

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 15 September 1983

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

## PETITION: TEACHER HOUSING

A petition signed by 15 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government not to increase rents on Teacher Housing Authority houses and improve the programme of maintenance and upgrading of these houses was presented by the Hon. W.E. Chapman.

Petition received.

## PETITION: MARIHUANA

A petition signed by 40 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject any legislation that would legalise or decriminalise the use of marihuana was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

## PAPER TABLED

-The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister of Mines and Energy (Hon. R.G. Payne):

*Pursuant to Statute—*

1. Pipelines Authority of South Australia—Report, 1982-83.

## QUESTION TIME

## GAS SUPPLIES

**Mr OLSEN:** Can the Premier say whether the Government is negotiating with the Australian Gas Light Company with a view to obtaining additional supplies of natural gas for South Australia? At present, South Australia has assured supplies of Cooper Basin natural gas for its own domestic and industrial requirements for power generation and gas reticulation until 1987, while New South Wales has supplies until 2006, as a result of supply contracts approved by the Dunstan Government.

At the time of the last election the former Government was involved in negotiations with the Australian Gas Light Company, which purchased the gas for distribution to New South Wales. The aim of the negotiations, which involved my colleague the Deputy Leader, senior public servants, representatives of the Cooper Basin producers, and the Australian Gas Light Company, was to rationalise the existing contracts. This would allow South Australia greater access to presently known reserves, thus extending the 1987 deadline. Is the Premier able to advise whether the negotiations are continuing and, if they are, what progress is being made?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I think it would be wiser if I respond to the honourable member's general question in relation to the supply of gas for South Australia in the period beyond 1987. I can advise in that respect that all options are being fully explored and that considerable progress has been made by my colleague, the Minister of Mines and Energy, in relation to a number of parties involved. Of course, since the previous Government was in office there have been some quite considerable changes in the assessment of reserves and possible supplies. That is commercially

sensitive information and, obviously, I cannot go into it in any detail. I think it would be more useful if, instead of delving back into past history and recalling events of some time ago, the Leader would try and orient himself to the contemporary situation in 1983. I assure the honourable member that we have the situation well in hand.

## PENSIONER EXPLOITATION

**Mrs APPLEBY:** Will the Chief Secretary instigate an inquiry into what appears to be fraudulent action being perpetrated on a pensioner in my district who has sought my help after the following incidents took place? During a freak storm earlier this year, a large tree snapped and fell in the front yard of this person's home. She then engaged some people to cut it up and clear it away. The job was reasonable although not complete, but payment was made. The person then, through a local press advertisement, engaged a tree-feller to complete the work. On completion, it was suggested that payment could be made by the pensioner's using her telephone number in the contractor's advertisement and by taking telephone calls in relation to his work. She would then pass on any messages when he contacted her. This procedure had taken place over a month. In the past few weeks she has had a visit from an officer of the Department of Social Security inquiring what monetary gain or income had been received for this service. Another question she had to answer concerned whether this person was living on the premises. The Department of Social Security is satisfied with the answers to questions asked of the pensioner. My comments on this matter are as follows: First, the cost of the original job has been paid many times over with a job for a month as an answering service. Secondly, the lady has suffered exploitation and has had her honesty and morals questioned. Thirdly, my concern is for the lady, and it appears that there may be other people in our community who are being exploited in a similar fashion by questionable persons.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** As outlined by the honourable member, the situation is rather strange, to say the least, that anyone would seek to take advantage of a pensioner in that way. However, whether or not fraudulent behaviour has taken place is a matter for the law to determine and I will call for a report from the Police Department on that aspect. It occurs to me, as stated by the honourable member, that this may be a common practice in the community and, if it is, it is unlikely that members of Parliament or the police would know about it unless someone had the courage, as this lady has, to bring it to the attention of the authorities.

It would be a good idea if the media were to publicise this case and ask other people in Adelaide who may be involved in a similar situation (that is, pensioners who have had contract work to be done and then have been asked for the use of their telephone as a calling service for the contractor or whoever has been asked to cut out a bill in other ways) to contact my office, the Police Department or the member who asked the question so as to indicate clearly whether this system applies across the board in South Australia, or whether this is an isolated case. Either way, I will have the matter examined and bring down a report for the honourable member.

## GAS SUPPLIES

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** My question is directed to the Premier. I would have asked the Deputy Premier a question so that he would not feel lonely, but this one goes to the Premier.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to resume his seat. This provides me with an opportunity to say one or two things about the standard of behaviour, or lack of it, on both sides of the House over the last week. Regrettably, whether because of a lack of communication or for some other reason I do not know, there has crept into the whole of the proceedings an undesirable and un-South Australian style of personal denigration to a degree that I have not seen before during the past 13 years.

I am not attributing that to the Deputy Leader: obviously, that was a jocular remark, but it gave me the opportunity to say something which I wanted to say in any case and which I intended to say at some point during the afternoon. My remarks are directed to both sides of the House—let us be quite clear about that. There are only two members in the House to whom my remarks are not directed, and they are the member for Flinders and the member for Semaphore. Everyone else can consider himself—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I do not know whether I have to wave a red or a yellow card, according to the soccer code, but I want to get back to common sense, common principle and decency.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Would honourable members please listen for just a moment, rather than having multifarious conversations around the football field. All I am saying is that it is all very well for me, as Max Harris would have it, to bark as I know the well-known mammal, the walrus, is prone to do at about this time of the year, although not with an alleged catarrhal condition. The walrus is known to bark because of the time of the year. But this gains absolutely nothing: a great deal more is gained if a positive effort is made to raise the standards. I am not trying to be ponderous or pompous.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Honourable members continually ask me for a fair go: all I am asking of honourable members is a fair go. If members would just listen to me for two minutes, the whole matter would be under way. If I get that fair go, all right. All I am saying is that over the past week in one way or another personal ill-will has crept into the proceedings, reaching a stage that I have never witnessed—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! —in 13 years in this place. First, personal ill-will has crept into the proceedings; secondly, there has been absolute insolence towards the Chair, whether direct or indirect, and that applies to members on both sides of the House—except for the two honourable members to whom I referred. All I ask is that there be some fair play. I am not asking that the cut and thrust of politics be manoeuvred in any way: in no way am I suggesting that. All I am asking is that there be some reasonable adherence to what I consider reasonable fair play. I call the honourable Deputy Leader.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Will the Premier say what is the Government's policy on the allocation of presently known supplies of natural gas to the Adelaide market and a petro-chemical project, and does he intend to discuss this matter with executives of the Asahi Chemical Company in Japan during his forthcoming visit to that country? Under the existing terms of the Cooper Basin indenture, a deed of covenant and release makes provision for 213.5 billion cubic feet of gas to be available for a petro-chemical plant. In a press statement of 27 January 1981, the now Deputy Premier stated that a petro-chemical project should be deferred until enough natural gas had been discovered to satisfy South Australian requirements.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I thank the Deputy Leader for his question and for the courteous way in which he has asked it. I will reply in kind. The Government remains firmly committed to the establishment of a petro-chemical complex in South Australia. Negotiations have been going on over the past year or more with the consortium involving Asahi Chemical, which also has an Australian partner in the C.R.A. group. The question of allocation of gas supplies is an important part of those negotiations. My colleague, the Minister of Mines and Energy, has been actively involved in that pursuit. In my forthcoming trip to Japan I certainly intend to speak with representatives of the companies involved about the prospects for a petro-chemical plant.

## STUDENT ASSISTANCE

**Mr GROOM:** Will the Minister of Education investigate allegations of inequities in financial assistance schemes for students, a matter that was raised in today's *Advertiser*? In today's *Advertiser* an article by the education writer appeared headed 'Students do same work, \$83 difference in "pay"'. The article referred to the fact that one student received \$103.90 a week from the Federal Government while studying metal fabrication at Regency Park Community College, while another person, doing the same work, using the same lathes, etc., got \$20 a week, and another person got \$38 per week. It appears that each of those people is paid under different schemes. One is paid under the tertiary education scheme; the second is not eligible for payment under that scheme and gets an apprenticeship allowance; and the third person was registered with the Commonwealth Employment Service, and gets a transition allowance and a living away from home allowance.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Certainly I was interested to read that article in this morning's paper, and I know that a number of people have come across situations where there seems to be some difference between the levels of payment that are obtainable by students doing various courses after they leave secondary schools. In fact, some months ago, in June of this year, when I was visiting one of the country areas and met with someone in the area of Aboriginal education, a particular anomaly was brought to my attention in regard to Aboriginal education allowances payable when a student had dependants.

It turned out that the allowance payable for those undertaking education was less than the unemployment benefit that would have been payable had a person remained on unemployment. However, if a person had no dependants, the situation was not the same. At that time I undertook to take up investigation of that anomaly. When I investigated the matter further, it became quite clear that a number of anomalies exist that need further investigation in this regard. I decided to write to a number of bodies and people asking for their views and for them to outline anomalies that may have come to their attention, so that when I do make a considered approach to the Federal Minister I will be able to do so on the basis of having given as wide a spectrum of attention to the anomalies as possible.

Accordingly, I wrote to the Director-General of Technical and Further Education, the Director-General of Education, the Executive Director of the Tertiary Education Authority of South Australia, and also to the student organisations involved in the various tertiary institutions, including the Council of South Australian College Students, asking them to give me their views on the anomalies that exist in the various allowances payable to students. When I have received all of the replies to that request (and I am still waiting for a number of them) it is my intention to put forward a considered proposal to the Federal Minister for her inves-

tigation in conjunction with her colleagues (because a number of these fees come not from the education arena but from other portfolio areas). When the Federal Minister of Education (Senator Susan Ryan) was here some weeks ago I in fact flagged to her that it was my intention to make this approach to her as soon as I had the information from the various bodies concerned.

With regard to the article in this morning's paper, it must be mentioned that the article went on to explain some of the reasons why there were differences between the various levels of fees. Inevitably, there will always be differences in the allowances payable to various groups of students, for various justifiable reasons. For example, in regard to the examples referred to in the article, one of the students was living away from home in order to do a course in the city—I believe he came from Eudunda, or somewhere. Naturally, there will always have to be special allowances payable for those sorts of situations. In other cases, means testing of family income comes into play. Again, those sorts of issue will always need to be considered in any allocation of allowances. I do accept that there are anomalies in this whole area. I am trying to build up a solid case that canvasses all the areas involved, rather than just go on a one-off basis with one allowance or another.

#### MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT (DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS) ACT

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** I ask the Premier whether it is the intention of the Government to progress a complaint against a member who fails to comply with the requirements of the Members of Parliament (Disclosure of Interests) Act, 1983, to the point that he or she would be ineligible to retain his or her seat in Parliament?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** It is a curious question. Legislation which has been passed by this Parliament places certain responsibilities on all members of the Parliament and also provides penalties or sanctions for non-compliance with those provisions. I am sure that nobody in this place would contemplate a breach of such requirements, which are embodied in the law. I am not sure that it is a question of policy, but a question of the law and how it stands that is involved in this case.

#### CAR PARTS

**Mr KLUNDER:** I ask the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs in another place: will the Minister investigate the situation where car parts suitable only for off-road use are sold as though they are generally suitable for normal road use? Earlier this week, a constituent came to see me to indicate that his pregnant wife had been stopped by police, who then defected the family car for having magnesium alloy wheels of a certain type and an over-sized steering wheel. These items were available in various shops as modifications for that car, and it was only after checking that it was found that the parts were in theory suitable only for off-road use. My constituent was concerned that he had inadvertently breached the law and that parts which are illegal on the road can be purchased openly without a warning being given that the parts are for specialised off-road use only.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** I thank the honourable member for his question, which I shall refer to my colleague in another place for investigation and report.

#### CIGARETTE AND TOBACCO ADVERTISING

**Mr ASHENDEN:** Does the Minister of Recreation and Sport still hold the view that he expressed at the opening of the Australian bocce championships in Adelaide on 13 June, that he strongly opposes any ban on the advertising of cigarettes and tobacco? The national bocce championships held in Adelaide earlier this year were sponsored by the Benson and Hedges Company. In an address to those taking part, the Minister made a number of strong and positive statements about the sponsorship of sporting activities by cigarette and tobacco companies. He said that this form of assistance to sport was very valuable, and that he could not therefore support any move which would prevent advertising by cigarette and tobacco companies. In view of the Government's policy on this matter, announced yesterday by the Minister of Health, I ask the Minister whether he still holds the views that he expressed on 13 June.

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** As the member for Todd and other members of the House well know, a private member's Bill in another place is being considered at present. I abide by the health policy of our Party, which indicates, of course, quite clearly what we propose in regard to the banning of cigarette advertising. I certainly support sporting organisations within Australia, and that legislation to which I referred. The Government's position has been made quite clear and that is to make sure that one State does not act unilaterally in this matter. The amendments will be based on the fact that other States and, indeed, the Commonwealth must have a common approach because one State acting unilaterally on the matter would certainly cause a problem for sporting organisations within South Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** I now turn to sporting sponsorship, which is very important to sport in South Australia and throughout Australia. It is important that private sponsorship as well as Government sponsorship and assistance is made available so that those sports may continue. One sport is that of bocce, which is currently sponsored throughout Australia by a company. The member for Todd has mentioned the particular championship which I attended. I believe that the position is such that it would be very difficult for any sport to continue in Australia without that type of sponsorship. As members of the House are well aware, I am a smoker myself, and I believe that that is something of an individual choice.

I believe that other products are manufactured and sold legally which are probably as deleterious to health as are tobacco products. I repeat that I support Government policy in regard to the education campaign involving \$250 000 which was announced by the Minister of Health yesterday—

**An honourable member:** What about your public statement?

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** Do not worry about the public statement.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I hope that we will not so soon disintegrate back into the pattern of the past week.

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** If the member for Todd can recall, one of the points that I made on that occasion and have made frequently to sporting bodies is that I do not believe that South Australia should act unilaterally on this matter. That is the position as it is at present and I support that policy.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I hope that honourable members recognise the fact that they are being watched by South Australians, and ordinary South Australians expect some reasonable sort of standard from them.

### CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

**Mr GREGORY:** Can the Chief Secretary explain to this House, for the particular benefit of the member for Murray, exactly what provision is made in the 1983-84 Budget for capital works in the prisons area? The member for Murray was quoted in the *Advertiser* on Wednesday last as saying the following:

The Opposition has stated it welcomed any plan to improve the situation at the prison.

He was, of course, referring to Yatala. He then went on to add:

but there was no allocation in this year's Budget which would allow the plans announced by Mr Keneally to proceed in 1983-84.

The plans to which the member refers are those confirming that the Government intends to proceed with the proposed nine-year programme of works at Yatala in half that time. Yesterday, in asking a question of the Premier, the member for Murray made much the same sort of remark. Commenting in his explanation on an observation of the Ombudsman, who said that he hoped that the Government would see fit to spend the money in the prisons area, the member said:

As the Budget has been brought down, we recognise that that is not the case.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I must say that I was somewhat surprised about the reporting of the honourable member's comments in the *Advertiser* on Wednesday when he said that no provision had been made in the Budget for capital expenditure in the area of correction. I did not take a great deal of notice of that, because I thought that he must have been misquoted. He has been a Minister, he is now a shadow Minister and he has been in this House for the past 10 years. I should have thought that during that time he would have learnt to read the Budget papers. So, I did not take a great deal of notice. However, a radio commentator said to me, 'Mr Keneally, you will not have any money to do any of the capital works in the area of correction.'

I said, 'You haven't been speaking to the shadow Minister?' In fact, he said, 'I have been speaking to Mr David Wotton.' I said, 'I thought as much.' I then said, 'Perhaps you could ring Mr David Wotton and invite him to read page 142 of Parliamentary Paper No. 9, which shows capital expenditure of \$7 million.' The radio announcer said, 'Perhaps he will listen to this radio programme.' I said, 'I hope so. He might learn something.' Yesterday the honourable member asked the Premier a question and again repeated the fallacy that there was not any provision in the Budget papers for capital expenditure in the Department of Correctional Services.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** That is not what I said.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** Obviously, the honourable member is embarrassed. I would be, too, if I was the honourable member. I was surprised that not one of his colleagues had pointed this out to him. I assume that they have not done so because they were embarrassed, and that some would like to take his place. Certainly, in fairness to their colleague, members opposite should have pointed out to him that there was a line in the Parliamentary Budget papers (at page 142) which covered expenditure of \$7 million in the Department of Correctional Services. For the honourable member's benefit I should point out to him that about \$4 million will be spent in the area that impacts directly on Yatala Labour Prison.

There has already been one brief put before the Public Works Standing Committee that has been approved, and another one will go before that committee in a week's time. I cannot really be held responsible for the ignorance of the honourable member, but I do think that it is beyond the

pale when he wants to repeat that ignorance in the media in South Australia, so that radio and television commentators are questioning me on the basis of ill-informed information provided to them by the honourable member because he is unable to read his documents and cannot see that the Government is providing money for capital expenditure in the Department of Correctional Services. Perhaps the honourable member is taking a line from his Leader and one of his colleagues when they respectively were the Chief Secretary and when very little capital expenditure was invested in that area. This Government has announced a programme of capital expenditure.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** You are just uptight about what the Ombudsman said.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** No. The honourable member might feel inclined to ask me a question about the Ombudsman, but I should point out to him how it would reflect on himself and his Leader when they were in Government. That is quite clear. Again, the honourable member has proved that not only can he not read the Budget papers but also he cannot read the Ombudsman's Report.

### LAND TITLE DEEDS

**Mr MEIER:** Can the Minister of Lands say whether it is the policy of the Lands Titles Office to destroy title deeds that are beyond a certain age when they are returned to that office for alteration? It has been brought to my attention by a constituent that some time ago, as a result of an easement required through his farming property by the Electricity Trust, he was required to give the Trust his title deed so that it could be forwarded to the Lands Titles Office for the appropriate stamping of the easement on it.

The title deed was issued on 12 May 1875, about 108 years ago. Certainly, historians would consider it a significant document in South Australia's early history of land settlement. According to my information, it was forwarded to constituent received the returned title in the post. To his consternation it was not the original title but rather a new one. Inquiries by my constituent indicated that the old title deeds were destroyed by the Lands Titles office, usually by a shredding machine. At a time when conservation is emphasised by many sections of the community, my constituent and I do not wish to see the wilful destruction of old documents.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The brief answer is that I do not have a clue but I will certainly get some information for the honourable member. I would share his concern if, indeed, valuable historical documents are being destroyed. It is part of the general enthusiasm building up for the Jubilee 150 year that many people are tracing their genealogies. One of the sources of information that should be available to them is old-type documents. Often this is perhaps the only way that certain aspects of family history can be traced. I will get that information for the honourable member.

### CONTAINER TERMINAL

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Semaphore.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr PETERSON:** I assure the Chair of my respect. Is the Minister of Marine aware of the financial incentives being offered by Commonwealth and Victorian agencies to retain the Japanese/South Korean/Adelaide container terminal work in Melbourne? Recently, the Minister made a statement in the House as follows:

It is the case that in June a number of Victorian agencies got together to offer a discriminatory discount on South Australian cargo to and from the Far East.

My information is that a rebate of some \$80 or more on a 20-foot freight container is being offered to conference shipping lines in this service to ship to and from the Melbourne container terminal. I am informed that the \$80 includes a \$30 rail freight rebate made up of \$22 Victorian Rail rebate and \$8 Australian National rail discount. That is out of a total freight rate of \$200. In Melbourne the Seatiners terminal is offering a rebate of \$30 per container and the Victorian Port Authorities are offering \$20 per unit. It has been suggested that, because of collusion in this matter, it may be a contravention of the Trade Practices Act. With the Commonwealth and Victorian agencies combining against us, we may never see here a permanent direct shipping call from the Japanese lines.

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** I thank the member for Semaphore for his question as it is an important one. I made a statement earlier during this session of Parliament expressing concern about the incentives that have been offered. From my knowledge of the situation, it seems that the Victorian agencies put together an incentive package applicable to South Australian containers that are moved by ANSCON. The honourable member mentioned \$80 per container. My understanding is that the offer equals something like \$90 per container. I am not sure of the other rates, particularly the rail rates to which the honourable member referred, but I will certainly be pleased to check it out for him and bring back the detail.

I will also check on the situation with the Trade Practices Act. I am uncertain whether it is in breach of that Act. The honourable member will also be aware that the Federal Minister for Transport (Hon. Peter Morris) announced on Monday this week the National Road Freight Industry Inquiry. It is the most wide ranging investigation of Australia's land transport freight industry ever undertaken. The National Road Freight Industry Inquiry will provide the facts and figures and will certainly give some ideas necessary to keep the transport system honest.

We forwarded nominations from South Australia to represent this State on that inquiry. One of the names forwarded was that of Mr Keith Johnke, Commissioner of Highways. I understand that the Commonwealth Government was very keen to have Mr Johnke chair this inquiry, but unfortunately the Commissioner became ill and was unable to be involved in it. However, as the Federal Minister has now named the three people concerned, South Australia will have an opportunity of having its views considered. I shall be happy to get this information for the member for Semaphore and will bring back a reply as soon as possible.

### THEVENARD

**Mr GUNN:** Can the Minister of Marine give any details of future plans for developing the port of Thevenard? South Australia is Australia's largest miner and exporter of gypsum, and the Lake MacDonnell deposits near Ceduna are the largest in the world. The port of Thevenard also ships substantial quantities of grain. Obviously, with the drought and general economic down-turn, traffic in the port has been reduced. However, as South Australia is facing a bumper harvest this season and, as there are some prospects for increased sales of gypsum, can the Minister inform the House whether there are likely to be any improvements to, or upgrading of, the port of Thevenard?

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** I thank the honourable member for his question, which I expected because only last week I made an inspection tour of West Coast ports, including Port

Lincoln, Streaky Bay, Fowlers Bay and Thevenard (our most westerly deep-sea port) in the company of my departmental officers and also the member for Eyre. Discussions that took place during that inspection tour revealed increasing shipments of gypsum from this port and also that larger vessels will be needed to accommodate the increase in both gypsum and the grain trade.

As a result, I have ordered a feasibility study into providing a deeper and wider shipping channel, swinging basin and deeper twin berthing to accommodate these larger vessels. The proposed project would cost in the vicinity of \$4.5 million, and it may be possible to begin work on it next year. The deepening project would take about six months to complete using the Department of Marine and Harbors dredging team. Under the proposal we are investigating, the main shipping channel would be deepened by nearly one metre, which would be sufficient to virtually eliminate delays in ships sailing or berthing due to insufficient depth of water. At the moment, these tidal delays can last up to 24 hours, and they are costly to shipowners and disrupt the port's operations.

The project will also involve deepening and widening of the swinging basin and deepening of the two bulk-loading berths. Under this proposal, the maximum length of vessel that could be accommodated at the port would be increased from 168 to 172 metres, and an increased safety factor would be built in with the enlarged swinging basin. This is a major deep-sea port, and we must be prepared to move with the times in this regard.

During the last peak season, in 1979-80, .47 million tonnes of grain, .56 million tonnes of gypsum and .08 tonnes of salt were shipped out of Thevenard. Although these tonnages have been reduced severely over the past couple of years through drought and the world recession, gypsum and salt shipments have recently been rising and, with the good agricultural season we are now enjoying, bumper shipments of grain are expected. Also, both major gypsum producers are increasing sales from Lake MacDonnell and new overseas markets have opened up in Japan and South Korea.

One of the producers (C.S.R.) has ordered a new 23 500 tonne bulk carrier and this vessel, which is 168 metres long, has been specifically designed for Thevenard trade. In 1979-80 Thevenard handled 95 ships. This had fallen to 69 last financial year. However, in the coming year, 100 or more vessels could be using Thevenard. The deepening project that we are investigating should enable us to raise individual export tonnages from around 18 000 tonnes at present to 25 000 tonnes or better. I am hopeful that the feasibility study will show that this project is not only justified but should be proceeded with in the very near future, and I am sure that the member for Eyre would appreciate the importance of that development to his area and to South Australia generally.

### OMBUDSMAN

**Mr TRAINER:** Can the Premier advise the House of the current situation concerning the relationship between the office of the Ombudsman and the Government, and whether the current relationship represents an improvement on the situation existing in previous years?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I think it is worth pointing out that the Ombudsman is, of course, an officer of Parliament and reports to Parliament, as the tabling of his report by the Speaker in this House and the President in another place indicates. Of course, relations between the Government and the Ombudsman's office are very important because, without there being a mutual confidence in the Ombudsman's role, it would be very difficult both for him to

perform effectively in what is a very important duty and, of course, for the Government in terms of the proper surveillance of its departments and, equally, for members of the public who come to the Ombudsman for assistance. All members of Parliament, at various times (whether in Government or Opposition and, indeed, whether Ministers or not), refer people to the Ombudsman for particular attention to their cases.

Yesterday members received a copy of that report, and they will have noted that this year it is refreshingly free of criticism of the attitude of some Ministers to the Ombudsman's role which had become a very unfortunate feature of previous reports. Indeed, he mentions in his introduction on page 6 of the report tabled yesterday that he is pleased that the Government has agreed to amend the Ombudsman Act to overcome some of the problems that he has raised in previous years. I would hope that we would be able to bring down that legislation in the current session.

Of course, that is in marked contrast to the reports for 1980-81 and 1981-82. Members will recall the report tabled on 16 October 1981 in which the Ombudsman, reporting on his relationship with the Government, said that it had generally been excellent. Nevertheless, he felt that he had to report that, in the case of one particular Minister, it had failed. He reported as follows:

Unfortunately, my relationship with the Ministry failed in one area. The Minister concerned seemed to have some misunderstanding of the statutory responsibility and function of the office of the Ombudsman. This particular Minister appeared to believe the Ombudsman had a function akin to consumer affairs—as part and parcel of the Government administration—rather than appreciating his independence, as a representative of Parliament.

Unfortunately, the situation worsened in the following year. In last year's report we find the following:

1981-82 has been a good year for the office; it has nevertheless been one of friction with the Government, as there have been some conflict in the interpretation of my role. As well, there have been some staffing problems, which will always plague a small unit of only 10 persons.

Later he says:

I get the impression, however, that some members of the Government would like me to be a little less enthusiastic and to take greater care selecting issues to investigate.

He also singled out the Premier and the Attorney-General. He said:

In particular, there has been considerable suspicion of the office by both the Premier—

that is, my predecessor the Hon. David Tonkin—  
and the Attorney-General—

Mr Griffin in another place—

highlighted by the problems encountered with section 18 (1) of the Ombudsman Act, a provision requiring me to give advance notice of an investigation.

He mentioned the general problem of a lack of co-operation, particularly in the correctional services area, which has been highlighted again in this year's report. It is interesting to note that during part of that time the present Leader of the Opposition was in charge of that department. He said:

An Ombudsman cannot, for instance, make much headway when co-operation is withheld or an Administration is corrupt. And while I am not suggesting evidence of corruption, this year has seen a glaring lack of co-operation from some senior administrators in correctional services.

I am pleased to say that my Government does not intend to regard the office of Ombudsman with contempt, nor are we so lacking in confidence that we will be paranoid about his desire to properly investigate complaints put before him. The Government welcomes the Ombudsman's comments. It sees his office as an important part of ensuring that public administration is efficient and effective. I look forward to many more reports from Mr Bakewell, and I congratulate him on the way that he is doing his job.

## STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

**Mr BECKER:** My question is to the Deputy Premier, in his capacity as Minister of Labour.

**The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:** That will make his day!

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Before the honourable member continues, I ask the Deputy Leader to restrain himself.

**Mr BECKER:** Why did the Government authorise the payment of \$1.1 million to S.G.I.C. before 30 June 1983 to establish a managed fund for workers compensation under the job creation scheme? Pages 137 and 138 of the Auditor-General's Report for the financial year ended 30 June 1983 refer to the job creation scheme and state that South Australia had been allocated \$17.5 million for the calendar year 1983. The report states:

Funds amounting to \$8.8 million were received from the Commonwealth to 30 June and credited to a Treasury Trust Account, 'Employment Project under the Wage Pause Program': \$4 million of those funds were transferred to a Deposit Account—'Job Creation Scheme—Project Grants', which had a balance of \$1.9 million at June, after effecting payments on account of various projects.

Payments amounted to \$2.1 million of which \$1.1 million was paid to the State Government Insurance Commission to establish a managed fund for workers compensation. Actual compensation payments and management fees will be met by the fund. The balance of payments for the year, \$1 million, related to advances to sponsors for approved projects.

I understand, from reading the report, that payments under the job creation scheme to 30 June 1983 amounted to \$2.1 million, of which \$1.1 million went to S.G.I.C. to establish a managed fund for workers compensation, and \$1 million was spent on actual projects. It seems to me that \$1.1 million is a very high sum to pay to provide for workers compensation on work worth about \$1 million or even \$8.8 million.

I am also concerned that S.G.I.C., during the financial year ended 30 June 1982, incurred a loss of \$682 000 on employers' liability (workers compensation), but for the year ended 30 June 1983 S.G.I.C. made a profit of \$249 000. I am wondering whether the \$1.1 million went to S.G.I.C. premium earnings to help turn a loss into a profit? I am concerned that such a large sum was paid from the job creation scheme as at 30 June 1983.

*The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I am not happy with that remark from the Deputy Leader. However, I will turn to the remarks that were being made by the member for Hanson. I believe—

*The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the Deputy Leader to restrain himself and not to laugh at the Chair. All I am asking for is a fair go.

**The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:** All I do is open my mouth and you, Sir, reprimand me. It gets a bit frustrating, quite frankly.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the Deputy Leader to restrain himself. The member for Hanson was embarking on a course of debating the matter. There have been several clear rulings in that regard over the past few weeks and I ask him not to proceed in that way.

**Mr BECKER:** Employers have made representations to me about workers compensation premiums. I understand and appreciate that Labor policy is for the establishment of a workers compensation board to administer the collection of compulsory premiums from all employers and the payment of compensation to all employees who are entitled to receive it. The representations made to me may bear out the situation causing concern. As the Minister knows, I am involved in working for voluntary organisations and various charities. One residential agency which conducts a special school has had its workers compensation premiums increased from \$180 000 to \$510 000 this financial year. Another



sheltered workshop has had its premiums increased from \$51 000 to \$152 000. Another sheltered workshop has had its premiums increased from \$9 000 to \$19 000. An institution which runs a residential care unit and a special school has had its workers compensation premiums increased from \$90 000 to \$270 000, and another institution providing residential care for disabled persons has had its premiums increased from \$14 000 in June 1981 to \$48 000 in June 1982 and up to \$180 000 in June 1983. As can be seen by those examples, the payment of workers compensation premiums is causing considerable concern.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is again lapsing into debate. Before calling the Deputy Premier, I want to make an apology to the Deputy Leader. I am informed that my last remark to the Deputy Leader should have been addressed to another honourable member.

**The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT:** I thank the honourable member for his question. I am not quite sure what he asked, because it is about ten minutes since he asked the actual question. He has only repeated things that I have been saying since my Party has been back in office. I will obtain a detailed answer in relation to the financial aspects of the honourable member's question.

It is essential that anyone working under the Job Creation Scheme is covered by workers compensation, and I am sure that the member appreciates that. Under those circumstances, it was quite essential and mandatory for the Government to take the opportunity to ensure that workers are covered by workers compensation and, obviously, it went to the S.G.I.C. However, it did not go to the S.G.I.C. for the reason suggested by the honourable member, and I am quite surprised and disappointed that he should make such a suggestion. No attempt was made by the Government to turn a deficit situation into a profit situation in relation to the S.G.I.C.—that is the allegation that you made.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask that the Deputy Premier refer to honourable members by the names of their districts.

**The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT:** The honourable member was making an allegation that the Government was giving a hand-out to the S.G.I.C. The S.G.I.C. does not need a hand-out; it is a competent organisation, and I am delighted that it is there. I will now deal with workers compensation as it applies in South Australia at the moment. In about 1977 I first started to make noises about the scheme operating at that time. I was not satisfied with the scheme, so I established the Byrne Committee of inquiry into workers compensation, to advise the Government on where it ought to be going in that area. The member for Florey was a member of that committee, as were the late Nick Alexandrides, Arnold Schrape, from the Employers Federation, and Mr Byrne. That committee did not report to the then Labor Government because the report was not ready until the incoming Liberal Government had taken office. The Liberal Government did not accept the report: it did not have the courage to even try and float the report in the community. The Minister made no attempt to sell the report to the public. In my view, that was wrong because it placed us in a drastic situation in relation to workers compensation.

Since I have been back in office, I have had 300 or 400 copies of the Byrne Report printed and flooded into the community. I am asking for comments from organisations including trade unions, employers, lawyers, and insurance companies. I have visited New Zealand and have seen the system working there: it is the best system I have seen. The overall system in New Zealand is almost a replica of what was recommended by the Byrne Committee. It has great possibilities and potential. Everyone in South Australia who knows anything about workers compensation is concerned and worried about the present crisis situation. I face such a situation almost daily as I negotiate to try to get someone

a specific coverage for some reason or other that the insurance companies give. I do not believe that that is a good enough system for this State.

In Queensland there is a somewhat similar system under which there is no problem. Everyone in that State gets a cover because of the single-channel opportunities run by the Government. I have made two or three public speeches on this matter and the *Advertiser* has printed an article on it. I am assured that the New Zealand authorities will visit South Australia to debate this matter at a public seminar early next year, so that we can get public debate moving on this issue.

It is never easy to change anything, especially when the doctors and the insurance companies are against such change. A member opposite, whose name I shall not mention, told me that he and his colleagues would probably privately support me on this change of legislation, but that publicly they could not. In New Zealand, everyone pulls together on workers compensation (the insurance companies, the doctors, the lawyers and the trade unions), and those who opposed it in the first place now say, with hindsight, that they were wrong, that they should have adopted this system several years ago.

**Mr Lewis:** Do you mean—

**The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT:** I invite the honourable member to go to New Zealand and see for himself. Members should read the Byrne Report and make up their own minds whether the Government is on the right track.

## TECHNOLOGY INCENTIVES

**Ms LENEHAN:** Will the Minister for Technology say what are the possible implications and benefits to South Australian industry resulting from yesterday's announcement by the Commonwealth Government concerning tax incentives for investment in high technology companies?

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I am pleased to receive the question from the honourable member, because it is an important question, both in its own right and also because it is the first question that I have received in my capacity as Minister for Technology. The article in this morning's newspaper contained an announcement by the Commonwealth Minister for Science and Technology (Mr Barry Jones) and the Commonwealth Minister for Industry and Commerce (Senator Button) about a scheme offering support for high technology and industrial development. Details of the scheme have their antecedents in the report of Sir Frank Espie for the Government, on behalf of the Australian Academy of Technological Sciences. The thrust of the proposals announced this morning are that there will be a cost to the Government by means of forgone tax revenue as a result of taxation incentives of \$20 million a year, which will lead to a promotion of investment in high-technology industries of about \$40 million a year.

The State Government will immediately consider ways to take advantage of the scheme and will encourage companies and industries to do likewise. The fields involved in the new technologies are as follows: manufacturing; agriculture; forestry or fishing; postal; telephone, teleprinter, telegraphy, and communication services; architectural services; surveying services; computer software; consultant engineering services; trade, educational and training services; scientific and technical services; and data-processing services.

From the range I have read out, members will be aware that many South Australian companies are capable of involvement in these areas and that we will have little difficulty in finding companies eligible to participate in this scheme. The Commonwealth Government intends to introduce legislation next year to establish a management and

investment company licensing board to administer the programme and to license management and investment companies. Those winning licences under the programme will be able to claim 100 per cent tax deduction in respect of their investment and high-technology ventures. This has been an important initiative by the Commonwealth Government because high-technology companies by their very nature operate at high risk, and without venture capital they cannot flourish. Therefore, if new enterprises do not grow, we will miss out again on the opportunity to exploit new skills and innovations. Therefore, the Commonwealth Government's announcement is fully supported by the State Government. It is most important to reinforce the development of high technology not only in South Australia but in Australia at large.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION: PRISONS

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Earlier today, in reply to a question asked by the member for Florey, the Chief Secretary totally misrepresented what I had said about Budget allocations for 1983-84 as they relate to the Correctional Services portfolio. The Chief Secretary indicated that I had said that no money had been allocated for capital works in respect of the Correctional Services Department for 1983-84. However, what I have said is that the Opposition had said previously that it welcomes any plan to improve the situation at Yatala. I went on to say that there was no allocation in this year's Budget which would allow the plans announced by the Chief Secretary today to proceed in 1983-84. That related to the master plan and the expenditure of \$13.2 million announced in this House on 13 September 1983. I did not say that there was no allocation for capital works in the Correctional Services portfolio generally for 1983-84. My interest in this matter is deadly serious, unlike that of the Chief Secretary, who answered the question with a smile on his face. I refute statements about my inability to read the Ombudsman's Report, which supports criticism of the current Chief Secretary's handling of this portfolio since he came into office.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION: WORKERS COMPENSATION

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

Leave granted.

**Mr BECKER:** During the reply I received from the Deputy Premier to my question on workers compensation, the Deputy Premier gave the impression that I had implied that the Government had given a hand-out of \$1.1 million to the State Government Insurance Commission to turn a loss for 1982 into a profit for 1983 on workers compensation. It was not my intention to create such an impression, nor was that the purpose of my question: I was raising the point that the job creation scheme had made a payment of \$1.1 million to the S.G.I.C. to provide workers compensation in respect of the job creation scheme. I referred to S.G.I.C. in my explanation because its figures are the only figures available to us. For the year ended 30 June 1982, S.G.I.C. made a loss, whereas for the year ended 30 June 1983 it made a small profit. I then quoted figures from various disabled organisations to show the difficulty of highlighting the vast increase in workers compensation premiums. That is why

I used the comparison showing that insurance companies claim that they have difficulty in making a profit and that employers are being asked to pay higher premiums. However, in no way did I intend to reflect on anyone by implying that the Government had given S.G.I.C. money to balance its books, because I do not think that that would have happened, as S.G.I.C. would make its own provision for that. That was never the intention of that part of my question.

**The SPEAKER:** As there are no more personal explanations to be made, I call on the business of the day.

#### APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 14 September. Page 868.)

**The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN (Alexandra):** In supporting the Bill for the appropriation of moneys from the Consolidated Account for the financial year ending 30 June 1984 and to authorise borrowings of moneys, and for other purposes, I take the opportunity to comment on a number of aspects of the Bill and its attached papers, as have a number of members on this side.

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** You were almost denied that opportunity.

**The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN:** I note the point made by the member for Light. The balance of Opposition members and members on the Government side were almost denied the opportunity to comment further following a blunder, yet another, by the Minister of Local Government, who was temporarily in charge of the House at that stage of the evening.

**Mr Lewis:** Did you say 'temporarily' or 'temporarily'?

**The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN:** I said 'temporarily'. I do not want to use my 30 minutes to talk about the problems faced by that Minister, however. I gather from the community at large and from members in this place that the Minister's position in the Cabinet is also temporary and, as I have said before in this Chamber over the past few weeks, that Minister, by his capers, is causing embarrassment not only to his Cabinet colleagues and members of his Party but to the whole institution. When perusing the Budget papers with which we have been provided, it is fair and I believe appropriate to read the details in conjunction with the undertakings that the Premier made when he was Leader of the Opposition, particularly during the period prior to the last election. The Bill for appropriation, the first of its kind introduced into this Parliament by the present Government, is in significant part dependent on the undertakings that are given by the Government in the immediate preceding period, and in this instance, of course, that was in relation to the pre-election statements made by the then shadow Premier cum shadow Treasurer. He stated (page 3 of the policy speech) immediately before the last election:

We need a Government willing to work directly with the private sector, to take the lead to unlock investment funds and create real jobs.

That was the broad and embracing statement of good intent—if it were to be implemented. I have no doubt that, among members of the Labor Party, there was a genuine attempt to achieve that goal, but the then shadow Treasurer proceeded in his policy speech and on other occasions of convenience to mislead the community of South Australia by giving undertakings under that broad canopy statement that he must have known, as indeed we in Government knew, could not be achieved in office without a significant



increase in taxation or revenue-raising measures of one kind or another.

It was in that area of deceit that we believe the present Government, and the Premier in particular, owes great apology to the community of South Australia. The Government, within the few months after coming to office, set out to achieve the undertakings that were given and, as I said, reflected in the general thrust of the Budget speech. It introduced a range of taxation measures that the Premier immediately prior to the last election undertook would not be introduced. He also stated that there would not be a need to take that action. The policy speech (page 4) further states:

As a first step we will establish the South Australian Enterprise Fund to assist the expansion of industry.

Again, that was a broad sweeping and, to the ears of the community, welcome statement. It was further stated:

The Enterprise Fund will pump investment into high technology and export industries. It will get behind businesses that have potential to expand and create jobs.

To date, there has been no evidence of the Government's establishing the fund beyond the announcement. There has been no evidence of the Government's expending its efforts behind business. It was further stated (page 7):

... I will announce a detailed jobs and school leavers package that will assist a further 1 000 South Australians to achieve real jobs ...

In consultation with the shadow spokesman for education on this side, I find that there is no evidence of Government effort in that direction. The Premier further stated (page 9):

We will give strong backing to our resources and mineral developments.

I note with interest that the Minister of Mines and Energy is in the House, and I can appreciate the embarrassment that he feels in relation to his Party's attitude towards the natural resources of this State and the policy that dictates a go-slow attitude in the development arena.

Accordingly, down the drain go the jobs that otherwise would have been available to the State had a real Government with a really genuine intent to promote, as the words reflect, our mineral and energy resources been in office. At page 12 it was stated:

We will support the establishment of the Ramsay Trust to raise finance for low-cost housing.

We have heard a tremendous amount from the Government about its expressed concern for the housing industry and the jobs associated with that very important part of our community life, but little positive effort has been applied in that direction. In regard to transport, at page 16 of the policy speech it was stated:

Our priority will be to keep fares down to attract and retain passengers.

What a joke! We are not yet privy to the passenger movement statistics on public transport for the year ended 30 June 1983, a document to which ultimately all members have access, invariably many months after the end of a given financial year, but quite clearly in regard to the fare structure I am sure that the whole community is aware of the savage application of fare adjustments by the Minister of Transport within but a few weeks of his coming to office.

Shortly after the announcement of the fare adjustments for public transport in South Australia, the Minister undertook an overturn in the transport area by selling off land that otherwise would have been preserved for a north-south corridor. Indeed, that corridor would be an essential trafficway for the movement of private and industrial transport throughout the elongated city of Adelaide.

The decision to close off the opportunities and options that would otherwise have been available to a responsible, well managed Government institution in future years by

putting on the market land that had been earmarked and held over the years for the purposes of installing a traffic, way for the southern districts, in particular, received from members of the community, industry and various local government authorities the response, namely, a kick in the tail, that the Minister deserved. Further the Premier stated:

We will give priority to upgrading transport corridors to the north-eastern and southern suburbs.

We know the sequence of events that has occurred on that issue since the Government assumed office. The programme for the O-Bahn busway project, for what it is worth to those people in the north-eastern suburbs, has been cut, which will result in a delay in the establishment of a full link with the area involved and a spread of expenditure over a further period beyond that originally outlined by the previous Government.

During my address I will quote several other parts of the Premier's policy speech. So far, I have outlined some examples of where the Labor Party in Opposition was taken out on a limb by its shadow Treasurer and shadow Premier when attempting to take the public of South Australia for a ride. Not only in this present Budget but also in the lead up to its presentation the Government had no alternative other than to introduce a whole range of taxation measures, quite contrary to that undertaking given at the top of page 23 of the policy speech, where the now Premier said words to the effect that there would be no increase in taxation or other like revenue raising measures during the period of a Labor Government's first term in office. He said also:

We will work with farmers and growers to reduce costs and expand markets.

To date I have been unable to identify any area in which the Premier or any one of his Ministers, including his first Minister of Agriculture in office and his subsequent Minister of Agriculture in office (the Hon. Mr Blevins) has made any effort on behalf of the Government to reduce costs and expand markets for the primary producers of this State. South Australia's fishing industry should be recognised, but the current Minister of Agriculture has made his position quite clear in that he has no real sensitivity or regard for the extension of markets for the people involved in that industry or for the economic function within that industry and those who are dependent upon it. Certainly, in the rural sector there does not appear to be any incentive or any assistance of any real kind forthcoming.

For some time, dating back to well before the present Government came to office (and indeed over a significant part of the Tonkin Government's term of office), officers in the Economic Division of the Department of Agriculture have set out to assist the farming community in so many ways that it would take me all day to mention them. However, one of these initiatives relates directly to the financial situation of the Government and of the Department of Agriculture in particular. Those in the Economic Division of the department have diligently applied themselves in the matter of rural assistance. A report that was identified in the *State of South Australia Agriculture of 5 August 1983* deserves some mention and some favourable comment. I will not name the officers in this instance, but generally speaking it is clear that they have applied themselves to a paper that incorporates proposals to consolidate the various funding assistance Acts and the various funding assistance measures administered by the Department of Agriculture. That move is most welcome. In my view it is high time that we had a single and permanent banking situation within the State department whereby loan assistance can be made available to the various facets of those involved with agriculture, horticulture, irrigation, and other associated links with those pursuits for which loan moneys are available, whether during drought periods, for periods following natural

disasters, or in the ordinary course of assisting in farm build-up and/or debt reconstruction.

There are several primary producer and rural industry assistance Acts for which the Minister of Agriculture is directly responsible within South Australia, and there are those for which the Minister acts as agent on behalf of the Commonwealth under the primary producer assistance Acts at that level. It is my opinion that the whole exercise has become too clumsy. It is not clearly understood by the rural community, and the time has come when every effort should be made (without Party political encumbrance) to join with the departmental officers in an effort to have that system consolidated.

There is now, and will continue to be, in this very competitive rural industry of ours in South Australia a need for access to lower interest rate loans. In saying that, I make quite clear that I do not mean loans constituting hand-outs or grants. In the matter of low interest loans, funds should be made available not in direct competition with the commercial lending authorities but for the purpose of picking up the difference between the limits that are available from ordinary lending authorities under their respective policies and the amount that is required for the purposes incorporated in any given application. I think that in administering that sort of fund the principle of dealing with individual applications on merit is a good and safe principle to observe. I know that that would involve a lot of work, research and investigation by officers of the department and that it would place an enormous responsibility on the Minister of the day. That does not alter the fact that the industry needs this. I know of no better or more appropriate section of the Government administration to handle this situation than that which exists within the wheels and works of the Department of Agriculture. A comprehensive rural assistance scheme is therefore justified as a permanent component of the Department of Agriculture.

However, I understand that the Government believes that the delivery of rural assistance could be made more effective if the various needs and wants of rural producers with respect to rural assistance were embodied within a single comprehensive rural assistance net. Whether that means a consolidation of the various Acts, with or without consultation with the Commonwealth Government and paying regard to their overall national attitude on this subject, is really irrelevant to the objective. Obviously, some keen and careful homework will need to be done in this direction. I hope that a serious attempt will be made by the present Minister to pick up the threads and obtain an understanding of the very real needs of agricultural servicing in an attempt to positively apply himself in that direction. I would hope that, in his capacity as Minister of Fisheries, the Minister would pay regard, in considering this consolidated financial resource, to the needs of the fishing industry.

I know that my colleague, the Opposition spokesman for fisheries, will agree with me that that arm of the primary sector requires access to financial loan funding for the purpose of establishing themselves in the industry, expanding in that industry and/or for other purposes of a kind that are similar to those of their primary producing colleagues on the land. I hope that the structure proposed embraces the needs of all of the primary industries and does not continue to isolate the fishing industry as, indeed, Rural Industry Assistance Acts in isolation have done to date.

In the time that is available to me in this debate I do not wish to go into the details of the Budget papers, but will reserve my opportunity in that direction until the Committee stages are in process over the next two or three weeks. I refer to a report which was recently made available to the media and to the Opposition, and which came from the Research Policy Advisory Committee and embraced some

details and recommendations following a review of South Australia's agricultural research centres. It is true that the need to investigate the activities and efficiency (or lack of it) in South Australian research centres was raised with me while I was Minister of Agriculture in the early stages of the Tonkin Government.

I recall a discussion with the then Director-General of Agriculture (one Jim McColl), which I am sure that he also will recall, when the subject of this review was raised. I indicated to him at the time that efficiency and effectiveness within the Department of Agriculture was not confined to the corridors and offices of the black stump at Grenfell Centre, nor to any other particular division of the Department's structure throughout the State. Indeed, the desire to have efficiency in that Department left no division of the Department exempt. The proposal emanating, as I recall, from the Advisory Board of Agriculture in the first instance was supported.

The committee has finally produced its report. I gather from the grapevine that the report was ready for production during the reign of my successor, the Hon. Brian Chatterton, M.L.C. Whether or not he had a chance to peruse it and simply put it away in the too hard basket during his trying latter weeks as Minister I cannot be sure, but it is clear that on its presentation to the current Minister it was authorised to be circulated in the directions that I have indicated.

On receipt of this document I am somewhat concerned to find that the committee has recommended the sale of more than half the State's agricultural research centres. One option proposes to sell the land and facilities incorporated in the Minnipa Research Centre on Eyre Peninsula—an incredible investment which has been developed over a number of years and which has serviced well the grain-growing community of that region of the State. I am absolutely staggered to think that a working party of the Department should go so far as to recommend the writing off of an enormous number of facilities, some of them only recently installed in that region, at the book values that they currently attract.

To write down houses at such centres to the level of some \$5 000, which is probably appropriate when one looks at salvage value, is really wasting money in this situation in which I believe that we cannot afford to do so. I would be very interested to know the reaction of the rural community which has been serviced over the years from that centre and which has heavily patronised its function and operations in the Eyre Peninsula region, particularly in the area of researching and trialling wheat and other grain varieties to the point where they are able to recommend their sowing in that immediate area.

The review document proposes to sell the Lenswood Research Centre. Other than the Loxton facilities in the Riverland, the Lenswood facilities are the only ones of their kind to service our horticultural industries, and I can imagine the reaction that will come from the apple and pear growers and other horticultural people in the Adelaide Hills and adjacent regions as the contents of this document flow out into the community.

The proposal to sell the Kybybolite Research Centre in the South-East and all its quite modern facilities is a real shock, and I anticipate that there will be vibes from that community that do not support the proposal. Certainly, in conversation with the member for Victoria, in whose electoral district the Kybybolite facilities are located, I find that there will be some reaction. The proposal to sell the Turretfield Research Centre, the dairyland area of Northfield, likewise needs a lot more explaining and justification that has been detailed in the working papers provided in this report.

Regarding the Parndana Research Centre, on Kangaroo Island, I take it as an insult to the intelligence of people

who are directly involved in agriculture in that community to suggest taking away and not replacing a service and research facility that is so much required in that area. The Parndana Research Centre was established at about the end of the Second World War and served a very good purpose throughout the period of occupation of the war service settlement lands in that region, covering a project involving the development and pasturing of some 156 farms and constituting thereby one of the largest war service land settlement centres in Australia. Indeed, most of those properties were subject to further development and, accordingly, required further guidance and assistance of a research nature, both in pasture and livestock areas. I am staggered to think that a working party should set out to recommend to any Government the sale of a research centre of that magnitude and importance, and propose at the same time to replace the facility in a location on the mainland. The very geographical isolation of Kangaroo Island demands that a permanent and ongoing research facility for agriculture be maintained in the district. Whether there is a case to break down an area involved to sell—

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

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** This Bill shows up the vast philosophical differences which I believe highlight the difference between the two major Parties that seek to govern this State. The Premier refers to the Budget deficit and uses it to justify the rises in State taxes and charges while, in fact, the increases are to write off the mismanagement of his own Ministers since they came to Government to the tune of some \$23 million-odd.

**The Hon. W.E. Chapman:** That's overspending.

**Mr OSWALD:** Yes; it is overspending by complete mismanagement. The Premier uses it also to implement the A.L.P. platform and socialist programme put forward at the last election. It is not a question of having to raise money because of taxes. They did not have to put these taxes up, as our Leader demonstrated quite clearly during his response to this Bill.

South Australia has now closed its doors again to business. We have returned to the era of high taxation and big government and, whether or not honourable members opposite like to hear it, this is what we have achieved. I believe that they set out in their lead-up to the election to achieve that goal but, by a series of deceptions within their media presentation and speeches, they managed to cover that particular aim; nevertheless, it was deception to the nth degree.

In the few minutes that I have available to me, let us compare the excitement that existed in South Australia between 1979-82 when there was in power a Liberal Government which implemented a policy of small Government, low taxation, but confidence and stimulus to business with the depressing Budget which has been presented here today, a Budget which would depress anyone in the community who was endeavouring to keep a business afloat. I recall that back in 1979-82 one could go out confidently to the public and say that things were happening in South Australia under the Tonkin Government. Projects were being planned or completed which were to change the economic direction of this State. Schemes were being put abroad which I will come to shortly which actually provided jobs. I can recall back about a year ago that we were hearing about a lot of projects coming to completion. We heard about the final wells being placed on the 800-kilometre pipeline coming down from Stony Point at an expense of about \$1.2 billion, and that money was spent here in South Australia.

**The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:**

**Mr OSWALD:** Well over \$1 billion collectively for the project. Also, about year ago there was the green light for

the Roxby Downs project, as well as for the Honeymoon and Beverley projects—all positive projects that would bring employment and wealth to South Australia. At that stage we were announcing the new city to be constructed in the Far North; Technology Park was being opened up, and South Australia was about to lead the way in attracting and establishing high technology industries.

At about this time last year South Australia was chosen, I understand, as a prime contender for Australia's uranium enrichment industry—all potential projects to develop and lift this State, all projects with enormous investment potential, and all projects which would bring jobs to South Australia. A year ago, planning of the \$1 000 million petrochemical plant had entered a new phase, and I well recall seeing the announcements in the press in that respect.

I also recall representations of the Japanese firm Sumitomo who were in Adelaide for talks with the former Premier on plans to convert South Australia's coal into gas. Once again, they were positive projects that the people of South Australia could see that their Government was orchestrating for their benefit. I also recall that the planning of the new power house at that stage was well under way, and it is still in its construction stage. But, once again, it involved planning for the future of the State. In about October last year, the doors of the Hilton were opened, and at the same time international flights started coming to South Australia, bringing in the tourist dollar—once again an achievement of the Liberal Government, a Government which was out to help private enterprise because, without that, we cannot have employment in the State. It is all very well for honourable members to rip into businesses in order to get taxes because we need taxes from businesses to orchestrate our programmes. However, unless we get out and encourage businesses to expand, we will not have the income coming in and, therefore, will lose the potential for job creation.

I also recall about a year ago the member for Davenport, when Minister of Industrial Affairs, reading into *Hansard* the names of some 100-odd companies in the manufacturing industry which had either come to South Australia or were expanding here. If honourable members would care to refer to it in detail, it is at page 3937 of 1 April *Hansard*. I do not think that it would hurt to remind honourable members of the feeling of confidence that was abroad in those days when the Liberal Government was in power. The *Hansard* report is as follows:

The total number of committed projects since the Liberal Government has been in office is 95, with a total value of \$1 606 million. There are a further 12 projects and feasibility studies with a total value of \$1 341 million. I put those together and that comes out at about \$2.9 billion. Of those 107 projects in the committed area, 17 are between \$100 000 and \$500 000; 14 are between \$500 000 and \$1 million; 33 are between \$1 million and \$10 million; 10 are between \$10 million and \$100 million; and two are over \$100 million.

Since the Labor Party came into office, I have had that *Hansard* report in mind, and I have carefully looked at the papers with the expectation of seeing what new companies or firms were about to expand or even come to South Australia. However, there has been a vacuum in the paper. The atmosphere has gone. We do not see the companies expanding. We have a Government which came into power on a plank of deceit in that it promised jobs and expansion, but that has not happened.

In those days, South Australia was very much open for business, and I believe that that particular *Hansard* report clearly points out the confidence that pervaded the State under our Budget. The encouragement that the Liberal Government showed these developers from the first day it came into office was reflected in the tremendous long-term and short-term advantages that accrued to all South Australians, not just those in business but those that it flowed on to.

It was because of the pro-development policies of the Liberal Government between 1979-82 that South Australia went against the massive swing in unemployment interstate. This is a very important point which is often overlooked. In 1979-82 there was a depression across the country and unemployment was soaring interstate yet, by the careful policies of the former Liberal Government, South Australia was able to go against that trend. Certainly, unemployment rose, but it was incomparable in relation to other States, and positive, pro-business policies brought that about.

Because of the actions of the Labor Party, which in its last three years in office leading up to 1979 implemented the type of Budget that we see before us today, South Australia lost some 20 000 jobs and became the highest taxed State in the nation. The wheel has now turned a full circle and South Australia is heading once again towards being the highest taxed State and the unemployment and inflation capital. In the three years that the Liberal Party was in Government, we reduced it to the lowest taxed State in the Commonwealth, but we are now back to the highest taxed State, with the highest unemployment and highest inflation in the Commonwealth. A great record for a Government which has only been in power for some nine months and which has delivered a Budget this week which will do nothing to stimulate the business sector or to provide jobs! This State is crying for help from a Government which has turned its back on the elements in the community that can create jobs by hitting them for a six with taxation.

The present Government is a Government of deception, and one cannot get away from that. Indeed, it came to power in a similar manner to the way in which the Victorian Government and the Federal Government came to power. Government members should reflect on when Premier Cain conducted his campaign in Victoria and swept to power on promises of no increases in taxes. That was the basic premise of his platform. He said, 'Elect me as Premier of Victoria and there will be no increases in taxes.' Why did he put that point forward? Because it was carefully orchestrated. He clearly had to counter any Labor odium, particularly among small businesses, of being a big spending and a big taxation Government. He was frightened that the business community would see him as being involved with big spending and big taxation. What happened? A short time after gaining office, Treasurer Jolly did an about-face in the same way as the South Australian Treasurer. He said that tax increases were inevitable because he suddenly found that he had a deficit about which he did not know anything. A massive deficit! He told the public, 'I have to move to put up your taxes.' What utter rot! It was an utterly deceptive campaign that Premier Cain undertook well knowing where he was going in regard to the taxation base in Victoria.

The Victorians were deceived. Of course, it is too late once one has cast one's vote. One has to wait the required three years before one can remove a deceptive Government and elect a Government with honesty and integrity, a Government that will stick to what it has promised. The same situation happened in the Federal arena. It is all very well to say with the benefit of hindsight that we should not have elected the Hawke Government (if one happened to vote that way). The same thing happened in the Federal arena—people were deceived.

What happened in South Australia? The same thing. Not only has the Bannon Government shown its deception by breaking its word on taxes and charges, but it is still casting around looking for further taxes and charges to impose on business. The Government cannot deny that. We are all still waiting to find out how much the Government will charge through its financial institutions duty—whether it will be 3c or 4c. We are still waiting to hear how the duty will be implemented. As a result of some stories I have

heard I am concerned that it will not just be taken when money goes into an account in, say, a credit union. Once money is in the union, and is transferred to a sub-account—a person may have two or three sub-accounts in that union—people could be hit by a duty of .03 per cent or .04 per cent each time. In fact, the person who thinks that he will be hit only once may be hit two or three times before the money is paid into a final account.

The A.L.P. strategy in South Australia was clearly to woo the business community. It started a couple of years before the election with Leader of the Opposition Bannon carefully orchestrating his speeches on small business. He set out to woo the business community by setting out matters in speeches made at businessmen's lunches. Heaven help any business man who did not turn up to those lunches. They had to turn up because they relied on Government contracts. If they did not attend, they knew the boom would be lowered and they would not get the contracts. It was great stuff for the Premier, who could say that the captains of industry came along—he got them along and he told them the story that they wanted to hear—the story that they feared would change when the A.L.P. got into Government. They know well what happened. When the A.L.P. got into Government it did fail them, and they have been deceived.

Taxation increases were made that we all knew would be implemented. As happened in Victoria, federally and in South Australia, the Western Australians found out about this wonderful tactic that was so successful in South Australia. It was taken to Western Australia. The South Australian model was used as a model for deceiving the swinging voter and the business community. It was used in Western Australia in the lead-up to its election.

It was so painfully obvious and Western Australians took the bait and have now been caught up. We have now reached the stage where we have Labor Governments virtually across the Commonwealth. The public will have its day of reckoning because, having got into power, the Labor Party now has to perform and it is performing in typical fashion. If members of the public ever have the opportunity they should read the A.L.P. State platform, before an election rather than after it, to see where the A.L.P. is going. It is a frightening document for anyone who wants to get out and earn a living for himself based on his own ability to put in a day's work.

Over the course of the years 1980 and 1981 we heard continuous speeches from the Leader of the Opposition seeking support from small business while at the same time offering promises that his Government would stimulate their businesses. During the election campaign we had to put up with an absolute deluge of deception, misleading advertisements and pamphlets. One press report included a photograph of the Premier, the same photograph that appeared in all his advertisements. If one looks at the whole campaign one can see that it was a presidential-style campaign which put up one man as leader so that it did not matter how the rest of the team performed. The rest of the Ministry could be useless, but it would not matter. All the campaigning is styled around that leader. The same thing happened federally with the election of R. J. Hawke in a presidential-style campaign. The Labor Party put up a leader and suggested that the sheep would follow. In this case it put up a leader and all the promises that he would keep. What happened to those promises? Headed, 'Time is up Mr Tonkin', the report states:

Over three years South Australians have given Mr Tonkin a chance and he blew it.

Goodness, here are 95 companies that brought millions of dollars of development to South Australia under the Tonkin Administration, yet according to the A.L.P. the Liberal Government blew it. The report continues:

During this time there was record unemployment.

Certainly there was unemployment but, if one compares the situation with that occurring interstate, we were doing very well. Our policies were excellent. Our growth was slow, but members know this (I know it, but I merely report it for those readers of *Hansard* who are interested). Our unemployment was increasing slowly while in the rest of the country it was speeding up. People were coming and investing money in South Australia because they had confidence in the Liberal Government and its Budget. The report continues:

Record home interest rates.

Of course, that can be thrown into an election advertisement, but the present A.L.P. Government knows that that is really not within the control of the State Government, and doubtless at the next election it will be careful to avoid any reference to that matter. The A.L.P. then talked about record increases in State charges, electricity charges, bus and train fares, and hospital charges.

We all know well what happened. As soon as the Labor Party was reported to be the incoming Government, it said:

We will stop the use of State charges like transport fares, electricity, water and hospital charges and not use them as a form of backdoor taxation.

The Government was not in power even nine months when it turned around and went against that. It has exhibited total and utter deception. We then had another statement that the A.L.P. would not introduce succession or death duties. It would not be game to introduce succession duties, but it will probably let its Federal counterpart do it and work out a means of getting it across.

The Government said it would not introduce new taxes, but that is a total falsehood because the Government knew that it would bring in the financial institutions duty. It existed in Victoria and there was no reason why it would not be introduced here. The report continues:

South Australia is not what it used to be.

Of course it is not. Until 1979 we were losing jobs. Industry was taking jobs out of South Australia. In 1979 when this article was written things were not what they were, but then we had 95 companies worth billions of dollars coming to South Australia. The place was moving, and development was taking place. Confidence was abroad. The Premier then tries to twist it and say that things are not what they used to be. He stated:

Our enterprise fund will pump investment into business and jobs.

We wait with bated breath to see the implementation of that key plank of the Labor Party's platform at the last election. I hope that it happens for the sake of the State. Something has to happen with this whiz kid that is now the Premier.

What happened to the Ramsay Trust? I will not go into that matter as we know what happened to it. Another advertisement headed 'Jobs' stated:

Our school leavers package will give jobs and skills to our young people.

What is happening there? What policy has the Labor Party introduced that has brought one job to South Australia? It introduced taxes which are an impost against new jobs being created in this State. We can look at the tax that the Government has imposed on insurance premiums for compensation. The increase was between 4 per cent and 6 per cent. It will affect compensation premiums and will put a terrific impost on the ability of employers to employ. The unit cost of labour is skyrocketing. I would have thought that the Government would be concerned about that, but it is not. It is letting it go on as it is a source of revenue and supports the policies outlined in the Labor Party's platform.

I refer also to the hypocrisy shown by the Premier after carefully attempting to woo the business community. The

idea was to wait, as they did in Victoria, and then slam the business community for a six. The Government did that very easily. I refer to increases in taxes and revenue, including business franchise fees which will bring in \$13 million this year and \$17.3 million in a full year. Petroleum product prices also increased, as did liquor licence fees and stamp duty. The financial institutions duty is about to be imposed. That group of charges alone, assuming they amount to .03 per cent (and not more than that), will be an imposition of \$84 million.

In introducing the charges, the Government has not hit the tall poppies. In its impost on smokes, drinks, beer, wine, petrol and insurance, it is hitting not only the big man but also the small man. I refer to transport fares, electricity and water charges, housing rents and gas rates. Those costs have gone up, the Government claims, to offset the deficit. In fact, it is to take account of the incompetence of its Ministry in running up an extra \$35 million deficit and also to implement the policies to which it has committed itself. If the Government readjusted its Budget it would not have to embark on a massive increase in taxation. If it took heed of what the Leader of the Opposition proposed in his speech in reply to the Premier, it would have some good information on how to run the Budget of this State on an economic line rather than a philosophical one.

One cannot run a State or business of any sort unless it is run the same way that one would run a closely-knit, orchestrated, economic business. Philosophy is fine and I acknowledge that there are needy people in the community. The Liberals acknowledge that, and it is a basic plank of our philosophy, but there are ways and means of running a Budget. Those ways and means are not the ways and means of the Labor Party. It believes that, if it runs short of money, it can increase taxes without looking at household budgets. In a short time collective charges and taxes will net some \$174 million, which is not a bad figure for a Government which said, during the election campaign last year, that it would not touch State charges or taxes. The utter deception and trickery defies all logic.

Let us look at individual examples rather than talking in broad terms. I refer to the tourism industry. If ever an industry has been betrayed, it is the tourism industry. In this State that industry has the greatest potential for growth and for the creation of jobs. Members opposite know that and they admit it. However, in the meantime, they still condone the massive charges. The Premier and the Minister of Tourism both promised the Tourist Industry Council that it would be clearly consulted before any new tax affecting the tourism and hospitality industries was imposed. What happened? Nothing! Taxes came out without any consultation and yet more taxes were imposed. What has the Government done to that industry? It gave the industry a 33½ per cent increase in licensing fees. That will have an impact. That netted the Government \$8 million, which is great for the champagne socialists opposite. The Government wants to spend up and spend big. It is no good running a business and eroding the profits. Profits are needed to make a business viable. Without a viable business, one cannot employ: one is lucky to employ oneself, let alone put on extra staff. It is great to have an increase in licence fees and to write off money lost through incompetence in the Ministry. It results in lower profits and lost jobs.

The Government then imposed a fuel tax: that is revenue. In the past that money went to the Highways Fund, but this Government has changed (as it is wont to do) the method of collection and has put the money into General Revenue. Therefore, the tourist cannot travel so much. Outback hotels are affected, mobility within the tourist industry becomes depressed and jobs are lost. The other tax imposed upon us was the general insurance levy, which is

an utter disaster. I mentioned what it did to compensation, let alone what it has done to other facets of the tourism industry. Initially, the charges were imposed on an industry which South Australians desperately need to foster. In my district we are doing what we can to foster tourism and the same is happening elsewhere. It is the greatest job creator of all. In this connection I refer also to small businesses.

The Labor Party seems to be belting the large businesses. We all know what the Labor Party did to the Honeymoon and Beverley projects. Those projects were given the green light under the Liberal Government, but have now been stopped as the boom was lowered on them. If it were not for Norm Foster doing the right thing by the people of South Australia, we would have the same problem at Roxby. In the meantime, the joint venturers have to contend with being subverted at every bend of the track by the left-wing elements of the Labor Party who would do anything to stop the project. In his era, former Premier Dunstan was happy to allow uranium exploration to go on but, once companies carry out exploration and find uranium, for some philosophical reason the Labor Party then says they cannot proceed. It will let a company mine at Roxby Downs but the same type of ore cannot be mined 300 miles further across the countryside. When the companies asked for compensation they were told to get lost. Those companies can spend millions of dollars which goes into our pockets but they do not get any compensation. An article in the *Advertiser* of 19 August stated:

The South Australian Government has refused to pay compensation of several million dollars to the Honeymoon uranium joint venturers for work associated with the project.

The article further stated:

The manager of the South Australian Chamber of Mines, Mr I. F. Drysdale, said the Government's decisions were disgusting. Of course they were disgusting, because the Government now on the Treasury benches is against State development. As soon as the people of South Australia remove the Government and replace it with a Liberal Government, which will do for South Australia what the Tonkin Government did between 1979 and 1982, the better off the people of South Australia will be.

**Mr BLACKER (Flinders):** I wish to deal in particular with the manner in which this Government is proposing to transfer Loan funds to the recurrent account. The Premier has acknowledged in this place that this is an undesirable practice, and I applaud him for making that acknowledgment. However, I do not believe that an acknowledgment, in itself, is sufficient—a far greater effort must be made by the Government to pay its own way in regard to recurrent expenditure. To use Loan funds in the way proposed is only putting the State further behind the eight-ball. After all, every dollar transferred out of Loan Account into general revenue has to be repaid with interest. What we are doing is not just saving our skins today or this year: whether that loan be repaid next year or in 10 years time, we are saddling the next generation with a funding system over which they will have absolutely no say and which they obviously will have considerable difficulty in repaying.

It is not many years ago that a similar situation existed in America, when certain States had a funding system whereby they transferred Loan funds to recurrent expenditure to such an extent that they reached a point of no return and were on the verge of bankruptcy. Succeeding generations were then obligated to raise revenue just to pay the interest on those Loan funds and to pay for the mistakes that their predecessors had made.

One by one those States saw the error of their ways and, in turn, introduced legislation providing that, if a Government transferred Loan funds to recurrent expenditure in one year, that State concerned was obligated by law to repay

the sum involved the following year. The effect of that was that Governments of the day, rather than future Governments, were made responsible for their own actions. I do not have documented evidence before me, but I understand that every American State has now adopted similar legislation making it obligatory for Governments that use Loan funds to repay those funds the next year, either by raising taxes so that the loan can be repaid out of recurrent expenditure or by cutting back on spending programmes in the Public Service or in other areas where Government expenditure occurs, but not involving capital works funds.

In the past two years or so, \$100 million has been transferred out of Loan Account into general revenue. This means that \$100 million in capital assets has been denied this State, whether it involve capital improvements such as swimming pools, Government buildings, bridges, roads, and so on. It will take a long time to recover that money. A 10 per cent interest rate involves another \$10 million the next year, without making any capital repayment. That is the part that worries me. If one were to liken this situation to a farming situation, it would be like selling off the back paddock in order to pay the day-to-day expenditure on the farm, yet we all know that one cannot keep selling the back paddock, because eventually there is no back paddock to sell. This is the fundamental problem I see with the financing of Budgets in the way that they have been financed in the past couple of years.

Without any doubt, South Australia is riding on the sheep's back—or on the farmer's back. It has become the in-thing in recent years to claim that we are no longer a farming community and no longer dependent upon the rural community as such. However, in the past couple of years, when we have had serious droughts and when the cash flow from the farming community has not been filtering down through manufacturing and service industries, we have found that the average Australian's belt has had to be tightened. When one considers the coming good season (and one must put a question mark over that because one is never sure of that until the grain is in the silo and the wool is sold), and assuming that no natural disaster occurs, it is quite likely that our rural industry will inject \$500 million into South Australia's economy in the next few months.

We are now in the middle of September, and within four months it is not unrealistic to expect that \$500 million more than the figure last year will be injected into South Australia's economy. That will be the greatest boost that any industry could give a State. I freely admit that that is purely because of seasonal conditions. However, the point I am making is that, if those industries that have the capacity to produce are fostered and recognised as being the backbone of the community, the economic recovery of this State will be much quicker than it is at the moment. If we can get the rural economy back to a position where cash flows from the primary producer down through machinery manufacturers, service agencies and every little country town (and how much of Adelaide is really riding on those service industries?) and if we give encouragement to the farmer so that that occurs, we are well on the way to economic recovery.

One of the issues which ties in with what I am saying and which has been of some concern to me is the application of the Rural Industries Assistance Scheme. Members would be aware that that scheme has been federally funded and administered by the State. It is a scheme under which farmers, provided they meet appropriate criteria, can obtain financial assistance by way of loans applied as a 'finance of last resort'. I have some reservations and am in two minds about the application of this scheme, because it encourages and promotes the inefficient farmer. The farmer who is diligent and sets aside his own drought provisions and undertakes his own insurance cover gets absolutely no benefit



from this scheme. On the other hand, the farmer who does not carry out such drought preparation and does not put away an appropriate amount of fodder, or money in the bank, for hard times can pick up money from this scheme.

There is another side to this coin, because we all recall that last season was a drought season and that much of our rural community was in a poor financial situation. Through the Rural Industries Assistance Scheme, it has been possible for much of rural industry to recover within a very short time. Had private producers been left to his or her own resources, it would have taken them two, three or four years to build up stock numbers to a normal carrying capacity. The Rural Industries Assistance Scheme has allowed these people to fully restock and to take advantage of the excellent season we are now enjoying. It may be that the ideals of the scheme have not been portrayed to the general community in the way that they should have been, because if they had been there is no doubt that its true benefits would be better appreciated. One of the issues of ongoing concern to the rural community involves petrol prices.

Again in today's *News* there is a headline which states, 'Petrol price war on again.' So, the whole thing is going round and round in circles, and where does the poor consumer stand in such circumstances? I see that the front cover of today's *News*—

**Mr Mayes:** They are better off. It is 41c.

**Mr BLACKER:** I thank the honourable member for his interjection. He has suggested that the rural person is better off. May I inform him that, whilst metropolitan people are paying 41c a litre for their petrol, country people are paying 50c a litre for their petrol.

**Mr Mayes:** Not in my electorate: they are paying 41c.

**Mr BLACKER:** The member for Unley quite obviously does not live in a country electorate. The price discounting war foreshadowed in today's *News* is at the direct cost of all those people in the country areas who have to pay full tote odds. The last time I filled my car, it cost me approximately \$36 at 50.2c a litre, and that is one of the cheapest prices on Eyre Peninsula. Sir, I ask you: where is our fuel pricing system, and why is the Government of the day even suggesting that the situation should remain as it is?

In the past couple of months there has been an increase of 4c a litre in the price of fuel, but neither this Government nor the previous Government has been prepared to even contemplate the idea of some fuel equalisation scheme to give equality to residents throughout this State. As long as that situation exists, there will always be dissension. People in the country areas have to have petrol: it is an essential commodity. They have no alternative means of transport and most people do not have access to rail. Few people have access to bus transport and, therefore, fuel in country areas is an essential commodity. I could float the idea, and I believe, with some justification, that there should be a surcharge on metropolitan fuel because we have a bus service and alternative means of transport (be it bus, taxi, train or tram) subsidised by taxpayers. However, the person out in the bush not only does not have the choice of transport and must pay full tote odds but he has to pay a considerably higher price than does the person who lives in the metropolitan area, and who also has that subsidised service at his beck and call.

**Mr Becker:** There is nothing wrong with it.

**Mr BLACKER:** The member for Hanson said that there is nothing wrong with it. I suppose that, if I were enjoying that situation, I would be sticking up for it too. However, I think that it must be put into its correct perspective. There are very sound economic and logical reasons why a fuel price equalisation scheme would be beneficial to this State, not only as a convenience measure but as an industrial

measure in terms of the rural products that have to be transported to and fro.

We hear Governments talk about decentralisation. We say, 'Why not set up another industry in Whyalla?' One of the biggest problems in relation to setting up another industry in Whyalla is the freight disadvantage. Why not set that up in Port Lincoln or set up some little agricultural bulk bin machinery industry? Why not have them spread around in the areas where their market is? The answer is the cost of freighting raw product to the manufacturing centre, and vice versa. If a product is exportable or has to be sent to markets elsewhere, then one has that freight component again. Whilst farmers, carriers, tourists, and anyone else who wants to travel in this State have to pay inequitable prices for fuel, this disadvantage will continue.

I could quote one classic example. Within the confines of the metropolitan area there is a manufacturing industry of bulk handling equipment. That industry (I cannot give the exact figures, and that is why I will not be specific in naming anyone) two years ago employed some 46 people, and 90 per cent of its production went to Eyre Peninsula. Why is not that firm manufacturing on Eyre Peninsula where its market is? Again, freight comes into it, time and time again. The problem is a State-wide and very serious problem which this and previous Governments were not prepared to tackle.

I have a file 2 cm thick containing letters from Ministers of Consumer Affairs, all of whom have been ducking the issue about a fuel price equalisation scheme—because it would not be popular. The metropolitan masses outnumber the country numbers, which are obviously considerably less. On that basis, everyone is ducking the issue. However, in the meantime where does the country person stand and, more particularly, why do we have the inequalities that exist? Two of my constituents have just returned from trips around Australia. The dearest petrol was on Eyre Peninsula: the cheapest was at Mambray Creek. There can be no logical explanation for that, and I believe that that is a problem with which this Government should endeavour to deal.

Road funding is also affected by the numbers problem. What has happened to it? Where are we going? Will we ever (and I say that quite advisedly) see some of our main arterial roads sealed? Quite frankly, the way that the funding system is going, and because the Government is not taking to heart its obligations to service the people (and it uses a numbers count which it takes on a Thursday afternoon), we find a situation where district councils have to use road revenue to pay for rural arterial roads which are community assets and which under present circumstances will probably never be cleared.

I use two examples. There are two main rural arterial roads in my electorate which have attracted some publicity in recent years, namely, the Lock-Elliston road and the Cleve-Kimba road. The Cleve-Kimba road is allocated by the Eyre Peninsula Local Government Association as being No. 1 priority, and the Lock-Elliston road as No. 2 priority. The previous Government made a token allocation, and I say 'token' quite advisedly because, had that limit of funding continued, the sealing of one of those roads would have been completed in 22 years time. One could hardly say that it was a massive gesture, but at least it was a gesture. It has now come to my notice that it is feared that such funding may be cut. Again, the Government of the day is considering that. I had hoped to ask a question today to confirm whether or not the system of road funding that had been promised (or, certainly there were indications of there being continued funding at that level for those areas) was to be cut. Again, country people are contributing more by way of fuel tax to the State's economy than are the metropolitan users, and

they are receiving less. That sort of situation cannot continue. Where will we be in the end?

When talking about transport, one gets back to a number of other issues which have come into being. One which has attracted a lot of Federal as well as State attention is the railway line from Alice Springs to Darwin. I find it a rather anomalous situation that a major capital works programme of national significance is actually being stopped while, at the same time, there is talk of job creation schemes to replace it. In fact, I draw the analogy for this very reason: although the Alice Springs to Darwin railway line is not directly a State responsibility (I believe that it is indirectly), it has been suggested to some of the councils in my area that they will receive less road funding but that that will be made up by additional job creation schemes.

I believe that it is purely a matter of manipulating job creation figures, because people could be put off to benefit the job creation scheme. Several councils in my district that would normally have had their rural arterial road grants out some weeks ago are holding on to tenders called for equipment because of a lack of direction, uncertainty and the suggestion of possible cuts in road funding. It is almost certain that councils will have to put people off; at the same time the Government will say that those workers can be re-employed under the job creation scheme.

Surely a capital asset of a permanent nature provides more permanent jobs than does any short-term job creation scheme. I am not totally decrying the job creation scheme: it has a place within the community, but it should not be at the expense of permanent jobs. I believe that a similar situation exists in relation to the continuation of the railway line from Alice Springs to Darwin. I believe that the South Australian Government should look seriously at the completion of the Alice Springs to Darwin railway line, even if it means putting in some of its own money, because it is important to not only this State but also the nation. I am critical of the Federal Government's attitude towards this project, because it is of paramount importance to the nation.

I believe that Paul Everingham summed up the situation in today's *News*. He says that the Alice Springs to Darwin railway line is a vital link in our defence system in this country. One can obviously see the significance of that statement. If our defence forces were located in the southern part of Australia and northern Australia was attacked, there is no way in the world that we could transport men and equipment to the north, and vice versa. It is frightening to contemplate such a situation. The completion of the railway line is important not just because of its economic benefits through the freighting of produce and in relation to general trade but also because it is essential for our defence forces. At the moment semi-trailers are permanently engaged in transporting prawns for processing between the Gulf of Carpentaria and Port Lincoln.

I would also like the State Government to take up with the Federal Government the matter of meat inspection fees at export abattoirs. The Samcor abattoirs at Port Lincoln has battled for years to be upgraded to United States export standard licence requirements. It has no obtained that licence, but it must now pay the penalty of meat inspection charges for export stock. An export meat inspection fee has to be paid on every beast that goes through the Samcor works at Port Lincoln and Gepps Cross. It is absolutely ridiculous that meat inspection fees levied in the pig industry amount to more than the total export earnings for that industry.

The anticipated export inspection costs for 1983-84 will amount to \$5.9 million, whereas the projected value of possible pig meat exports for the same period is \$4.9 million. This anomaly has arisen because of the Federal Government's mishandling of the situation and the imposition of meat inspection fees on pig meats, bearing in mind that 80

per cent of our pig meat (and sometimes more) is for local consumption. I ask the Government to please get together with the Federal Government and grant an exemption in relation to export meat inspection fees for meat for local consumption. The Port Lincoln meat works is paying a cruel penalty after battling for many years to gain a top grade standard of hygiene. It is a penalty indeed, because \$5.9 million will be paid in costs in order to receive a return of \$4.9 million from the export of pig meat.

Another problem at Port Lincoln relates to the high school, primary school and junior primary school complex. Those who know Port Lincoln will be aware that those three schools are well below standard. Many suggestions have been made in an attempt to overcome the problem. One suggestion is to establish a new primary school in Port Lincoln (there are three now) because the present facilities are grossly overcrowded. However, because of the cost and flow projections a new school for Port Lincoln is some time away. It has also been suggested that the Education Department could acquire appropriate land on the southern side of the Port Lincoln High School and include it within the school grounds. However, that would involve the acquisition of at least six properties. The difficulty with that suggestion is that the Government does not have the money for capital acquisitions. What will probably occur is that the properties will be sold (two are on the market at the moment) and the land will be used for medium density housing. The capital value of the blocks would then increase, which means that the Education Department would never be able to acquire that land. I do not know whether it would be possible to have the land designated under the Planning Act for single storey accommodation.

I believe that the Government is investigating the possibility of closing the roads between the three schools. That would increase land presently available to the schools. There is some merit in that suggestion and I believe that it should be pursued immediately. The closure of those roads would make available an extra two or three acres that could be used for playing areas, particularly for the primary school and to a lesser extent for the high school. It would also mean that access from the primary school to the junior primary school would be available to the high school, which would allow a greater area for student participation.

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

**Mr MAYES (Unley):** I wish to refer to education expenditure and, as I do not feel 100 per cent today, I shall seek leave to continue my remarks on another occasion. In considering education expenditure in the Budget presented by the Premier, it is important to make comparisons with the performance of the previous Government on this line. We have heard much from the Opposition over the past few days, and especially on the day on which the Premier brought down his Budget, regarding what this Government has done in respect of educational expenditure. When considering recurrent expenditure and Loan and Capital works expenditure, the shadow Minister made disparaging remarks about the role of the Government and its allocations in these areas.

**The Hon. Michael Wilson:** What did I say?

**Mr MAYES:** Just wait and I will tell the honourable member.

**The Hon. Michael Wilson:** I hope that you quote me correctly, not like your Minister.

**Mr MAYES:** I am sure that the Minister quoted the honourable member correctly. I shall do my best to quote the honourable member as correctly as I can, given the fact that I shall be quoting from the daily newspaper. When referring to the comments by Opposition members on the

Government's allocation of funds for recurrent expenditure, it is worth reflecting on the previous Government's allocations, both for recurrent expenditure and capital works, over the past three years. When dealing with recurrent expenditure, there is a theme running through the comments by Opposition members about greedy unions in the education area. Predominantly, that criticism is levelled at the Australian Institute of Teachers because that is the major union in this area. True, other unions cover certain parts of the education field, but they form only a small part of the total picture.

Over the past 12 months we have heard the catch cry that an increase in wages means fewer jobs, but I remind members that, because of an increase of 6.19 per cent at the beginning of September 1982, there has been no movement in wages in the education area. That fact is relevant when we consider the Opposition's cry that an increase in wages will mean fewer jobs because, in effect, the wages in this area had been fixed for the past 12 months. In the light of an increase in the consumer price index of about 11 per cent over the period from September 1982 to September 1983, there has been a drop in real wages, so teachers and all the workers in the community whose wages have been fixed for the past year have suffered a loss in real wages over that period.

For the foregoing reason, it should be made clear to the community at large that, because of the wage freeze that has been in vogue since September 1982 (and there is no movement yet, although there is a proposed movement on the horizon and much speculation about how much it will be), teachers, like many other workers in the community, have suffered a loss in real wages, and they have been very patient indeed. To illustrate my argument, I refer to Step 4 of the teacher's assistant scale, for which a salary of \$15 413 has been prescribed since 1982. When people talk about the greedy public sector unions and how much they claim for their members, they should bear this figure in mind. For instance, at the recent summit conference called by the Premier, the Leader of the Australian Democrats in another place advocated that members of the Public Service unions should suffer a loss of 6 per cent in their real wages, and this would apply not only to teachers but to members of other Public Service unions as well, including policemen and nurses. What has happened to wages over the past year? A real loss in wages of about 11 per cent has occurred over that period.

**The Hon. Michael Wilson:** That applies to most of the community.

**Mr MAYES:** Yes.

**Mr Baker:** Why should public servants be treated differently from the rest of the community during a wage pause?

**Mr MAYES:** They have been singled out specifically by the Leader of the Australian Democrats for special treatment: last week he called for a 6 per cent decrease in their salaries. However, they have already suffered a real loss in salaries of about 11 per cent. Yet, contrary to the opinion often expressed by members opposite, that reduction in real wages has not created jobs, and the member for Mitcham will appreciate my point possibly more than some other members opposite: that a loss in real wages does not necessarily increase employment.

Over the past three years the increase in the number of jobs promised by the Tonkin Government did not eventuate, even though wages were kept at a low level. Of course, the unemployment was national in nature and the minimising of wages and salaries by Liberal Governments in South Australia and in other States and the Commonwealth did not create jobs even though real wages dropped. Indeed, since 1976, there has been a 25 per cent drop in real wages in some trades and professions, so where is the massive creation of jobs as a result of a loss in real wages? It is

nowhere to be found. In relation to education, teachers have lost about 11 per cent in real terms: they received the last increase in September 1982 and in real terms they have been losing steadily ever since. Many people in the community seem to think that the average salary in the Public Service is \$30 000 or \$40 000, but I remind members that very few public servants enjoy that sort of salary. We took out figures that showed that the average wage or salary earner in the Public Service was receiving between \$14 000 and \$15 000 a year.

**The Hon. Michael Wilson:** By 'we' you mean the Public Service Association?

**Mr MAYES:** No, people in the Labor Party. We should take the myth of the highly paid public servant being typical of the Public Service and put it to death quickly. When talking about Public Service rates of pay and teachers taking a cut so as to create jobs, I am reminded of a recent statement by the member opposite about 2 000 jobs being taken away.

**The Hon. T.H. Hemmings:** That was the member for Todd.

**Mr MAYES:** I thank the Minister for his interjection. If we look at the theory that increased wages mean a loss of jobs and, alternatively, that a reduction in wages means more jobs, the theory is simply untrue. Looking at the level of salaries payable in the Public Service, we find the public generally receiving a barrage of spurious information from the Opposition benches and from other well-meaning people in the community to the effect that a 6 per cent or 10 per cent salary cut in the public sector, including politicians, will mean more jobs, but that is not correct. One should look at the average salary paid to public servants generally. Indeed, it is preferable to look at the median salary of public servants, because that is a more accurate measure. I venture to say that the median salary payable to public servants is between \$14 000 and \$15 000 a year. Many members of the community would be surprised if these facts were made public, but they would have a far better picture of the true position.

They are referring to very average incomes, to people in the community and public servants who receive those average incomes suffering a 6 per cent salary decrease. I would not like to see anyone on that salary level have to do without that 6 per cent, because most of those people would be struggling. From my own experience, I know that they are struggling now. Many of my constituents are on that wage level, some of them being public servants, and those people are struggling to meet their mortgages and the average family commitments. One of my friends is a CO1 clerk in the Public Service; he has two children, and he is struggling each week to make ends meet. It is fine for the Leader of the Democrats in the Upper House to say that there should be a 6 per cent decrease, but he should try to live on that level himself. It is fine for him to say, 'I will be prepared to accept 6 per cent': we know that he has spent a longer time in the community to have far greater asset backing. He was the Agent-General and he was Chairman of the State Government Insurance Commission. The honourable member has had a few rosy positions and has enjoyed the opportunity to acquire more assets.

**Mr Becker:** He has had a few really good perks.

**Mr MAYES:** The member for Hanson has made a good point. I do not think that many public servants would have enjoyed the perks that the Leader of the Democrats in the Upper House has enjoyed. If one considers recurrent expenditure, one sees that it is not salaries that have been crushing the Budget over the past 12 months, because there has not been any movement.

**Mr Ingerson:** Are you talking about education?

**Mr MAYES:** Yes.

**Mr Ingerson:** Qualify that.

**Mr MAYES:** I can go on, and I hope that I will have the opportunity to comment on other lines next week in relation not only to teachers' salaries but to other salaries in the Public Service as a whole. The wages question has not been the aspect of the Budget to cause problems: the only movements have been through incremental steps, by people moving up the range, either because of qualifications or years of experience.

**The Hon. Michael Wilson:** That involved about \$6 million.

**Mr MAYES:** I know that it is a quite considerable amount. Of course, that sum does not represent a major part of recurrent expenditure. If there was a 6 per cent increase, it would involve a far greater lump sum in that area than would any incremental increase in a year as an absolute figure. We must give the public very clear information about wages in the public sector, and about teachers' wages in particular, in this line of expenditure. I refer now to comments made by the shadow Minister; and I will do my best to quote him accurately. An article in the *News* of 8 September stated:

The State Opposition has condemned the Government for the \$2.4 million reduction in the school building and redevelopment programme announced in the South Australian Budget. The Opposition education spokesman, Mr Wilson, said that, taking inflation into account, this represents an 18 per cent reduction on last year. 'This is at the expense of dozens of schools desperately in need of redevelopment,' he said.

It was further stated:

And the recurrent expenditure as a percentage of the State Budget had declined by almost 2 per cent. 'When the rise in the c.p.i. is taken into account, the money allocated for education in the Budget represents a reduction in real terms,' he said.

The c.p.i. for June 1983 was then referred to. If one considers the position under the previous Liberal Government (and I recognise that the shadow Minister was not the Minister of Education but was the Minister of Transport—and my comments are directed to the then Minister of Education, who was in the House a few minutes ago but who is not here now) and the policies which this State enjoyed under that Government, one sees that during that time more than 600 teaching jobs disappeared. That figure takes into account nothing but the cold, hard facts. That was the public sector attitude. In fact, 3 500 jobs in total were lost.

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** Was there any reduction in the number of students in that time?

**Mr MAYES:** Yes. There was a 4 per cent reduction in the number of school assistants, which was implemented as policy. The former Minister of Education stated the other day that there were no sackings under the former Liberal Government, but if I had more time (and I will have time in the future), I would tell him what actually happened. I know that the former Minister does not know what went on. I remember that he asked us (and when I say 'us', I mean my representation as a P.S.A. officer) exactly what was going on in the field, because he did not know. The former Minister instructed that 4 per cent of school assistants hours must disappear, and alternatives were offered to people, some of them with heavy commitments (for example, single parents).

Work in other schools was offered. In one instance a person was offered work in a school that was 25 miles away. She had a couple of hours work at one school in the morning, and a couple of hours work in the afternoon at another school 25 miles away. If that is a relocation of hours, I will go he.

That is the sort of policy that was implemented by the former Minister. When one says that there were no dismissals, one should consider the situation carefully—if that was not a dismissal, what was it? Work was offered across town, and that posed a problem for the person involved.

She did not know what to do. Because of her family commitments, she did not take the afternoon hours, and so her original part-time hours were reduced by half, which brought her below poverty subsistence. That was the sort of policy implemented by the Liberal Government. In addition, in regard to the overall implementation of school assistants hours, the former Minister of Education initially gave an ultimatum—or several ultimatums, because after negotiations he changed his mind on numerous occasions. On one occasion the Minister went to Mount Gambier to avoid negotiations, if I recall correctly. In that situation we found that the Minister had given a clear instruction that there should be a 4 per cent cut to occur on a certain date—I believe that the ultimatum was November 1981. Consequently, in direct terms we were faced with a dismissal situation. It is important that, when one looks back on the performance of the previous Government, one considers exactly what occurred. 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 FERGUSON (Henley Beach):** During this grievance debate I want to turn my attention to motor car insurance. Two problems have been brought to my notice during the time that I have been representing the District of Henley Beach. The first relates to the unfair practice of some insurance companies in charging higher premiums for comprehensive insurance when a car is being bought on hire-purchase. Some hire-purchase companies charge a much higher fee for comprehensive insurance when a purchaser is using hire-purchase rather than another form of finance. I telephoned an insurance company to find out the rates I would be charged if I wanted to comprehensively insure a vehicle bought on hire-purchase. In my case (not being required to pay any excess payments and having the maximum level of no-claim bonus) to comprehensively insure a new Holden 6-cylinder Commodore I would be charged \$230 per annum if I was purchasing it on hire-purchase. On the other hand, if I was using a different kind of finance, the insurance cover would cost only \$185 per annum.

I cannot see the logic in that form of discrimination. Insurance companies maintain that vehicles bought on hire-purchase agreements are more frequently involved in accidents. They also claim that people who buy cars on hire-purchase do not look after their cars as well as those who buy cars for cash or by way of personal loans. That is a nonsense argument. Insurance companies are discriminating against some motorists who, incidentally, may have an unblemished 20-year driving record. I suspect that that is the real reason why some insurance companies provide bonuses to salesmen who send customers their way. In effect, the customer is paying that bonus. It is not uncommon for a motorist to pay up to \$100 a year extra. Additional charges are much higher for drivers over 24 years of age who have been unable to accumulate any no-claim bonus.

The practice of charging hire-purchase customers more for insurance apparently is unique to Australia. So far as is known, insurance companies in other parts of the world do not indulge in this sort of practice. I must say that major insurance companies, such as S.G.I.C., do not charge the higher rate. It is unfair that a driver who is able to arrange finance by way of an overdraft or an accommodating bank

manager should have an advantage over any driver who cannot do so.

I want to refer briefly to problems associated with insurance broking. This is not a new problem: people in the business world have been commenting on this matter for many years. I want to quote from the *Business Review Weekly* of 20-26 August 1983. In the editorial, under the heading 'Check your insurance broker', reference is made to insurance brokers, as follows:

The Australian insurance industry needs a great deal of attention. Consumers have just seen enormous increases in workers compensation premiums, partly because of previous rate-cutting but also because the Australian courts simply have not understood the burden they were placing on the community when they increased the payments for injuries.

But the insurance problem goes much deeper. When P & O decided to sell its Bishopsgate insurance company it had several potential overseas buyers, but F.I.R.B. requirements ruled them all out. So instead P & O chose 'dinkum' Aussies—who simply were not the right people for the job.

This demonstrates that the regulation of insurance company buyers is ineffectual and should be either abandoned—and let the insurers beware—or greatly tightened.

By far the worst feature of the Australian insurance industry is not the companies but the brokers. At the moment there seems little to stop anyone setting up as a broker, taking money from a gullible public, negotiating long payment terms with insurance companies, and using the money to buy expensive cars in the meantime.

Recently we have had insurance brokers collapse in Canberra, Melbourne and Adelaide—and many will follow. I earnestly suggest to all B.R.W. readers that unless you are insuring through a major broking house you should check that any premiums paid to brokers are passed on to the insurance company.

To do this it may be necessary to ring the insurance company, and you should also ensure that the company a broker has chosen for you is one of substance. Most insurance brokers are reputable, but there seems no way of personally checking the likely fly-by-nighters.

At the moment there is no legal need for trust accounts, but fortunately many insurance companies, sometimes prodded by re-insurance groups, are insisting that brokers have trust accounts and pay their bills. But it's hard to expect insurance companies to be the policemen in this area.

A constituent in my electorate has experienced a problem in this regard. The gentleman concerned, and his wife, are pensioners. They were attracted to a television advertisement offering extremely reasonable rates for comprehensive motor car insurance. The gentleman concerned is a migrant who has problems with communication.

After contracting to take comprehensive insurance, my constituent was provided with only a certificate of insurance from the insurance brokers; no policy documents were provided. Unfortunately, my constituent was involved in an accident. He reported the accident verbally to the insurance company, which took his statement and asked him to sign it. My constituent now has a problem with his claim because the insurance company has stated that his original statement was incorrect as to the detail of the claim and is refusing to pay the claim. This matter has been referred to the Consumer Affairs Branch with a view to sorting out his problem.

I wish to draw to the attention of the House the problems that constituents have in making a claim on certain insurance companies. It seems to be completely unfair that a claim should be refused on the basis of a breach of policy when the policy has never been supplied to the person concerned. The general public should deeply consider before being attracted to what appears to be a bargain when television advertisements offer cut-price rates from insurance brokers. The problem may well come when claims for pay-outs are made. People should make sure that they are provided with a copy of the policy, and they should be conversant with its contents.

The former Liberal Government and the former Attorney-General, and the Attorney-General before him in the Dunstan

Government, were prepared to take steps to bring in legislation to control the broking industry in South Australia. I commend the work of the former Minister, Mr Burdett, in this area. A working party was provided to develop a code of conduct for the insurance intermediaries, and that report was circularised within the insurance industry with a view to providing legislation to control the sort of practices to which I have already alluded.

Unfortunately, indications came from the Federal Government that it was about to bring in legislation, so proceedings were held up. Uniform legislation, of course, would be far preferable to State by State legislation. The former Federal Government was moving very slowly on the matter. The present Federal Government has promised to bring in legislation, but is still looking at it. It is time that the urgency of controlling insurance brokers was brought to the attention of our Federal colleagues and the need to move in this area stressed to them.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel):** I want to raise the matters that are canvassed in a report, *Review of Research Centres*, which was furnished to the Department of Agriculture in August 1983, in the first instance in so far as it relates to the recommendation that the Lenswood Research Centre be closed. The report says:

Of the horticultural research centres, it was established that the service provided to industry from Lenswood Research Centre could be more effectively and efficiently achieved if the centre were sold, a district office established to provide an extension resource to growers and the existing research integrated with that of the groups of research officers established at Nuriootpa and Northfield.

I reject that recommendation entirely. I have read the report, albeit fairly quickly because it has not been in my possession very long, and not one skerrick of evidence is adduced in this report to sustain that recommendation.

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** You don't think that they are looking for money, do you?

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I ought to deal with that. The fact is that primary industries in South Australia earn in excess of 50 per cent of this State's export income and something in excess of 40 per cent of all the State's production. That is an enormous contribution to the welfare of every man, woman and child in this State, yet here is a series of recommendations embarking on a penny-pinching exercise which will jeopardise the output of some of our primary industries.

In terms of Lenswood Research Centre and that recommendation, it is ludicrous to suggest that meaningful research can take place in relation to the growing of apples, pears and berry fruits outside the area where this occurs. That is what the recommendation is suggesting. The major horticultural areas in terms of apple and pear growing are the Adelaide Hills (in my electorate). To suggest that those activities can be carried on elsewhere than in the middle of that area is absurd.

The research centre used to be located at Blackwood and land was acquired. The second quote which I wish to refer to talks about the functions of the centre. The Lenswood Research Centre land was acquired in 1964 but it was not established then; it was previously at Blackwood, I recall. Its intended use was for apple, pear and cherry research and the agricultural industries it served were orchards, vegetables, berry fruits, ornamentals, and hobby farms. The environment to which the centre relates is high-rainfall Adelaide Hills. The field of expertise is orchards and vegetable crops. The overlap with other centres is nil. The interstate equivalent centres are in Victoria, New South Wales, Tasmania and Western Australia, and the other roles of the centre are in rootstock production, grazing and apples for fruit storage work. How on earth can effective research

work be done outside the area that it is designed to serve? That recommendation is absolutely absurd. As I go through the report I find no evidence whatsoever to sustain that conclusion which I read. There are a number of other quotes from the report which I wish to read. However, I make one or two other points.

I have been contacted by, and I have contacted, some leaders in the horticultural industry in the Adelaide Hills, and they cannot understand this recommendation. They learnt in the past week or two that this report was to hand. I do not think some of them have seen it, but they have contacted me. 'Amazed' is not a strong enough word to describe their reaction to this report. To suggest that work at Nuriootpa in relation to the growing of apples in the Adelaide Hills or a regional office and an office at Mount Barker with no research facilities can effectively carry on what is happening at Lenswood at present is unbelievable.

It seems that the only reason for this report is to save money, but I believe it is penny-pinching which will prove to be cost ineffective. Although the relatively small amount of money which goes into the effort at that research centre will be saved, I believe that the impact on that industry will be quite marked. In reply to the suggestion that the centre does not fulfil its operation or that it is under-utilised, I can only point out that the centre is a focus for all sorts of activities, some with which I have been associated. The local branch of the Agricultural Bureau uses the centre extensively. It has slide evenings, educational evenings and runs programmes on development.

If one talks in terms of developing plant varieties and work with rootstock and so on, one is talking about a matter of years before that work comes to fruition. The centre is continually evaluating new crops, and to suggest that can happen outside of the region it is serving is ridiculous. To make a suggestion regarding experimental work in order to give valid results in terms of that sort of work at Northfield or Nuriootpa is quite ridiculous. The research centre was moved from Blackwood in the Hills, which was nearby, about 10 or 12 years ago because Blackwood was not the centre of this horticultural activity, and the rationale behind moving the centre from Blackwood to Lenswood was because Lenswood was in the Hills and in the heart of this horticultural district. In Government, the Liberal Party rejected any suggestion that this sort of rationalisation should occur.

Everyone in this House knows that the Liberal Government was on a very effective cost-cutting exercise but, where that cost cutting would diminish returns to the State, we just would not embark on it. The former Minister of Agriculture who has just been replaced rejected it, but this report has just come to light. To suggest that it should be implemented for such absurd reasons, which are certainly not in the report and which are quite illogical, would be a foolish course upon which to embark.

What we need desperately at present is encouragement of income earners in South Australia. My constituents are particularly concerned. Every two years a major expo is held at Lenswood Research Centre, and I opened one about two years ago. That expo attracted hundreds of people from the surrounding Hills area who saw the new equipment and methods exhibited. The Department of Agriculture had a stand and much useful information was made available to growers and horticulturalists in the Hills through that expo. I am amazed that this recommendation is even included in the report so as to see the light of day.

I will be appalled, to put it mildly, if the Government is foolish enough to act on the report, because it is a penny-pinching exercise with recommendations that cannot be sustained. In the case of the centres of which I am aware, it cannot be sustained, especially as it will diminish the resources and advice available to the people who are making

a significant contribution to the economy of this State. It is really only for peanuts. When one sees what is involved, one sees that the recommendations are only for peanuts. I am disappointed in the report and I urge the Government to talk to local growers, the people concerned about the results of the report. I note that the evidence came from a series of submissions and papers tendered by various people, but I urge the Government to think carefully and consult local growers as to the result of implementing the report's recommendations. I will be watching with much interest and concern as to the outcome of this report into research centres in South Australia.

**Mr GREGORY (Florey):** In April this year the Editor of the *Murray Valley Standard* wrote an article entitled 'Point of View' published on 28 April 1983. Headed 'Rape', the article states:

Militant women stole the limelight at two State observances of Anzac, on Monday. Scores of women—most of them shown on TV as fierce enough to terrify the most hardened of sex-starved soldiers (active or retired)—made sure we got their message that they're 'against' rape in war.

So are we all (I hope), just as we're against shooting of civilians, or troops, starving of orphans, torture, bombing of churches (or art galleries), or torpedoing of hospital ships.

Where were the protestors about these admittedly unpleasant side-effects of war, on Monday?

Where were the protestors against war itself, and what about the growing incidence of rape on our peacetime streets?

Single-minded fanatics who would deny the 'old soldiers' enjoyment remembering the days when they fought for us on foreign shores are to be pitied.

Anyone who says Anzac is glorification of war itself should ask the marchers their view . . .

And, anyone using this day as a chance to push radical and tasteless 'barrows' deserves prison, or whipping, or a few nights in a Siberian labor camp.

'Rape', they cry . . . they should be so lucky!

While Mr Hambidge was dealing with a matter of concern to many and a matter occurring on Anzac Day when a group of women wanted to protest at rape in war, he did it in such a manner that created the impression that women who are raped are lucky, particularly those who were protesting, to such an extent that a woman living in the area in which the *Murray Valley Standard* is distributed was moved to make the following protest:

Friends, I have been raped. I have to live here. I cannot fight this alone. Can you?

Mr Hambidge's attitude illustrates his uncaring attitude towards women—an attitude that may be interpreted to mean that women liked to be raped. I refer also to his earlier comment:

Rape they cry—they should be so lucky.

This is an implication that those women who are concerned enough to protest against rape would be lucky if they were raped. I have looked at many viewpoints published in the *Murray Valley Standard* complaining of acts of violence, vandalism and crime. The editorials carried a cry from him in respect of violence. There is a consistent comment from Mr Hambidge objecting to what he sees as increasing violence in our society. Yet, in this comment he was advocating violence towards half our society.

I wish to refer to some articles in respect of rape and what is said about it. The first is from the *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology* published in June 1983. I will read a selected passage from it, as follows:

Rape is an act of violence which is perpetrated on the victim without her consent. It creates feelings of helplessness, fear and vulnerability. For the victim there is a recognition that her environment is not safe and she experiences an invasion of her personal space and loss of bodily integrity.

The *Current Affairs Bulletin* published in September 1979 states:



Twenty years ago the word 'rape' was rarely mentioned, and even more rarely printed. The news media referred to rape only as 'a serious offence against a woman'. Today it has become one of the most discussed and most controversial crimes in our society: most discussed because it is believed to be an increasing problem from which 'no woman is safe', controversial because social attitudes on many of its aspects are sharply divided.

The article further states:

Rape is a matter of deep concern, especially among women, because it is apparently widespread, and such a frightening and degrading experience. Moreover, what follows the offence might be no less harrowing for the victim, and it is this subsequent experience which those who advocate reform believe could be greatly alleviated by changes in the law and accompanying procedures.

The article continues:

A woman threatened with rape has to decide whether or not to fight, scream, try to escape, or whether to submit in the hope of not being injured.

The people in France had this to say in the *Guardian* of 13 November 1977, under the title 'emerging from a guilty silence':

What are women after this time? That's the likely response from people who don't realise that women are now seeking further emancipation which may also include the right to dispose of their bodies freely. For aside from absurd and outdated sex discrimination and prejudices and in addition to unequal social role and age-old habit, men's domination of women continues to express itself through rape.

The article continues:

The shame of adult women is rooted in the modesty of the little girls they used to be, and there is all the more reason to keep quiet when the rapist is a member of the family.

The article further states:

If, as feminist author Helene Cixous believes, 'Rape is the killing of a woman's womanliness,' it's not so surprising that victims sometimes succumb to suicidal or murderous impulses.

The article continues:

Thus many women rape victims tell how after their initial defensive reaction they stopped fighting back because male violence appeared even more threatening than rape. 'I thought he'd kill me,' they say.

The article continues:

Among the rape victims I talked to, there wasn't one who confessed she found pleasure in it. The men I spoke to, including a convicted rapist, told me that 'personally' they didn't know what rape was.

All these quotes illustrate that the act of rape is an act of violence against women, an act usually undertaken by men and an act that has been associated with war. While Mr Hambidge may complain about a small group of women protesting against rape and war being justifiable, he should understand that women are now openly complaining against rape. This action takes many forms, such as the demand for and establishing of rape crisis centres, continuing support for women who have been raped, or even public protests like the one about which Mr Hambidge was protesting. I find it objectionable that a person who aspires to lead our community should say, 'Rape, they cry—they should be so lucky.'

Motion carried.

At 5.26 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 20 September at 2 p.m.