employing Stan Evans, identity card number such and such, there is less opportunity for exploiting the system, especially if the penalty was high for not informing the authorities. I know it is 1983 and we start talking about a police State, but when dishonesty has reached the point to such a degree that there is a need to do that. The cash economy is another area where it would be of help. What is happening is that more and more people are starting to abuse the system because others are abusing it. We are no different to the birds and the animals of the world.

If there is a community 'heap' and we live in a house and work, and our neighbour lives in a house and gets support from the community 'heap', the children grow up saying, 'Dad, why do you go to work? Mr and Mrs Jones and their six children next door don't go to work, they get it off the community "heap".' More and more people will then begin to take it off the community 'heap'. We have reached that stage where, like it or not (and I am talking about businessmen in the income tax area, as well as people at the other end of the spectrum), many men and women in the community exploit the system.

We need to recognise that the laws have been made in such a way that those who employ smart lawyers have been able to bend the rules to exploit the system. I know the previous Government did, and I believe the present Federal Government hopes to, tackle some of these areas. However, we have to tackle the other end of the spectrum where there is exploitation of the social security system, where we are paying about 37 per cent of the total tax collected federally in that area.

I refer now to another area. I attended a Government auction at which books were being sold. In fact, recently I have been to two or three auctions, at one of which 1971 model trucks were being sold, one having done only 6 000 kilometres, another 8 000 kilometres, and a third having done 12 000 kilometres. They were heavy vehicles and worth a lot of money, but they had been backed up and down a yard to see whether their wheels turned, going by the kilometres covered in 12 or 13 years. I attended a Federal Government auction on 6 September (but State Government auctions are the same). Some vehicles although six or seven years old have done only 16 000 kilometres to 18 000 kilometres.

The two Ministers who are in the House should take note of what I am saying. We should forget about Government departments being totally isolated individual operations. If a department such as the E. & W.S. Department has a tip truck for which the Highways Department has some work, why should not that truck be used by the Highways Department, even if some paper work has to be done to say that the truck was used in a certain department for a number of weeks? An International Haugh front-end loader, 1969 model, was sold recently having done only 640 hours of work over 14 years. In times of constraint, why do we not start using vehicles and machines in different departments? This equipment is not the prize of particular departments: it is paid for with taxpayers' money. I invite the Minister of Education and the Minister of Water Resources, who are present, to say to their colleagues, 'We should get a bus one day and look at the vehicles in Government departments, particularly the E. & W.S. Department, the Public Buildings Department, and the Highways Department. We should drive through the yards to see how many trucks, tractors and vehicles are not being worn out but are rusting out.' The Ministers will be amazed to learn of the millions of dollars that are being wasted by each department's buying X number of vehicles.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: My buses are not being rusted out; they are being worn out.

Mr EVANS: That is fair comment. However, eight or nine vehicles that are lying idle could be taken from the E. & W.S. Department one dark night, they could be used for 12 months, and the department would not know that they had gone unless a stocktake was undertaken. I am trying to make the point that there is an opportunity to cross-use Government vehicles in different departments, and I believe that the idea of saying that all the vehicles that belong to the E. & W.S. Department can be used by no other department is a lot of hogwash and a waste of money. A lot of the vehicles are not worn out but are outdated.

I have referred to this matter because I looked at a Government yard recently: to be honest, I was dumbfounded to see acres and acres of Government vehicles. I do not blame the people who work in that department. These vehicles are lying idle because there has been a decrease in the work load of that department. However, I do not see why another department cannot use those vehicles instead of their lying idle.

I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, because that is the traditional thing to do. I do not

necessarily support the programme that the Government would implement through the Governor's Speech, but I understand that that is the traditional process and I congratulate members who have made different points in this debate. In particular, I congratulate the member for Bragg on his maiden speech and the excellent contribution that he made. Because the honourable member has a background of success in small business, he will bring some practical knowledge to the Parliament which I believe most people in the community realise is essential if the State is to be managed as a business. Surely, the biggest business in the State is managing the State and, if that is managed properly, other business will have an opportunity. So, I say to the member for Bragg, 'Welcome to Parliament and good luck in the future.' I support the motion.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I too support the motion. I would like to express my sympathy to the family of the late John Combe. Although I did not know him personally, I am well aware from what has been said in this House that he contributed much to the Parliament and to South Australia generally. Certainly, the member's friends and family would be saddened by his passing. I would like to congratulate the member for Bragg on his maiden speech earlier this session, and I certainly congratulate him on having gained election to Parliament. Recently, I came across a statement of ideals by Dean Alfange entitled, 'My Creed', part of which states:

I do not choose to be a common man. It is my right to be uncommon—if I can. I seek opportunity—not security. I do not wish to be a kept citizen, humbled and dulled by having the State look after me. I want to take the calculated risk; to dream and to build, to fail and to succeed. I refuse to barter incentive for a dole. I prefer the challenges of life to the guaranteed existence; the thrill of fulfilment to the stale calm of Utopia. I will not trade freedom for benefits nor my dignity for a hand out. I will never cower before any master nor bend to any threat. It is my heritage to stand erect, proud and unafraid; to think for myself, enjoy the benefits of my creations and to face the world boldly and say, 'This I have done.'

After reading that, I felt that much in it is in sympathy with the Liberal Party ideals. It certainly grieves me to see, from time to time, the way in which many members in this Parliament want to ensure that the Government takes a much greater interest in every aspect of a person's life. I think that the article which I have just read shows that many people (myself included) feel that the less Government interference there is in many areas, the better off a person will be and the better off society generally will be.

This evening I wish to deal primarily with the rural sector. It has been with a sense of real grief that I have had to sit in this Parliament so far this session and hear of increased taxes affecting the general public of South Australia, admittedly, but having a much greater effect in most areas of the rural sector of South Australia. Unfortunately, it comes at a time when the rural sector appears to be getting out of the grips of the drought that devastated this State and most of Australia. It is not only at a State level but also at a Federal level that things have occurred.

I will not highlight all the matters. However, when I attended the recent United Farmers and Stockowners annual State conference held in June this year, it was interesting to hear what the General Secretary had to say in his report. I refer particularly to his comments about the income equalisation deposit scheme. He said:

Although together with every other Australian farmer organisation we share the bitter disappointment in the loss of this facility, it is all the more poignant to South Australia for it was from this State that the idea became a reality.

We should remember that this doing away with the basic income equalisation deposit scheme has meant that the rural people now lose the option of opting in or out of the averaging of their incomes and, together with the restructuring, of the I.E.D., it provides no flexibility to enable the

rural producer to spread his income over good and poor years. The Secretary went on to say:

The importance of I.E.D.'s was to act as the grower's own insurance against drought and similar on those occasions when such insurance was required. Many farmers have made the comment to me in the past few weeks, since it has become clear that the I.E.D. principle has virtually been totally dismantled, that had it not been for this avenue of self-help they would have been required to have gone to rural assistance to survive the drought of the past 12 months.

It is a great shame when we see a Government interfering in a system that, to some extent, protected a farmer against drought and to some extent, therefore, saved the Government money. It is to be hoped that pressure will be applied so that this income equalisation deposit scheme can be reintroduced on a later date. I also took note of one item from the President's report, where he stated:

Serious concern has been expressed by people living in the remote areas of Australia at the provocative narrow-minded opposition by the Telecom unions to the launching of the Ausat communication satellite in 1988. Many of our pastoral members have been very active in countering these critics.

It is disappointing to me, because I believe that one area of Goyder, namely, in the southern Yorke Peninsula area around Stenhouse Bay and Marion Bay, where they do not have an automatic telephone exchange, will be completely reliant on a telecommunications satellite by which it will get its automatic facilities. It will also save Telecom, and therefore the taxpayer, a lot of money if they can put in their automatic exchange through this method rather than by having to put lines underground throughout this fairly rugged area. Again, it shows how the actions of some people can, possibly inadvertently, affect many other people.

I congratulate the U.F. and S. President, Secretary and committee on the way their conference went. It was a very polished conference, where the farmers had the opportunity to express their views. Certainly, it was very well attended and is something that I can recommend to all members who are interested in the rural industries.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: There were not many Labor members there—in fact, only the Minister. Is that right?

Mr MEIER: Yes, I think that the honourable member is right: only the Minister was there from the Government side, but it was pleasing to see many Opposition members there. The biggest effect on the rural sector of this State is with the fuel crisis. Currently, at Maitland we are paying over 46c per litre of fuel. The increase announced last night in the Federal Budget, together with the increase announced in the State Budget, will take it up near enough to 50c a litre. For those who find that hard to reconcile in their minds, that is \$2.25 per gallon. At \$2.25 a gallon it is very expensive motoring.

Unfortunately, rural people do not have the option of public transport as do urban people. Certainly, there are some bus systems but generally they are very slow and a trip to Adelaide would take many more hours than would a normal vehicle. It affects the whole of the rural area. I am not just talking of farmers but of all businesses which are affected, as is every individual.

The vehicle is an item which cannot be done without in the rural sector. A classic example was of a lad who came to my office the other day. He was 15 years of age and desperately needed a licence, as his father had recently passed away. He is now the one in the family who needs to drive vehicles around from place to place which entails going on public roads. Unfortunately, an approach to the Motor Vehicle Registration Department met with obvious opposition, as the regulations do not allow a person of 15 years to hold a licence. It just shows that, where a tragedy can happen in the family, it can be very difficult for that family. That will be so until the lad turns 16 years of age.

Leaving aside fuel prices, vehicles travel many more kilometres in the country than does the average city vehicle because of the greater distance between towns. They wear out faster and therefore rural people generally replace vehicles more frequently. Vehicles wear out faster because of the extra kilometres travelled, rougher roads, and, in many cases, because of added rust that develops in them due to muddy conditions on unsealed roads. It is also a great imposition on people if they have committed a traffic offence and receive a licence suspension. Certainly they are treated in the same way as people who live in the city, but a licence suspension in the country causes real hardship because there is usually no alternative means of travel. In the city it is easy as one can take a taxi, bus or some other method of transport. However, in the country invariably that option is not available.

It also affects people with higher taxes, particularly fuel taxes, in all commodities we buy. I refer to basic foodstuffs, materials of a hardware nature and materials for the building industry. Almost everything has to be bought from a central location in the city. A classic example is bricks. Most of the major brick companies are located close to the Adelaide metropolitan area. One can add near enough to \$50 per thousand bricks for transport costs to many areas in my electorate. The same applies to timber, nails, cement, and so on, involved in building. The supply of commodities is not always easy. Some firms have had pressure put on them by their suppliers and, unless they order a minimum amount per month, they will not be supplied with normal commodities at the going rate. This applies particularly in the electrical field. I have had examples of that where I have endeavoured to buy a small item. The local retailer has said that he cannot get it for me, as he has not been able to keep up enough orders to that firm.

In the city a much greater market is available, and most suppliers can keep a sufficient number of items flowing per month. With the delivery of groceries, it appears that the supermarkets have it all over the small country store. In fact, one country store proprietor said to me that it was cheaper for him to go to a place such as Half-case Warehouse and buy groceries, because he could obtain goods cheaper than by dealing with the particular co-operative through which he was getting his goods. Again, that is a hardship experienced by those in rural areas.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: And also a hardship on city stores.

Mr Ferguson: As well as the little stores, too.

Mr MEIER: Yes, I agree that the little stores in the city would be subject to exactly the same thing, although I suppose that city people have some advantage (although it certainly affects small business), because they can go to the supermarket if they wish. However, in small towns that option is not available.

Mr Ferguson: You should be able to go to the associated co-operative and get it at the same price as anyone else.

Mr MEIER: The auction system with which many rural producers have to deal, is changing to some extent. I refer to the pig marketing scheme whereby many pigs are now sold by being evaluated on the farm. A similar thing is occurring in regard to lambs. However, there are still problems to be sorted out, particularly in regard to the lamb market.

To the best of my knowledge, some two weeks ago producers were receiving an average of \$25 per lamb, whereas the price yesterday was in the region of \$16 to \$19 per lamb. It is simply a matter of supply and demand, so a producer finds it that much more difficult to work out exactly what he can afford, to what extent he can get himself out of debt or to undertake more developments on his farm. I appreciate that this matter has been with the farmer for

many years that the marketing system has improved a lot over the years. However it is a problem with which the farmer is faced and will be faced for the foreseeable future.

The transport industry, on which we in the rural areas rely so much, will again be hard hit by the increases in taxes that have just occurred. Many other industries including the tourism industry will also be affected. I shall refer in particular to the tourism industry in a moment. Honourable members would be aware that the cost per hour for labour is hitting country towns and rural settlements harder than it is the city areas. If one wants building renovations done in many small country towns, invariably one can hire a single tradesman, be it a bricklayer, a carpenter, a plumber or an electrician. One would find that the rate for many individual tradesmen varies between \$12 and \$14.50. Some would charge a higher rate than that, but it would not be hard to obtain that rate from a tradesman.

Once a person goes to a company that employs one, two or three people, or more, one would be looking at a rate usually in the vicinity of \$22 or \$25 an hour. One does not have to use much arithmetic to deduce that one would be saving half the labour cost by using an individual tradesman. The reason is very simple: an individual operator does not have worker's compensation costs; he does not have to provide for holiday loading or for superannuation for employees, and he does not have to provide for annual leave.

It is a fact of life that, as is the case in the city areas, companies in the country (which I think are being hurt more) are finding that they cannot afford to employ so many people, and the small operator, the individual operator, is finding that he or she would be ill advised to take on anyone. This is because the moment an operator takes on an employee his or her rate per hour must increase dramatically: in turn, that person will miss out on business, and business is hard enough to find in the drought-affected areas as it is. In the case of building, say, a \$50 000 house, according to some of the information that I received earlier, one could reckon that 40 per cent or 50 per cent of the cost involved would be for labour, depending on the type of house to be built.

A \$50 000 home would under normal circumstances incorporate a labour content of \$20 000 or more. I assume that that would involve payment at the rate of \$20 or perhaps even nearer to \$25 an hour for labour. If one were able to employ individual tradesmen to build such a house, one could probably save about \$10 000 on building that \$50 000 house. One must look at that suggestion carefully. The thing that worries me most about this State is that industry and business will continue to go downhill because people are going to tradesmen who charge a lower hourly rate. It is obvious that people generally want to save money and that, unless we solve that problem, we will not see a big revival in business or industry here. I hope that I will be proven wrong in this matter.

Schools in country areas have been affected in a multiplicity of ways lately. Teachers face extra costs to get to school or to come to Adelaide for business or holiday purposes. Parents are facing increased costs in taking their children to school. It was disappointing to hear that rents for Teacher Housing Authority houses will increase from October. It was interesting, too, to read an article which appeared in the current edition of the South Australian *Teachers Journal* under the headline, 'Protest action on rent increases'. It was also interesting to read that article in light of answers given by the Minister of Education to questions I asked earlier during this session. I think that this protest action stems mainly from what the South Australian Institute

of Teachers and teachers generally see as broken promises in relation to these rents.

I turn now to the tourism industry in the electorate of Goyder. Tourism in this area is feeling the effect of the recent increase in fuel tax. This matter is far more serious than has been indicated in newspapers or suggested by persons other than perhaps the shadow Minister of Tourism in her speech this afternoon. This worries me, because most areas of the Goyder electorate are some distance from Adelaide, and people rely on motor vehicles to reach these areas. In many cases people in these motor vehicles are towing loaded caravans, which increases fuel costs.

The tourism industry is spread throughout my electorate. However, some areas such as Riverton, Auburn and Watervale are much more tourist oriented than others. Auburn and Watervale are certainly feeling the effect of the wine tax and are struggling as a result of the drought last year. I can imagine the reaction that I will get when I travel through that area in the not too distant future. The Mallala area has an annual farm day which many people from the city attend to see farm animals, to experience what happens on a farm and have a thoroughly enjoyable day. This happens also in the areas of Virginia, Two Wells, Snowtown, Balaklava and particularly on the Yorke Peninsula.

The Yorke Peninsula has a strong tourist development association which recently took it upon itself to present a tourism award. The inaugural award went to the Koolyurtie Museum, on the Southern Yorke Peninsula between Minlaton and Maitland. I will quote from the newsletter of the Yorke Peninsula Tourist Association, which states:

The museum is unique because of its fully equipped 'Old World' General Store, Chemist Shop and Drapery Store, with many of the containers, tins and bottles, still with their original contents, and with prices still marked in pounds, shillings and pence.

Adding to its interest is a collection of some 400 dolls from practically every part of the world, and a rare collection of cars, machinery and tools, many of which are hand-made devices from the pioneering days.

That was the winner this year. It is certainly a museum that I thoroughly recommend to anyone, be they South Australian, Australian or from overseas. It is pleasing to note that the Government assists with tourism as much as possible. It is also pleasing to note that community groups have banded together to try and promote tourism to the best of their ability. In fact, they are going from strength to strength. Many businesses are affected by tourism, and the obvious ones are motels, hotels, caravan parks, holiday flats, museums, shops and service facilities.

I have spoken to several shopkeepers with businesses in inland towns who have stated quite openly that they would not exist in those inland towns if it were not for the tourist business during the year. Obviously, there are many shops and businesses in coastal towns that rely almost entirely on tourist business. How much of an effect will the petrol increase have on those businesses? At \$2.25 per gallon, people will think twice about where they travel. In real terms, I believe that, because of the increase in taxes, the South Australian Government and the South Australian public will miss out on the benefits that could have accrued. I hope that some outlet occurs so that petrol price increases do not occur on a six-monthly basis, as was suggested in last night's Budget. In fact, according to figures that I received recently it appears that the entire Federal and State tax on a litre of petrol amounts to 27.9c; in other words, at present, 60 per cent of what we pay for petrol goes to the Government. People thought that smoking was an expensive habit! Driving a car is certainly just as expensive.

I now turn to probably the biggest problem in my district, that is, water supply. Wherever one goes in Goyder there are problems in relation to water. A classic area without

water is the Moorowie area, on southern Yorke Peninsula. It is 36 years since the Yorke Peninsula water scheme was referred to the Public Works Standing Committee in relation to Moorowie. Certainly, most of Yorke Peninsula has benefited from that scheme. However, Moorowie missed out. For over 20 years it has become progressively more noticeable that the underground water supply in the Moorowie area has been decreasing to an extent where it has become unfit for consumption by some animals. Some wells that were previously used to supply other areas with water are now drying up or have dried up. The reason for the wells drying up is not fully known. Whatever the reason, it is having a disastrous effect on this area, and rural production is declining.

For any increase to occur, a reticulated water scheme is absolutely essential. A similar situation exists in the Watervale district, north of Auburn. The Watervale township is missing out on many retiring couples who go to towns where water is available. The rural community, particularly last year in the drought situation, found it very difficult to survive and that area too, needs reticulated water. The Bowmans area between Balaklava and Port Wakefield does not have reticulated water in certain locations. Certainly it is available but many small properties are being developed in that area; people are buying blocks of land and establishing houses, and it is a great shame to find that often they are told by the land agent that water will be available and they take that at face value.

They buy the land, and in some cases build a house, apply for water and they are told that water is not available. It certainly has to be a lesson to any person to make sure that, if they are in any doubt about water, it is written into the contract that water will be laid on. They should also find out whether it will be at their expense or at the E. & W.S. Department's expense, as it could result in many thousands of dollars for a private person to have it connected. In Lower Light there is a similar situation where they have water but the pressure can decrease to almost nothing during summer months, and apparently the bursting of pipes occurs with great monotony and regularity in that area. I am not necessarily advocating extending the reticulated water supply to all parts as I believe there is a limited water supply available.

The Murray River has only so much, and the reservoirs cannot be increased apparently to any great extent. Therefore it seems that some alternative methods have to be devised. I believe that much more encouragement should be given to the use of rainwater tanks, and by rainwater tanks I do not necessarily mean the 500 or 1 000 gallon tank, which is fine for everyday drinking and may be able to be used for the watering of some prized pot plants but, besides that, it is of not much use. If a person looks at tanks in the order of 5 000 or 10 000 gallons plus, then a considerable amount of water could be used throughout the house for most of the year, and possibly some minor addition from reticulated water supplies would be necessary. There are many towns in the Goyder District which still have large tanks and many houses in towns use rainwater all the year. It is only at extreme times, such as last year, when people have to rely on reticulated water supply for their everyday water needs. Much more thought and encouragement needs to be given to this area.

Another thing that the Government and South Australia generally might be able to consider is the desalination of sea water, particularly through the increased efficiency of solar plants. I believe that a lot of experimentation has been done in Japan and that the cost is coming down. Probably, with the increases in water rates that we are seeing from this Government, it might reach a time in the not too distant future when fresh water from desalination plants

might become an economic proposition. Whatever the case, research should be done in this area. The other area that is suffering from a water problem is Virginia, an intensive agricultural area which has also suffered drastically during the recent drought.

It has suffered because the market gardeners have had to subsidise their normal water supply with extra water. Many of the crops that they grow need water at particular times of the year and, due to the drought, water was not available. The great shame in the Virginia area is that the Bolivar effluent scheme has been continuing for so many years. The Hon. Ren DeGaris in the Legislative Council on 26 July 1973 (page 48 of *Hansard*), stated:

I should like to quote the history on this matter. In 1956 the *Advertiser* carried the following Government announcement about the new Dry Creek treatment works: 'Clean water for irrigation of any class of crop'. In 1964 the Engineering and Water Supply Department sent a letter to landholders in the Virginia area asking for their co-operation on soil testing and indicating that there was good water available for irrigation that would be of great value to them. In 1965 the Hon. C. Hutchens (then Minister of Works) assured Parliament that work would be carried out on a 26in. main in the Virginia area costing about \$612 000. During that year several speeches were made in each House about Bolivar water...

In 1966 the Hon. Frank Walsh, when Premier, said that the Virginia water project would be finished, that the schedule would be maintained, and that the cost would be \$800 000. In 1967 the Hon. Frank Kneebone (representing the Minister of Works) said there would be a large scheme for Virginia, and that funds would be available in about 1967-1970... In October 1969, the *Education Gazette*, at page 12, said that 'the Bolivar treatment works has been provided to enable reclaimed water to be used for irrigating nearby farm lands'.

This has gone on and on. Not just the Hon. Ren DeGaris commented in this regard, because the Hon. Dean Brown, on 22 November 1973, asked:

Will the Minister of Works say why, in view of the successful experimental results of the use of Bolivar effluent water for growing crops, the Government has failed to meet its obligation to supply water to market gardeners in the Virginia area?

He went on to state what Sir Thomas Playford had said about that scheme. A former member for Goyder, Mr David Boudry, on 4 August 1976, stated:

Not to act now means that this local salinity will discriminate against some growers. Also, it will be detrimental to the whole basin and ruinous to some individuals. I think the Government should consider the importance of the Virginia area and its value to the State.

The Bolivar Effluent Irrigation Study Report, which was put out in February 1976, outlined full details of what was available through the use of Bolivar effluent water for irrigation. It was stated:

Previous investigations by the Engineering and Water Supply Department have shown Bolivar effluent to be the most probable alternative water source to supplement the groundwater and to assist in achieving the two principal objectives of the study:

- (a) To retain the present irrigated agricultural industry at about its present level of production.
- (b) To preserve the groundwater resource by reducing withdrawals to natural recharge rates.

Many crops are grown in this area, and those crops are vitally important to the Adelaide metropolitan area. The Virginia area is so close to Adelaide that it would be a crying shame to see it slowly disappear, especially as the possibility of that happening is very real. These crops could well be grown in the South-East, where there is already a big industry. It would be most unfortunate if we had to rely more and more on Victorian and Queensland products for the Adelaide market. Why should this be the case when in the Virginia area tomatoes, potatoes, onions, cabbage, cauliflower, lettuce, pumpkins and other crops such as lucerne, almonds and vines are grown. Adelaide's reliance on this area is confirmed by the report, and I direct the attention of members to this report on the Bolivar effluent irrigation

scheme. Five schemes were outlined, but scheme A was certainly the most practical.

At the time of printing, namely 1976, the figure was close to \$20 000 000. We would obviously have to double that or more to put this scheme into operation. However, why should it be something that will sit around and have nothing done to it? Virginia people are becoming more and more concerned about the water supply. Other growers would like to move into the area but cannot because no more water is allowed to be drawn from the underground water supply. I know that the Government says that there is no money available. However, if this State is to progress, money will have to be borrowed for certain purposes—purposes that will genuinely increase the productivity of this State.

We have seen many industries close down. The car industry is in a great state of flux at present: it is worrying. Therefore, we have to look to industries that we can maintain and, to maintain them, we will have to spend money on them. Market gardening in Virginia and surrounding areas is one industry which I believe can be promoted. If millions of dollars can be spent in this area, it will lead to increased productivity, more jobs and it will mean that Adelaide has a guaranteed source of fresh fruit and vegetables close by.

Related to water (and certainly as part of the natural environment) are trees and their effect on the rural environment. It was with great pleasure that I went to a tree symposium held at Roseworthy college on 18 and 19 March this year. The symposium lasted for two days and was opened by the Minister for Environment and Planning. Many different topics were discussed and considered by people who are real experts in their field. The topics included the conservation value of trees; the past attitudes and present status of trees; the influence of trees on the rural environment; the impact of trees on the rural community; and ways of growing trees on rural properties which, I believe, have to be looked at very carefully.

Native vegetation clearance controls were recently introduced into this State. The idea is obvious: we want to try and preserve some of our native vegetation. It is disappointing that the effects on employment in some areas have been not far from disastrous. I refer to the Mallee areas where, I believe, some of the Mallee woodcutters have virtually had to close down. I also refer to areas in my district, particularly on southern Yorke Peninsula, where farmers have bought land with the full expectation that they would be able to clear it. It now looks as though they will not be able to clear much, if any, of it. I think that perhaps the moves were too drastic because it is not a matter of simply saying, 'We will stop clearing land.' It has to be more than that: it has to be reafforestation because South Australia has only 5 per cent of its natural wooded areas left. Therefore, to say that we will stop any more clearing and hold on to what we have does not give us enough. Therefore, the symposium put forward a very interesting example with respect to how farmers could increase the number of trees on their properties.

I refer particularly to a lecture by Mr Ian Brown at that symposium, entitled 'Establishment from seed'. Mr Brown had used three methods, together with other people in his area, to revegetate the area not far from Minlaton: first, by planting nursery-raised seedlings; secondly, by the protection of volunteer seedlings; and, thirdly, by establishment by direct seeding. He has experimented, particularly, with planting seeds directly into the ground and has found from as far back as 1971 through to this current year that many hundreds of trees have taken. Most of his experiments have been on the roadside and, certainly, it varies with respect to the years. Drought years have been somewhat disastrous, but when the rains fall at the right time he has found that hundreds of trees and shrubs have taken and have continued

to develop, and they are now flourishing. This has been undertaken with very little hand watering. Although this is along the roadside, he sees great possibilities for the trees to be planted on farms.

I believe that some sort of shelter belts need to be established in many rural areas. It is interesting to think back to the history of the peninsula where, in early days, it was not possible to drive sheep down through the wooded area of the Peninsula because it was too thick with vegetation; they had to be driven down the coast. Today, if one drives down most of it one would say, 'What a barren desolate area!' In parts, there are thankfully exceptions; that is why I believe that many shelter belts must be provided. At this stage, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. T. H. HEMMINGS (Minister of Housing): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): I wish to speak this evening on the incident that occurred earlier today between the Minister of Education and me. The first thing that I wish to do is to apologise to the Minister of Education on one aspect. It has been pointed out to me that I breached the unwritten code of Parliament in that information that I had obtained from the Minister in a private conversation should not have been used publicly. I can only assure the Minister that, despite the fact that I have been in this House for four years, I have been in Opposition for only eight months, and I was honestly not aware of that code. I therefore apologise to the Minister for using information which I obtained from him in a private conversation in a capacity which the Minister could reasonably not have expected me to do.

However, having said that, I do not resile from my recollection of the incidents that led to the unfortunate situation today. The information is now public knowledge, and I would like again to go over the situation as I see it. I pointed out to the Minister when I spoke to him that I approached him only to get some information clarified, as I was very surprised indeed at a press release which I saw in the *News* of 9 August, which stated:

The water resources Minister, Mr Slater, today confirmed that schools would pay the full cost of all water consumed after 1 July this year.

The Minister of Water Resources in an interjection today confirmed that that was an accurate report of his press release. That does not say that the Education Department is going to pay the cost of that water. It says quite clearly that schools are going to pay the full cost of all water consumed after 1 July this year. Surely, as a member of the Opposition, I was entitled to take those words at their face value and, evidently, it was quite correct because the Minister of Water Resources confirmed in an interjection this afternoon that he did make that statement. However, I did believe that that represented a major change in Government policy and, before taking up the matter with the school councils in my electorate, I thought that I would approach the Minister of Education to determine whether that was in fact accurate.

At this point both the Minister and I agree on our recollection at this stage. We also agree that, in that discussion he advised me that the Education Department would be paying for normal water usage in schools and that he hoped that an additional allocation of funds would be made available from the Treasurer to the Education Department to enable those payments to be made without disadvantaging

the level of grants going out to schools. We both agree on that point. I believe we also agree on the point that he said to me that he could not be sure that that money would be made available to his department and that, if it was not, it could have an effect on the level of grants paid to school councils. That also was confirmed by an officer in his department in a telephone conversation yesterday.

We disagree in relation to the excess usage of water in schools. My recollection of the incident is quite clear. I believe the Minister advised me that, where schools entered into excess usage of water, the cost of that water would be directly borne by school councils. I have already apologised to the Minister for then using that information without advising him that I was going to write to my school councils.

I said to the Minister only that I was concerned about the effect on my school councils. I was not aware of the breaching of the code in relation to the actions upon which I was about to embark. Certainly I acknowledge that I should have advised the Minister why I was seeking that information. However, that does not alter the point and I do not resile from the point I made that the Minister did make the statement to me about school councils having to bear the cost of water if excess usage occurred. I can only ask the Minister why he would think for one minute that I would pass that information on to school councils if I thought that it was incorrect, as I would know full well that, if I were to write to my school councils and provide false information, I would obviously be severely castigated for making such a statement. Members opposite may not believe it, but I am not utterly stupid and I do not enter into a situation knowing or feeling that I am going to leave myself open to an attack that would completely blunt any aspect of any point that I was trying to make in defending the interests of my school councils. I only put that forward to the Minister for his consideration.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I was not suggesting that you were stupid.

Mr ASHENDEN: I appreciate that. I did not for one minute say that the Minister said that I was stupid. I made the point that I would have been stupid to have made such a statement, knowing it to be false. I was also approached, out of courtesy, by the Minister before Question Time. I acknowledge that. The Minister said that he was going to raise, during Question Time, the letter that I had forwarded to my school councils. I appreciated that advice, but I also pointed out to the Minister that his recollection of what occurred and my recollection of what occurred were quite different. I believe that, had I been in the Minister's position, I would not have handled the situation as he has done.

I would have appreciated it if the Minister could have mentioned to the House that there was a difference between the two recollections, because he was aware of that. I believe that, had the Minister not inflamed the situation by the attack he made on me (and I took it as being quite a vicious attack), then I do not believe that this matter would have blown out of all proportion as it has done now. I believe that I have another point that shows quite clearly that the Minister of Education does make serious mistakes in recollecting conversations that have occurred. I want to quote statements that were made in the House last evening. Last evening the following statements were made by the member for Whyalla:

... What the member for Todd is really telling the Government is that his answer to the present recession, which unfortunately we are in, is to sack everyone.

Mr Ashenden: You're not original.

Mr MAX BROWN: The member for Todd can say what he likes but he has gone on record as saying that that would be his answer as far as he is concerned: we would not employ anyone.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: He has had an hour to refute it and he has not.

Mr MAX BROWN: As the Minister of Education has said, he has had an hour to say that he would not do that, and he has not done it.

I would estimate that, only 10 or 15 minutes before those remarks were made, I made the following statement to the House (and the Minister of Education was in the House when I said it):

We have heard the member for Hartley, supported tonight by other members opposite, in relation to the alleged statement that I am supposed to have made advocating the axing of 2 000 public servants. My statement is on the record. Members of the public and members of this House can refer to the *Hansard* in question, where they will note that all I said was that the employment of those 2 000 public servants should not have proceeded if the Government could not afford it. It is as simple as that. Now that they are employed, let us get it on the record that there is no way that I or any member on this side of the House would advocate that those public servants should be sacked. I hope that that matter has been laid to rest.

I made that statement in this House in the presence of the Minister, and yet he stated by way of interjection:

He has had an hour to refute it and he has not.

That is a very clear example again of the Minister's deliberate misrepresentation of a statement that I had made in this House. As far as what occurred this afternoon is concerned I shall leave it to honourable members to determine what might have occurred in that private conversation.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Outside the House tomorrow—take any action you want to take.

Mr ASHENDEN: The Minister has made the threat that he is going to make statements outside the House. I invite the Minister to do so. I ask the Minister to make statements outside the House (if he wishes to inflame the situation further) that relate to my integrity or my honesty. I would like him to state that I have lied to Parliament or that I uttered untruths. I would like that very much indeed. In his statement, I certainly invite him to make those statements in order that I can take the appropriate action.

Mr WHITTEN (Price): For the past 10 minutes we have been subjected to a completely scurrilous speech from the member for Todd claiming that he had been misrepresented. I would like to read into *Hansard* what the member for Todd did say the other day. In answer to an interjection by the member for Hartley, who said, 'Tell us what you would do?', the member for Todd stated:

I am very happy to answer that interjection—

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: On a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker, it has been a long-standing tradition of this Parliament to not refer to the *Hansard* record of the session that we are currently in.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Mayes): There is no point of order. I understand that those rules are relaxed during a grievance debate.

Mr WHITTEN: Thank you very much, Sir, for your protection. The member for Todd replied to the member for Hartley's interjection by saying:

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

That should lay that matter to rest. I am also advised by the Minister of Education that, whilst he accepts the back-handed apology from the member for Todd, tomorrow he will repeat outside the House what was said here. If the honourable member wants to take any action, the Minister of Education will quite certainly accommodate him. I do not want to talk any more about that matter.

I am very much concerned about what Liberal Governments have done in the past, particularly the former Liberal Government, which did not provide people with the necessary protection from unscrupulous persons who support the Liberals. I refer particularly to the builders who burgle,

thieve from or rip off the poor working person who makes one large investment in his lifetime—his home, the largest investment he will ever make. That builder, because of his shoddy workmanship, makes sure that that person does not get value for his money. A person I have known all my life contracted in November 1980 to have a house built by Fairmont Homes of 503 Lower North-East Road, Campbelltown for \$41 910. That contract stipulated that the builder would complete the house in a workmanlike manner.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: What have you done about it?

Mr WHITTEN: I have advised that person correctly and I will tell the honourable member what happened. Since a Labor Government has been back in power extra inspectors have been appointed to the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: Put on extras, have you?

Mr WHITTEN: I wish that the member for Alexandra would go and put his—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Price is entitled to have his grievance heard.

Mr WHITTEN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I looked at the mortar and brickwork in this home and found that, when I rubbed the mortar between my finger and thumb, I could blow it away as a powder. I advised the person involved to contact the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs. On 7 March this year, that person wrote to the Director of the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs, as follows: Dear Sir,

Unsatisfactory Workmanship—Building.

I wish to lodge a complaint against Fairmont Homes, Builders and Contractors of 503 Lower North-East Road, Campbelltown. In November of 1980, I contracted Fairmont Homes to build a house at my address above. The building commenced in January 1981 and was completed in March 1981.

On 3 March 1983, I had an air-conditioner installed. During the installation, the electrician commented about the poor quality of mortar used in the brickwork. While making the initial cut the brick being hit, instead of breaking, was being forced backwards. The same problem occurred while using a bolster to cut a half brick. The electrician, fearing structural damage, had to resort to the use of a masonry saw to make the two vertical cuts.

Extreme care was needed while removing the last layer of bricks. Anything more than gentle taps may have brought down the upper layers of bricks. The mortar used has failed to adhere to the brickwork and when rubbed between the fingers the mortar just powders.

I contacted the builder concerned and explained the problem as set out above. He seemed totally unconcerned and unprepared to investigate the matter. I am afraid that the brickwork is unsound and fear what may happen in the event of very harsh weather conditions. I ask that you investigate this matter on my behalf.

The Department of Public and Consumer Affairs advised the person involved to speak to the builder. He spoke to the builder who said, 'It is good enough for us. If you want to get tests done, get them done, but it will cost you \$400.' The person involved advised the department of what was said. Amdel was then commissioned to report on the mortar. I will not read all the test results, but I can tell honourable members that the Amdel tests revealed seven different mortar mixtures. Instead of being one part cement to three parts sand, the best mix was one part mortar to nine parts sand; the worst was one part cement to 14 parts of sand.

Last Sunday I visited the home and noticed that the sawn bricks could be shaken and moved about. I also found, by placing two fingers into the top course of bricks and pushing them up, that those bricks were loose. I rubbed the mortar between my fingers and found that it was just powder and dust. The Department of Consumer Affairs, after receiving a report from Amdel, contacted the gentleman concerned and supplied him with a copy of the letter that it had sent to the builder, Fairmont Homes. The letter, dated 9 August and addressed to Mr G. Flourenzou, states as follows:

Dear Sir,

I refer to the complaint lodged with the Consumer Service Branch against your company . . . concerning the defective composite mortar used in the construction of the brick-work . . . Please find enclosed a copy of an Amdel report which has been received by the Consumer Services Branch . . . As the damp course mortar is deficient in cement, it is considered desirable that an approved waterproof admixture be added to all the new mortar pointing. You are further requested to complete the remedial work within 21 days.

The letter advised Mr Flourenzou that if the work was not done Consumer Affairs would be advised. The Amdel report refers to the Australian standards for building mortars.

The SPEAKER: Order! The members for Elizabeth and Unley are out of order.

Mr WHITTEN: The Amdel report states:

The mortar samples tested were of very poor quality. They had cement:sand ratios of the order of 1:9-14 as opposed to the recommended ratio of 1:3. Mortars of such composition are deemed to be totally inadequate.

Of particular concern was the dampcourse mortar which was extremely cement deficient and hence will not afford suitable protection to the brickwork. The very soft, friable nature of mortar, and the fading and fretting observed are a direct result of the very low cement content of the mortar.

I have a high regard for Amdel. I believe that Amdel conducted its test properly. In fact, the Amdel report fully explains how the tests were conducted.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WHITTEN: I believe that people should be protected from these companies. I also refer to Monday's *Advertiser* and the A.M. column which discussed privilege, as follows:

Under the protection of privilege, M.P.'s can name persons or companies—

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

Mr RODDA (Victoria): I rise to make some observations about the Stock Diseases Act, a matter that I raised this afternoon in relation to a specific case. My comments relate to that Act and its requirements, impositions and penalties in relation to the lack of treatment for diseased stock. I think that this issue, which has been of long-standing concern, first arose during the late Sir Glen Pearson's time as Minister of Agriculture. At that time the sheep industry was plagued by disease. It was difficult to buy sheep or to have a clean flock. If a farmer had a clean flock he was virtually isolated because he could not sell them at market with safety; alternatively, a farmer could not buy with safety at market if he had an open flock—one had to have a closed flock.

The graziers and sheep farmers were, therefore, isolated. There was a lot of discussion between stockowners and the United Farmers and Graziers (I think that organisation was known at that time as the Primary Producers Union). However, they were of one accord. The Minister had long and varied discussions with these organisations and he introduced an administrative Act. It was made a notifiable disease. The way in which the disease was cleaned up was amazing. At that time I can recall, although I was not a member of this place—

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many audible conversations while the honourable member for Victoria is grieving.

Mr RODDA: At that time I was an officer in the Department of Lands, where I saw things from the opposite side of the fence. The characteristic of the alkaline soils was tolerated by sheep with footrot. Once the stock, which was run on the red gum acid bearing soils, reached the flush of spring with the lush sub-clover, there was a brash spread of

footrot. Long hours of work were required paring the sheep's feet, and I am sure the member for Light can also testify to the bare knuckles, the blood and gore that arose from the paring of sheep's feet and the daily necessity of foot baths. I know from a practical viewpoint the problems which arise from this disease. The late Sir Glen Pearson, with the introduction of his legislation, was truly a benefactor to the sheep industry. As a result, a big increase in the output of wool and fat lambs resulted from that legislation. However, the disease has never been properly cleared up.

It was distressing today to be informed that there is yet another case, because the people concerned are good farmers and good animal husbands. I do not chide the Department of Agriculture as it does a good job. However, I was under the impression that notification of the disease had to be given by the department. Section 19 (1) of the Stock Diseases Act, 1934-1975, prescribes what must be done, as follows:

19. (1) Every owner of diseased stock and every owner of stock which are suspected by the owner to be suffering from disease shall—

- (a) Within 24 hours from the time when the stock are discovered to be diseased or are suspected by the owner to be suffering from disease, notify, by the quickest means, the nearest inspector who is an officer of the Department of Agriculture or the chief inspector at Adelaide that the stock are discovered to be diseased or, as the case may be, are suspected to be suffering from disease, together with a description of the stock, the number thereof and the place where the stock are situated;
- (b) Keep the stock from coming into contact with stock belonging to other persons;
- (b1) Comply with all oral or written directions given to him by any inspector for the purpose of controlling or eradicating disease;
- (c) If so ordered by an inspector authorised in writing by the chief inspector to order the destruction of stock, forthwith destroy any such stock which are diseased stock.

There is nothing in the Act about notification, and when I consulted the research section of the library this afternoon I was advised that there was no requirement under the Act to notify the adjoining landholders. However, there is a policy within the Department of Agriculture to notify adjoining landholders, but with some qualification.

An officer of the department decides whether stock on adjoining land is in danger of infection. This matter is so serious that notification should be incumbent on the department. There should be an amendment to the Act that requires the department to notify adjoining landholders. Fences being what they are, livestock and predatory male animals such as bulls or rams can crawl through fences at night: no-one sees them in action, and they can spread disease, which can play havoc. There are very easy and effective means of mapping sections, such as microfiche and other modern technological methods. It is not hard to delineate who owns what and where it is situated.

My question today outlined two unfortunate consequences when all adjoining landholders were not informed. That situation reinforces what I believe. Footrot has not been rife but some cases have been reported. People have been irritated when I did not give them the answers or the action that they wanted. I was called a paper tiger, toothless and ineffective. I can appreciate the concern of these people. There have been other cases, which have no bearing on the cases to which I referred, where an unscrupulous person acquired sheep that were suffering from footrot: all hell broke loose in regard to the administration of that case. There have been other such cases. This matter should be considered by the Government. Perhaps the shadow Minister of Agriculture or I should draw up an amendment to the

Act that would require notification to adjoining landholders in regard to stock which may be diseased or which may carry this very serious and contagious infection. That gives rise to a lot of concern in a community. There are not such stringent requirements in Victoria, which makes us all the more dubious about the situation in which we find ourselves.

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

Motion carried.

At 10.28 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 25 August at 2 p.m