

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 12 April 1984

The **SPEAKER** (Hon. T.M. McRae) took the Chair at 10.30 a.m. and read prayers.

PETITION: PORNOGRAPHIC MATERIAL

A petition signed by 131 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to withdraw pornographic material from prisons was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

LUCINDALE AREA SCHOOL REDEVELOPMENT

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table the following report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Lucindale Area School Redevelopment.

Ordered that report be printed.

QUESTION TIME

ANOP SURVEY

Mr OLSEN: Will the Premier arrange to have tabled in this House the full questionnaire commissioned last year by the Government from Australian National Opinion Polls to survey public attitudes to drug taking, and all correspondence between the Government and ANOP and all accounts paid by the Government relating to the survey? ANOP, owned by Mr Rod Cameron, is the organisation used by the ALP in South Australia to undertake political market research. Last year, ANOP was commissioned by the Minister of Health to undertake a drug-related attitude survey at a cost to taxpayers of \$32 000. No other market research organisation was invited to tender for this work: in other words, ANOP was selected by the Government.

Last December, the Minister of Health tabled in another place what he said were the full details of the survey. However, it has now become apparent that not all the information made available in the survey was tabled. During the survey, the respondents, numbering 1 002 people, were asked a specific question about the Minister's personal approval rating. I also understand that the people surveyed were also asked whether they voted Labor or Liberal. Questions about the personal approval rating of the Minister and voting intentions are clearly political and should have formed no part whatsoever of any survey funded by the taxpayers of South Australia. I therefore call on the Premier to have tabled in the House all the relevant information relating to this survey.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am quite happy to table the survey which the Government commissioned and which the Government got. That was the only report it received. I make clear that, while ANOP certainly does work for the ALP federally, in a number of States and in South Australia (that is absolutely no secret), ANOP surveys that are conducted are paid for by the Australian Labor Party.

The Government, through the Health Commission, paid for a specific survey, the nature of which and the questions asked in which were detailed in the report which I do not have with me but which I will certainly table at the request of the Leader of the Opposition. Incidentally, whilst ANOP also works for the ALP, I point out that it works for a

number of Governments in Australia. It conducted a number of surveys for the Fraser Government. Recently it has conducted surveys for the Tasmanian Government. It is a highly respected research organisation. It specialises in certain cases and it does particular—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It does particular tasks extremely well. In fact, I believe that the previous Tonkin Government may well have commissioned ANOP for a survey. What I would also do, for the enlightenment of the House and the Leader of the Opposition, is table a list which I will get compiled of all the surveys that have been undertaken under the Liberal Government. However, let me say that the methodology used is up to the polling and research organisation. The Minister of Health explained the question about his standing. I must admit that the results were quite interesting in view of the controversy surrounding the Minister at that time.

However, as the Minister explained, the Government did not pay for the question that was asked about him, so it was irrelevant. What the Government paid for was the survey information that was commissioned. It is set out in the document. It is a very, very valuable piece of information. Indeed, I would hope that honourable members would use that information, and I know that some of them did, as part of their contributions in debating the controlled substances legislation. So, that is where the matter begins and ends. I repeat: the Government received what it paid for. If the ALP commissions surveys from ANOP or anyone else, it pays for them itself.

CHILD CARE CENTRE

Mr MAYES: My question is directed to the Minister of Community Welfare. The Premier and the Commonwealth Minister for Social Security (Senator Grimes) recently announced a Commonwealth-State agreement to boost child care services in South Australia at a cost of \$1.2 million. Among projects to be funded is a child care centre in the Adelaide city area being sponsored by the Public Service Association of South Australia. I understand that this centre will be unique in that it will provide overnight care for children. Can the Minister elaborate on the proposed centre?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I am pleased to receive this question from the honourable member. This is one of a package of new initiatives arrived at as a result of consultation between the Commonwealth and State Governments. The PSA sponsored centre will provide for 60 children, and children can attend that centre throughout the day and the evening. Final details are not yet available, and I will bring down a complete report for the honourable member in due course.

ANOP SURVEY

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Was the Premier aware, before ANOP undertook its drug related attitude survey for the Government last year, that the survey would ask questions about the personal approval rating of the Minister of Health, and whether the respondents voted Labor or Liberal? Were these questions specifically authorised by Cabinet and, if not, by whom?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Cabinet authorised the drug attitudes survey that ANOP conducted. The questions were in fact devised, I imagine, by the polling organisation and the Health Commission, and no doubt the Minister was involved, too. I was not aware of the full range or scope of

any of the questions. All I know is the results that were presented to the Government. The Minister advised me that a question had been added, at no cost, concerning his personal standing, and he told me those results. He has made that quite clear in his statement in another place.

BASS STRAIT FARM-INS

Mr GREGORY: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy provide the House with information regarding the level of commitment and prospectivity of the Bass Strait farm-ins announced by South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation on Tuesday?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: SAOG and Amoco have obtained approval for a farm-in to two areas in Bass Strait designated T14 and T18. The farm-in arrangements provide for an expenditure by SAOG of \$5.8 million over three years. T14 and T18 are respectively north-east and north-west and adjacent to a vacant area for which SAOG and Amoco have a pending application. BHP formerly had licences in this region and had drilled 19 wells and run approximately 10 000 km of seismic. The area is prospective for both gas and oil. In the area where SAOG has an application pending, BHP had made a gas discovery but it had not been tested when BHP relinquished the area.

SAOG has evaluated the prospect (and this is important to South Australians) and believes there may be as much as 1.5 TCF of gas in that structure. Similar structures are possible in the farm-in areas announced yesterday. The evaluation has indicated that, if sufficient gas is found to be in place, its economic exploitation would depend on achieving a necessary level of productivity from development wells drilled into the structure. SAOG considered these areas the best available immediate prospects for gas and as such I was pleased to give my approval for this important new venture.

ANOP SURVEY

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Will the Premier say whether the ANOP survey undertaken last year at taxpayers' expense in relation to the personal approval rating of the Minister of Health contains the voting intentions of the respondents to that survey? Has the Premier, any of his Ministers, or any member of the Government made available to any member of the ALP State Executive information contained in that survey?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am not aware of the full range of questions that may or may not have been asked as part of the survey.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I refer the honourable member to the answers that I have already given in reply to virtually identical questions from the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I repeat: what the Government paid for the Government got, and that has been tabled.

BUILDING CONTRACTS

Mr FERGUSON: Will the Minister of Community Welfare ascertain from the Minister of Consumer Affairs in another place whether his Department would be prepared to give wide publicity to building firms which are unable to complete their contracts on the given date? One of my constituents approached me in relation to a home that is

being built by a wellknown building firm which advertises in the *Sunday Mail* on a weekly basis. The completion date for his home was to have been 15 February 1984. The house is still awaiting completion and is now at the stage of needing the second fixings. The delay in the completion of the home means that my constituent is involved in additional payments for rent at \$110 a week, as well as additional interest payments. The Consumer Affairs Report for 1983 has warned consumers that the Housing Industry Association building contracts are of no use in a situation such as this. Unfortunately, building firms are taking contracts when they know that it is impossible to fulfil their obligations.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I will most certainly refer the honourable member's question to my colleague in another place to obtain a full report on this matter so that consumers may be fully informed of their rights in such circumstances. Necessary representations can be made to the Association, to which the honourable member referred. In regard to review of contracts, I point out to the honourable member that, at law, when contracting to have a house built consumers may include in the contract certain provisions with respect to time for constructing a dwelling. There is that opportunity available for consumers at present. Whether that can be built into contracts is a matter for further discussion.

ANOP SURVEY

Mr OLSEN: Will the Premier table in this House the doctored document laid on the table in another place, or all the questions asked in the survey, including the approval rating of the Minister and the voting intention of the respondents?

The SPEAKER: Order! Before calling on the Premier, I point out that there has been a growing tendency in this place, which I do not want to see continue, of slipping argumentative words in either at the very beginning or the very end of a question, as indeed the Leader did in that question: I do not want that practice to continue.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I rise on a point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will acknowledge that if the honourable member resumes his seat—the honourable Premier. A point of order, the honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I understood that the Standing Orders in Erskine May dictate that members can express themselves in a fashion to their liking, except that words which are deemed to be unparliamentary are to be excluded. If a member uses a word which is deemed to be unparliamentary, he is rightly requested to withdraw that word. I do not believe that Erskine May or the Standing Orders preclude the use of adjectives which a member believes describe a situation or a circumstance, and under no circumstance do I believe the word 'doctored' can be described as unparliamentary. Therefore, I am puzzled at the statement which you, Mr Speaker, have just made to the House.

The SPEAKER: I do not see why the honourable gentleman should be. Some people might say it was clever to talk about a doctored question; depending upon what side one is on, one would take it either as very clever or very gross. I am saying that, if it was not unparliamentary before, well, it is now, and that will deal with that matter.

Secondly, I point out that the rules which govern the asking of a question are very much more limited than the rules which govern the general terms of a debate. Thirdly, and most importantly (and thankfully we have not had the tendency to slide), while I am Presiding Officer in this place, I will not have this House of Assembly slide into the state

of other Houses of Assembly throughout the Commonwealth. The honourable the Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will table the report that the Government received. It is labelled 'Confidential, Community Attitudes Towards Drugs and Related Matters. Report on attitude survey of the South Australian community presented to the South Australian Government, October 1983'.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call to order the Leader of the Opposition—I warn the Leader.

ARTIFICIAL SWEETENERS

Mr TRAINER: My question is supplementary to Question on Notice 351 which was asked some weeks ago by the member for Hanson and which has since received a partial reply. Can the Minister of Health, through the Minister of Tourism, now report on any risk involved in the use of the artificial sweetener Aspartame sold in South Australia under the trade name 'Equal' by Searle Laboratories? My personal interest in this matter is based on my having undertaken to lose several kilos recently—an enterprise which was reasonably successful but which involved replacing sugar with an artificial sweetener.

Last year my colleague, the member for Henley Beach, reminded the House that cyclamate and saccharine have been banned as sweeteners since 1970 in the United States. I understand that a South Australian Government inquiry is underway into these particular sweeteners. Assuming saccharine and cyclamate should, therefore, be avoided, I began, several weeks ago, to use 'Equal', a product which became available on the local market in the past year or so. The package describes Equal as 'a new discovery . . . a totally new kind of sweetener that tastes more like sugar than any sweetener you've ever tried before'.

Mr LEWIS: I rise on a point of order. At the time the member for Ascot Park was making his explanation concerning a substance about to come on to the market in South Australia, he picked up a package displaying that substance which, I understand, is forbidden under Standing Orders. I ask you, Mr Speaker, to rule on that point.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mallee asked for a ruling and, as I stood to give the ruling, rudely proceeded to ignore me. I am about to give a ruling. What happened was that, as the member for Ascot Park was explaining his question, I was speaking to the Clerk of the House of Assembly about the business of the House. As I understand the situation, it has been observed by independent parties that the member for Ascot Park picked up an object or made some kind of display. In doing so, he breached the Standing Orders. I uphold the point of order.

Mr TRAINER: I was seeking to read part of the label. If it is acceptable—

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Ascot Park.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TRAINER: I will abide by your ruling, Sir, as every member should. It is unfortunate that the member opposite has prevented me from referring to some of the contents of the substance which are listed on the label. I was merely going to read it, because I have not had time to transcribe it from the box on to a separate piece of paper. However, the label provides further details regarding the contents. It refers to how many kilojoules of energy are available in each sachet; the relationship of the substance to sugar in terms of taste; and how many grams of sugar one sachet is equivalent to. Having checked the label, I was somewhat

disconcerted to have my attention drawn to an article in the afternoon tabloid of 27 January, which stated:

An artificial sweetener widely used in soft drinks may be a health threat. Aspartame, sold under various trade names, may be responsible for epileptic fits, severe headaches, depression, impaired vision, loss of balance and menstrual problems, according to overseas research. A Washington-based consumer lobby group has filed a suit with the United States Federal Court calling for a temporary ban on Aspartame, known there as Nutrasweet.

I would have mentioned that in relation to the label had I been able to do so and had I not been prevented by the member opposite. The article continues:

In Australia the National Health and Medical Science Research Organisation is investigating the use of Aspartame, which the United States organisation claims is widely used in powdered drink mixes, gum, cereals, and soft drinks.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I will take up this matter with my colleague in another place and have a report brought down. I appreciate the member's concern for information on this important subject. If the label is still in a condition suitable for transfer to my colleague in another place, I will pass it on to him with the information.

PRESIDENT OF LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Will the Premier say whether the Government accepts as a matter of policy the right of the President in another place to express a view on legislation as defined by a former Premier (Hon. D.A. Dunstan) in a statement he made to this House on 19 June 1973? I quote from page 20 of *Hansard*:

The only time he—

referring to the President—

gets a vote is when the votes in the House are equal. This seems fundamentally wrong, since it can be hardly argued that by reason of holding office as President, the President is no less a member of the Legislative Council. Accordingly, it is intended that the President or member presiding will be afforded an opportunity, if he wishes, to express his concurrence or non-concurrence in the passing of a second or third reading of a Bill in any case where he is not called on to exercise his casting vote.

It follows that clause 12 of the Bill reserves exactly the same right to the Speaker of the House of Assembly as the right which is reserved to the President of the Legislative Council.

The SPEAKER: Order! Before calling on the Premier, I rule the question in order: however, I further rule that the answer must not canvass any events that have occurred or may occur in another place.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes; the Government, as a matter of policy, supports that view. The House will recall that, before the insertion of what is now section 26 (3) of the Constitution Act, the President, in fact, had only a casting vote. However, I think it is very important to qualify my answer by refuting or rejecting the implication that I know the member for Light included in his question. While that provision was inserted in order to allow the President to express a view, one notices that in its wording it is in conflict, as it stands, with section 26 (2). One must then look at the other sections of the Constitution Act which may relate to it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In order to make sense of what is an apparent contradiction one must also, I would suggest, read the remarks made by former Premier Dunstan at somewhat greater length than the honourable member has done. He quoted a very selective passage. Therefore, that particular subsection of the Act must be looked at and made sense of in conjunction with section 8. That is not my layman's opinion: that is the opinion of the Solicitor-General and of two other learned Queen's Counsel. It has been significant

that no other legal opinions have been produced on this particular point. I am not canvassing the particular issue, but on this point assertions have been made. However, the Government is in possession of learned legal advice.

While that subsection allows the President to express concurrence or non-concurrence, the effect of that differs. If it is a constitutional measure, then the effect of his indicating non-concurrence with the measure and thus creating a deadlock, as it were, is that that measure fails. However, in every other instance, whether the President suggests that he concurs or that he does not concur, it has no effect. So, the President is indeed allowed in the absence of a casting deadlock to have an opinion and to put it on record in the form of a statement of concurrence or non-concurrence; but, he cannot alter the decision of the majority members on the floor of the House. That is the position. So, yes, the provision was inserted, as the then Premier explained, to give the President the opportunity to express his opinion in a situation where he was not called on to give a casting vote, but equally it was contemplated that that concurrence or non-concurrence could affect a result only in a situation where a constitutional majority was required—an absolute majority in constitutional matters. That is quite clear from the legislation.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I rise on a point of order. Do you concur, Sir, that it is what is written in the law of this House that is important?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I want to hear what the point of order is.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: It is what is written in the law by this Parliament which is important, not what is the intent of the Government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! That applies to everyone, including the Premier. I make two brief observations: first, I do not believe that that is a point of order and, secondly, even if it was, I believe it would be hypothetical.

HOME OWNERSHIP MADE EASIER PROGRAMME

Mr PLUNKETT: Following this week's announcement of an increase in the number of home loans approved weekly by the State Bank, will the Minister of Housing say whether the Home Ownership Made Easier programme has proved the success the State Government expected it to be amongst low-income households?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I thank the honourable member for his question. There is no doubt whatsoever that the HOME programme introduced by this Government last October has been the most successful scheme ever introduced by any State Government.

As the Premier said in that announcement, since HOME was announced last October, the State Bank has received more than 5 300 applications, an increase of 36 per cent in applications for concessional loans. This Government recognised the housing plight of low-income households even before it took office and set out to provide renewed hope for them. The HOME programme has been specifically designed to help the lowest income groups in our community into homes of their own. This has included tailoring repayments and interest levels to household income and removing qualifying anomalies, and most importantly introducing a new rental purchase scheme which allows purchase of any house up to a maximum limit of \$55 000. It provides a safety net for families who meet unexpected financial hardship.

Because of these changes, HOME is a pacesetter in home purchase assistance schemes in Australia. Obviously those

at whom the programme is aimed have immediately seen the significance of the new forms of assistance provided, and so have other State Governments from which I have had several inquiries regarding the mechanisms involved. HOME has proved the success that the State Government expected it to be, and that is because the programme has filled a massive void in the field of home purchase assistance.

POLICE COMMISSIONER'S MINUTE

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I direct a question to the Chief Secretary, as Minister in charge of the police. Before he answered a question in this House yesterday from the member for Unley in which he quoted from a minute of the Police Commissioner—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:—did the Chief Secretary ask the Commissioner to clarify his reference in that minute to a member in another place, Dr Ritson, and will the Chief Secretary apologise to Dr Ritson for the reflection on him contained in that minute?

The minute referred to advice which the Commissioner said he had that Dr Ritson had an interest in the Adelaide Diving Medical Centre and was seeking Government funding to further the interest of that body. The Commissioner's statement has been widely interpreted as suggesting that Dr Ritson had some financial interest in the Centre and was seeking Government funding to create some profit for himself. In fact, Dr Ritson has no financial interest whatsoever in the Centre.

It has been put to me that, as this was a serious reflection to make upon any member of Parliament, the Chief Secretary had a clear responsibility to clarify the matter with the Commissioner before quoting his minute in the House. I ask the Chief Secretary whether he had discussions with the Commissioner before he revealed the contents of this minute and whether, as he must accept the responsibility for the contents of the minute, he will now apologise to Dr Ritson for the serious reflection it makes upon him?

Mr Lewis: Or resign!

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Mallee to come to order.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I will not be resigning. I have to disappoint you, Peter. I am sorry about that.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Deputy Premier to come to order. Every member must be referred to by the name of his or her district.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I inform the member for Mallee that I will not be resigning. I regret the inconvenience that the Hon. Dr Ritson may have been caused in regard to this particular matter. He seems to have taken it on a very personal basis.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I will not have this place reduced to a barracking session. I repeat: I will not have this place reduced to a barracking session, and I ask honourable members to show some responsibility, particularly when there are many schoolchildren of this State in attendance. The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I go back over the statement (or part of it) that I read, particularly the part that is being objected to. The Commissioner's report to me states:

I am advised that Dr Ritson and Dr Swain, who have raised the doubts surrounding this operation, have an interest in the Adelaide Diving Medical Centre, and I understand are seeking Government funding to further the interests of that body.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: If honourable members want an answer, they will get it. If they do not, I will sit down. Please yourselves: I do not care, but it is a serious matter, and I would like silence to explain the position.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: It was a slur.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: It was not intended as a slur or as having a financial interest in it at all. The word 'financial' is not mentioned in it, and people can have an interest in an organisation or body without having a financial interest, and that is the intent—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Deputy Leader to order. I warn the Deputy Leader, and I ask all honourable members to show some responsibility in a serious matter like this, where indeed it might be said that there is an argument to suggest that a person in another place has been seriously reflected upon, no matter what the circumstances are. The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I did not make that statement. Remember: the words I read out to the House were in a report from the Police Commissioner. They are not my words, and I made no comment on those words.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Did you talk to the Police Commissioner?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Let me make that very clear.

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

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I made no implication that there was a financial interest, nor did I ever believe that there was one. I believe that the man was an interested person because of his activities in regard to that place, and he was trying to improve that place. That is what I believe. If honourable members opposite want to believe something else, they can believe it, but I made no allegation that that man had a financial interest.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Did you speak to the Police Commissioner?

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Murray.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I spoke to the Police Commissioner on two occasions, if the member for Murray wants to know. I asked him to obtain a report for me about this matter because of the publicity surrounding it. I explained that yesterday. I talked to the Commissioner again on Tuesday night about that report, and I said that it may be necessary at some stage to release that report and he okayed me to release that report. That is the clear situation and, as I said, the Hon. Dr Ritson has taken this thing very badly. I wanted to have a talk to him last night, but he was not there. He said some very nasty things about me as well, I should say.

Mr Ashenden: Well deserved, too.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I do not think that he was entitled to say those things that he said about me.

Mr Ashenden: Of course he was.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I do not think that he was, because I never said it. Let us get the facts straight.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Light.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I did not make that allegation and it does not matter how much the Opposition wants to interject. This is the old ploy: make them outside Parliament. I give Parliamentary reports in Parliament. That is what Parliament is for, and the member well knows it as well. If he wants some more information he will get it. If he keeps interjecting, I will not give it. I have answered the question that the member for Murray asked. If he wants some more information, I am prepared to give some more. In order to ascertain from the Police Commissioner what he actually meant by that particular paragraph, I again got in touch

with him last night and, whilst this is not directly from him because he is in Melbourne, he has been talked to about it. This minute is signed by the Acting Commissioner of Police and states:

With reference to your query concerning the basis for comment concerning Doctors Ritson and Swain, I have contacted the Commissioner who advised this was based on information supplied by Chief Inspector Wilkin, Officer in Charge, STAR Force, who in turn relied on information supplied by Dr E. Flock, the Police Medical Officer.

Dr Flock was contacted by Dr Swain in the evening of Sunday 8 April 1984. Dr Flock has set out his conversation on that occasion with Dr Swain and subsequent events. Details are enclosed. It will be noted that at no time has Dr Flock ever had a conversation with Dr Ritson on these matters.

However, the statement of Dr Swain joins Dr Ritson with him in lobbying the Government for the provision of portable decompression equipment. The connection of Dr Swain with the Adelaide Diving Medical Centre was also established by the statement of an employee of that establishment to Dr Flock on 9 April 1984.

The Commissioner has advised that he is not able to add any further information, and has asked me to emphasise on his behalf that the term 'interest' occurring twice in paragraph 2 of his report of 9 April 1984 was intended in the broadest meaning of that word, and definitely was not intended to imply a pecuniary or disparaging connotation.

And that is the way that I said it. It can be tabled if honourable members want that. I will read the whole thing out. That is the simplest way. It is a very long report of 2½ to three pages. I will read it out.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Premier.

Mr Mathwin: You've got the floor, John.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Yes, and I am going to keep it for a while, too.

The SPEAKER: Order! And I do not need the assistance of the honourable member for Glenelg, and he will be warned if he does not watch out. The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The minute states:

Deputy Commissioner of Police—

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I rise on a point of order. I believe that the Deputy Premier is quoting from an official Government minute, and I ask him to table that document.

The SPEAKER: Is the honourable Deputy Premier quoting from a docket or a document of a similar nature?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: No, I am not. However, I will read the document and then I will post it directly to the member for Murray. I will get it over there post haste after I have read it. The minute continues:

re: Piccaninnie Ponds S.A. Police underwater rescue operation. At about 1900 hours—

This will take a long time, but members opposite started it—

on 8 April 1984 (Sunday), I was requested by S.A. Police Communications to telephone a Dr Tony Swain (Tel. number 79 6505)—reason was given.

Shortly thereafter I rang the above telephone number. Dr Swain answered and asked me whether the Police Department was aware of the risks in carrying out such an operation at such a depth without having an on-site decompression facility, using inappropriate air-supply for the divers (i.e. should use mixed gases at depths reported by the media). He also said that both he and Dr Bob Ritson (M.P.) had made representations to the Government's Emergency and Health Ministers urging the necessity to have portable decompression facilities available for operations such as those being carried out by the Police Underwater Rescue Squad. (Both had Navy associations.) He was also concerned that members of the squad who are diving today should not dive tomorrow.

In addition, he wanted to know if the police were aware of the fact that a portable decompression unit was available at Morwell, Victoria, and whether the S.A. Police had notified Morwell that they were undertaking the Piccaninnie Ponds operations so that the unit was available if required at Mount Gambier. It was at this stage that I was able to say to Dr Swain that:

(1) I was not involved in the rescue operation, so I cannot comment on the nature of the work involved.

- (2) I understood that the S.A. Police Underwater Rescue Squad was specifically trained in the use of appropriate equipment.
- (3) I agreed that a portable decompression unit was necessary for the management of serious diving problems and should be on site where elective deep diving is being carried out.
- (4) I would immediately contact the Officer in Charge of the Mount Gambier operations and notify him of Dr Swain's concerns.
- (5) I would also report our conversation and its content to higher authority within the S.A. Police Department on Monday 9 April 1984.

I next telephoned S.A. Police Communications (about 1915 hours, 8 April 1984) and asked to speak to the Officer in Charge, Operations at Piccaninnie Ponds. I was told by Communications that they have a slight problem in that they 'sent a telex to them over an hour ago and they haven't replied'. At this stage I asked if Communications could ask Chief Inspector Wilkin to telephone me at home as soon as possible. Very shortly, Chief Inspector Wilkin rang me and I advised him of Dr Swain's telephone conversation.

Chief Inspector Wilkin stated that (1) the squad working at Mount Gambier were following the correct Navy Diving Technique; (2) using a six-man team system; (3) they practice annually in the Mount Gambier sink-holes; (4), if someone develops the bends they use the 'hook-line' technique to gradually bring the victim to the surface as per 'tables' then transport them to the nearest decompression facility; (5) agrees that portable decompression facility on site is ideal. I next (1940 hours, 8 April 1984) telephoned Dr Swain's home.

A 13-year-old offspring answered and said that Dr Swain was not at home. I then requested the person to write down a message from me stating: I have been in contact with the Chief Inspector of the STAR Force who advised me that the S.A. Police Underwater Rescue Team was using correct Navy Diving Procedures at Mount Gambier. At about 2110 hours, 8 April 1984, Police Communications rang me and stated that someone named Craig B . . . from the *News* wanted to speak to me re the Piccaninnie Ponds diving.

I must say that that gentleman was also telephoning me quite regularly that morning.

Mr Becker: A good reporter.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I did not say he was not. I have a great respect for his ability; he is probably one of the best in this State.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The minute continues:

I was given telephone number 270 3431. I repeatedly rang that number, but it was engaged; I requested Communications to ring that number and advise Craig B . . . that I was not involved with the operation but I have been verbally advised by the Chief Inspector of STAR Force that the operation was under control.

At 0845 hours, 9 April 1984 (Monday), at Angas Street Police Headquarters, I recounted the above events to Assistant Commissioner P. Hurley and Chief Superintendent Marshall. Mr Hurley was taking notes and stated that he would inform the Commissioner.

At about 0930 hours, 9 April 1984, Chief Inspector Wilkin telephoned me and stated that the Commissioner wanted to know the reason for Dr Swain's interest in diving. I replied that I was told by Dr Swain that he had some association with Navy diving. I went on to recommend that I telephone Dr Swain's, 46 The Parade, Norwood, number (42 6288) and inquire about Dr Swain's diving interests.

Accordingly, I telephoned the abovementioned Norwood number, asked to speak to Dr Swain, was told by a female receptionist that Dr Swain was not in and I was speaking to the Adelaide Diving Medical Centre and Dr Swain 'ran' the centre. I then rang Tara Hall and I spoke to Chief Inspector Wilkin informing him that I was advised by a receptionist at 46 The Parade, Norwood, that Dr A.W. Swain ran the Adelaide Diving Medical Centre. As far as I can remember, I have never met Dr A.W. Swain. I have met Dr Ritson once or twice in the past. I could say I know him by sight.

The minute is signed by Police Officer E.L. Flock, and I table it, Sir.

REDHILL TO BOWER ROAD CONNECTOR

Mr HAMILTON: Will the Minister of Transport advise the House what will be the effect on traffic flow from

Football Park when the Redhill to Bower Road connector is completed? The Minister would be aware of my continuing interest in traffic control problems within my electorate, and more specifically the Delfin Island, West Lakes Shore and Semaphore Park suburbs. I refer particularly to the problems concerning sporting fixtures at Football Park and on the waterway at West Lakes. Since my election to this place I have received numerous inquiries and expressions of concern about traffic control involving my electorate and, more specifically, the West Lakes Boulevard extension. In this instance I am interested in the Redhill to Bower Road connector.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: At this stage it is not possible to quantify the effect on traffic generated at Football Park by the opening of this road, an extension of Grand Junction Road. I expect that if any effect is experienced it will be small and certainly will not be detrimental. In fact, possibly it will assist a lot of people who attend Football Park, particularly those who travel north via Grand Junction Road to the northern suburbs. The opening of the road will be of tremendous benefit to the citizens of Port Adelaide. St Vincent Street is a major shopping centre, and the opening of this extension will obviate the need for very heavy vehicular traffic to travel on that road on its way to LeFevre Peninsula via the Birkenhead Bridge.

The contract for the work has been let, and I expect that work will commence in the near future, possibly within a week or so. I announced a day or so ago that it will be a concrete road funded under the Australian Bicentennial Road Development programme, and it is the first concrete road to be built in South Australia in 25 years. There are a number of concrete roads around the metropolitan area, and one that comes to mind is Frome Road, which has a bitumen surface with a concrete base. Concrete roads need very little maintenance, and there is a tendency to favour concrete roads, which certainly keeps the price of bitumen down. We will watch with interest the construction of the new extension to Bower Road, which I think will be a tremendous advantage to the region.

RAIL STRIKE

Mr BAKER: Was the Minister of Transport aware of any dispute between the Electrical Trades Union and the Australian Railways Union over signal operations prior to Tuesday's lightning rail strike, and, if so, will he say what action was taken to diffuse the situation?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I was aware of the dispute, which has been festering for some time, I think back to when the Hon. Mr Virgo was Minister of Transport. A situation involving demarcation between the Australian Railways Union and the Electrical Trades Union has been festering on and off, and I was aware of that. After negotiations with those involved on Tuesday, here at Parliament House, I was able to get them to return to work at the normal starting time on the following morning.

The United Trades and Labor Council will be convening a meeting of the unions to try to resolve the situation. That is the action that has been taken. The Government does not condone these types of wildcat stoppages. I think everyone would be aware that the Australian Council of Trade Unions has been trying for many years to prevent them, as they affect the public. I roundly criticised the union for the action it took. It acknowledged the position, so I hope that in future before any action of that type is taken it will have some regard for the travelling public. The member for Davenport was reported in the media as saying that we have had eight bus stoppages: some have been minor and some have been of a longer duration. There have been three rail

stoppages, two of which involved Australian National, and not the State Transport Authority.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: You've had more in 18 months than we had in three years.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I point out to the House that in 1980, in the first year of the previous Liberal Government's term of office, there were 16 strikes or disputes involving the bus and tram unions and the Australian Railways Union.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: During the present Government's term of office there have been eight stoppages, some of which were quite minor. If we adopted the method that the member for Davenport was trying to force on us, stoppages would escalate. I think that, having regard to our industrial relations record in this State, our approach is one that this Government should continue to follow.

KANGAROO CREEK DAM

Mr GROOM: Can the Minister of Water Resources tell the House what progress has been made on work at Kangaroo Creek dam associated with the Torrens River flood mitigation programme?

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: If anyone needs watering down, you people need hosing down.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The question directed to me by the member for Hartley is, I am sure, of particular interest to him because, if one remembers the B.C. Tonkin report from earlier days, one knows that it indicated that parts of the electorate of Hartley were subject to severe flooding in a 50 to 100 year flood cycle. Work on Kangaroo Creek dam is proceeding satisfactorily. The raising of the dam wall, the spillway and other associated works are 60 per cent completed, and the dam will be effective, but not fully completed, for the winter of 1984. It is expected that all the works will be completed in either late 1984 or early 1985.

STEWART COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr MEIER: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy inform this House when the Stewart Committee report will be made public? Its contents will be of real concern to people in the Wakefield Plains, Northern Yorke Peninsula and adjoining areas. In the past, much has been said in the local press about the possibility of the new coal mining ventures and the associated power station. The *Plains Producer*, of 4 April, refers to the Minister and to the Stewart Committee report as follows:

The document would contain recommendations for his consideration, which would later be presented for Cabinet approval, and the Stewart Committee findings will not be kept a secret, Mr Payne said.

The previous week's *Plains Producer*, under the front page headline 'More drilling planned for Lochiel site', detailed the latest coal exploration moves and, reporting on a meeting of local landholders with ETSA, stated:

One of the farmers present at the meeting said he knew 'less now than I did 12 months ago . . . they went through a whole lot of rigmarole without saying anything concrete'.

Many articles expressing concern have also appeared in the Yorke Peninsula *Country Times*. To stop unnecessary speculation, the findings of the Stewart Report need to be made public as soon as possible.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: In the past few days we have had a clear indication of the dilemma facing members opposite. There seems to be a great deal of opposition among them as to which of the many projects that may be referred to in the Stewart Committee ought to get a guernsey. However, I noted in the honourable member's question that he said that there was a real concern in his area, and that part of his question needs to be addressed seriously. The report and its findings will be of real concern to everyone in South Australia, rather than only to people in any one given area.

The honourable member would understand, when one looks at the period over which the committee has been working—at least 10 months—that to expect me to absorb any information in a report of that nature in a very short time and then be able to make an announcement is asking a bit much at this stage. It is my intention that the report will follow the usual course in these matters: when I have had the time to give it full consideration, I will go to Cabinet with recommendations, and then Cabinet will decide when, where and how it will be released.

WHYALLA PHYSICALLY DISABLED ORGANISATION

Mr MAX BROWN: Will the Minister of Community Welfare say whether consideration has been given to providing a one-off financial grant to the Whyalla physically disabled organisation for the provision of a small bus for the disabled people of Whyalla? For some time I have been involved in discussions with that organisation in an attempt to secure suitable transport facilities for the disabled. The problem that exists in Whyalla was intensified by the closure of the Whyalla shipyard. This closure eased the waiting time for South Australian Housing Trust accommodation in Whyalla and, in turn, that led to an increase in the number of underprivileged people in Whyalla who were attracted there from the metropolitan area. This inevitably intensified the problem of providing adequate transport for these people.

They are seeking about \$5 000 to \$6 000 as a one-off grant. Obtaining this much needed type of transport has been quite an involved process. The organisation in question has made approaches to the Whyalla City Council, which runs the local public transport and which, in turn, is heavily subsidised by the State Government. However, this organisation's request of the Whyalla City Council was denied, and the problem still exists. I trust that something can be done in the very near future. Hopefully, the Minister or his Department can set aside some money in the next year in order to provide the required subsidy.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFT: I thank the honourable member for his question, which has clearly evidenced his concern to ensure that disabled persons in the City of Whyalla and those from outlying areas coming to Whyalla are provided with this important resource. I will have inquiries made within my Department and other Government departments, and I will also look at what other non-government resources may be available to ensure that every consideration is being given to provide this service.

My Department has been concerned for some time about the co-ordination of welfare services in Whyalla, and I have visited Whyalla on a number of occasions to discuss this issue with non-government organisations and Government departments in that city. One of the factors that is clearly evident and proving a disadvantage to those who require welfare services in that city is the lack of availability of

transport. I will take on board what the honourable member has said in trying to resolve this matter.

STATE TECHNOLOGY STRATEGY

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister for Technology): I move:

That the House take note of the *State Technology Strategy* paper tabled in this House on Tuesday 10 April 1984.

It is not my intention to speak at this stage but rather to reply at the end of the debate. I wish to thank all members of the House, in particular the Opposition, for their co-operation in the lead-up to this debate.

I also thank them for the agreement that has been reached regarding the timing of this debate and the speaking times that will be allocated. This is quite a unique debate and many members of the community are looking forward with great interest to its proceedings.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): It is not usual (in fact, it is all too rare) for this House to debate in this way a general issue, noting a paper on a key issue of the day and allowing members to make contributions around it. We are not determining a particular question or policy on technology but, rather, noting a technology strategy paper. As my colleague has indicated, the importance of this matter warrants this procedure and, certainly, the co-operation of all members of the House in accomplishing this debate will be very valuable.

In addition, the comments and statements made by members during the debate obviously will be taken into account in terms of modifying, altering or adding to the technology strategy paper that the Government has set out for community discussion. This debate represents an important way in which we, as members of Parliament, can attempt to lead this debate in the community, to set the parameters of it, and give some guidance to general community debate. Of course, we are also able to have an input into general technology strategy, bearing in mind that in many areas technological expertise and advice is essential. Nonetheless, if our community and Governments are to develop policies in this vital area then they must be widely debated and the debate must not be confined to the experts, whether in fact or self-styled.

During the last election campaign I made a series of commitments for a future Labor Government to policies designed to assist the modernisation of South Australian industry and the broadening of our economic base. The central component of that programme was the promotion and development of new technologies. New technologies, of course, are not the only factors that will contribute to the renewal of our vital manufacturing base. We also need better corporate management, better marketing research, better design, better product quality, and easier access to venture capital.

However, new technologies must be adopted if South Australian industry is to compete with its interstate and overseas competitors. The technology strategy that we are considering today highlights why technological advances are vital for South Australia and how important changes can be implemented. Obviously, this is a long-term goal. We are not talking about overnight panaceas; indeed, many of the problems set out in this strategy are daunting. But, during the past 12 months alone, a great deal has been achieved in this State, and I am confident that progress will accelerate if there is a bipartisan and tripartite commitment.

It is not only the South Australian Government that is placing a high priority on technology. It is significant that today the Prime Minister will be making a statement to the House of Representatives on the development of a national technology strategy.

We have also been fortunate during the past 12 months to have a Federal Minister for Science and Technology (Mr Barry Jones), who has made a massive personal commitment to technological advance. Indeed, his book *Sleepers awake* has been a key document in the developing technological debate in Australia. I commend it to all members as a very good overview of the state of technology and the tremendous potential and challenge it poses.

I am sure members will be aware that at the national level a new Council of Industries and Technology Ministers has already been established. Last October the Federal Government convened a national technology conference which did a great deal to raise awareness and set the agenda on important technological issues. The Commonwealth has also adopted the Espie Report on Technology and has created the Economic Planning and Advisory Council (of which I am a member), which has recognised the importance of new technologies in Australia's economic planning.

My decision, following the election, to give responsibility for technology to the Minister of Education was not a coincidence. It was a recognition of the critical role that education must play in fulfilling the aspirations of this strategy. Two organisations relating to technology were already in place when the Government was elected. These were the Technology Park Adelaide Corporation and the Council on Technological Change. I pay credit to the current Opposition for establishing these organisations while in Government. Both organisations have a critical role to play in this strategy and both have the full support of my Government.

After the election we determined that there was considerably more that needed to be done. Because of that, a new Department of State Development and a Ministry of Technology were created. The task of implementing this strategy will not be the sole responsibility of the Ministry of Technology. It is a strategy for the whole Government, including all departments and statutory authorities, and for all South Australians. Any technological strategy of the type before this House—and this is the first in Australia—must recognise that diverse interests must be accommodated. The document is, therefore, an attempt to build a broad base of support from all sections of the community. To achieve consensus will require give and take by all sides. What is clear, however, is that any sacrifices, as well as the rewards, must be shared equally by all sections of the community. This document attempts to point out where they must be made.

The Government is deeply committed to making steady but fundamental changes to improve our community and our economy. However, these changes must be made at a digestible rate. Because of this the Government is committed, where possible, to making changes through promotion, agreement and advocacy rather than by regulation. We have no intention of setting up a bureaucratic machine to oversee technology. The Ministry of Technology will be kept as a small organisation that will develop goals, act as a catalyst for programmes to be implemented by others and audit performance. The document we are examining is by no means a final product. It will be rewritten to reflect the opinions given in this House, as well as those received from the community. The final document will then be presented to Cabinet for adoption. In the lead-up, of course, the Government has already undertaken a large number of initiatives, and I want to mention just some of them.

A review of Government industrial incentives is currently under way and the working party will report to the

Government in the middle of this year. We want to ensure that our system of incentives fully complements Federal programmes. They must promote innovation and new economic opportunities in South Australia, rather than simply be a device to prop up languishing or 'lame duck' industries.

The Government is currently reviewing its purchasing procedures, including those which are the responsibility of the Supply and Tender Board, and those of Government statutory authorities. Our aim is to ensure that the Government's purchasing programme assists innovative and creative Australian ventures, particularly those utilising new technologies. This review will be completed by the middle of this year.

The Government has also established an Education and Technology Task Force, the terms of which are outlined in this strategy. It aims to define the goals and set out action plans for all sections of the education system, from early childhood to post-tertiary levels. I am delighted that the South Australian Minister of Education and Minister for Technology has also convinced the Australian Education Council to establish a national task force which will complement our own.

During my policy speech I emphasised that we would give strong backing to ensuring that Technology Park Adelaide became a reality. To ensure this, the Government has provided funds to build Innovation House at the Park, and this will be opened in the next few weeks. The aim of Innovation House is to provide a 'nursery' environment for fledgling new ventures in the high technology area.

The new Adelaide Centre for Innovation and Development, which has just opened for business, has been located within Innovation House. It will advise and assist would-be innovators to turn good inventions into commercially successful innovations. It will provide advice on marketing, technology, finance and the preparation of business plans.

The Government and the Technology Park Adelaide Corporation are also working very hard to attract new ventures to Technology Park. We welcomed the announcement last year that British Aerospace was moving its Adelaide operations to the Park. The Government is, of course, in the process of establishing an enterprise fund designed to pump investment into innovative South Australian ventures that have a real chance of growth.

The Government has established the first of several promotion committees designed to advance 'key technologies'. The first is concerned with bio-technology and will be launched at a special ceremony on Monday. These promotion committees are designed to enable researchers to work with corporate managers to ensure the successful transfer of technological expertise to the private sector. Bio-technology is an area where South Australia has great potential. With only 8 per cent of the Australian population it is significant that this State gained almost half of the first series of Commonwealth grants for research and development in the bio-technology area.

The Government has assisted the Department of Technical and Further Education to establish at its Regency Park College a bureau in computer aided design and computer aided manufacture. A new centre in rubber and plastics technology has also been established at the same college. We want to ensure that South Australian educational institutions have the most advanced technologies available, and we are currently pursuing other developments in this area.

In addition, I can announce today that our Small Business Corporation will include a computer advisory unit for small business, with assistance from the Common-

wealth Department of Science and Technology. This will allow small businesses to have access to the latest equipment and advice in order to improve competitiveness and profitability.

The Government, with the Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the UTLC is currently making a strong bid to secure the \$1.5 million RAN submarine replacement programme. Our commitment to securing a role in defence offsets and the satellite industry is an essential part of our strategy to maximise South Australia's expertise and work force skills in high technology industries.

The initiatives are based in turn, on a long tradition and experience in this area. They tie in well with the light manufacturing sector in South Australia and some of the advances and developments undertaken in the years since the Second World War when, of course, South Australia was a major component of our defence infra-structure and our defence supply.

These are just a few of the initiatives the Government has developed during the past year. The Minister for Technology will mention others, and of course there will be further announcements in the next couple of months. But all of them taken together, I believe, represent a very comprehensive package in many areas of Government and private sector activity to advance the cause and development of technology and innovation.

But it must be remembered that the responsibility for technology does not rest with Governments alone. Our community must be committed to ensuring that this State is the Australian pace-setter in high technology. A very special responsibility, of course, rests with executive management in the private sector. It must make every effort to promote and foster greater innovation, promote increased research and development, and provide funding for that research and development capacity, and be more willing to reward initiative than it has in the past. It must also show a greater willingness to consult with its work force on the impact of technological change.

Similarly, the trade union movement must recognise that significant changes are under way and that in some sectors jobs will continue to disappear. The important thing to ensure is that that change does not take place at a rate that is socially disruptive and costly, and that, equally, where jobs are rendered superfluous or redundant, new jobs and skills are created in order to provide opportunities for those who have either been displaced or have not the appropriate technological training to take advantage of other opportunities. Technological change must be used to create those new opportunities, those new projects, and more jobs. Technological advances must not only be equated with the more efficient manufacture of existing products, although that in itself is an important role in technology.

Existing businesses, with a strong record of performance, in order to remain competitive, shift to export orientation because the size of our domestic market is not sufficient in this day and age to maintain long term a number of such enterprises, must ensure that they are up with the latest technology, and are prepared to invest in it and to ensure that they remain fully competitive.

Technology has an important role in the upgrading and producing of greater efficiency in manufacture in our existing establishments. But, equally, it must also provide new opportunities, new jobs.

South Australia has earned a national reputation in the area of design excellence. We must also develop a reputation for technological and entrepreneurial innovation. Again, the role of our education system becomes paramount. Through it we must help create the conditions where the skills of creative and entrepreneurial people are recognised, developed and rewarded. Australian intellectual and creative resources

have too often been separated from our broader economic system. But, ultimately, this technology strategy is about people—about human resources and how we use them, and about how we create the opportunities and quality of life for all our population. This issue is fundamental to our future growth and prosperity.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports the basic concept of improving the environment for implementing technological improvements to benefit South Australia and thereby the aims of the technology strategy proposed by the Government. In many ways, this technology strategy is simply a statement of problems which have existed for some time in the industrial and especially the manufacturing sectors of the economy. It presents general solutions to those problems which are already well known in many cases.

Although it attempts to offer some solutions to the structural problems of South Australian industry, I do not believe that any strategy for the implementation of technology, no matter how farsighted or how well put together, can hope to succeed while some of the other policies of the present State and Federal Governments remain in place. I refer specifically to high taxation policies.

The Liberal Party recognises that South Australian industry has found it increasingly difficult to compete with overseas products and that unemployment is an unavoidable consequence of this. Manufacturing industry in recent times has been severely treated by the ravages of recession and the obsolescence of its methods, production, skills and equipment.

The most pressing need in Australia at the moment is to reduce unemployment on a permanent basis, and to do so, as is widely accepted, our manufacturing industry must be revitalised and incentives given to invest and so create more job opportunities for young South Australians and young Australians. Manufacturing industry in Australia represents 23 per cent of gross domestic product while agriculture and mining provide 10 per cent combined. That is not to denigrate the roles that both these last two sectors play in the South Australian economy. While both these industries are in turn important to the South Australian economy, we have, since the last war, relied upon a viable manufacturing base for employment and the wealth of our economy.

The major problem associated with an emphasis on manufacturing as the basis for our economy is that as an employer it has undergone some very fundamental changes. While in 1965 manufacturing industry employed 27 per cent of the Australian work force, in 1983 this figure had dropped to 18 per cent. This figure must be corrected especially in the case of South Australia whose work force has traditionally relied on manufacturing. As the paper states, South Australia's manufacturing sector is closely tied to the production of consumer durables, such as motor vehicles, white goods and car components. Japan is well known as a large importer of technology—all this has meant that its economy has grown enormously whilst those of some other Western countries have remained relatively stagnant.

While Japan has been quick to act and import technology and use it to its own advantage, Australian industry has been remiss in investing in new technologies and, as a contrast to the phenomenal growth of the Japanese economy since the war, our economy has seen virtually no growth at all in the past few years. One of the most telling pieces of information is that last year, for the first time ever, Australia became a net importer of goods from Japan. As I have already stated, the most pressing need in the Australian economy is the need to create more jobs.

It is desirable that these jobs be permanent and that they fulfil a demand for those skills needed to create a wider

and more solid industrial base. The most important aspect of this technology strategy is that which concentrates on the employment of South Australians. In the past, technology has been viewed by many as a job-displacer. I cite the example of the campaign by the bank officer unions when automatic teller machines were first introduced in Australia. There is no evidence to suggest now that this technology had the effects that the banking unions suggested it would at that time. All that has happened is that more staff have been able to be deployed in other areas of banking, such as marketing, diversification of services and the expansion of the range of facilities offered by the banks and other financial institutions. I can also recall a time when the Vehicle Builders Union protested strongly at the implementation of robots in its industry. The role of government must be to ensure that—

(1) those displaced by a decline in the demand for their skills are retrained;

and

(2) that the industries which are likely to create the most jobs and produce demand are encouraged to set up their operations in this State as opposed to elsewhere.

The former Government recognised the clear need for South Australian industry to restructure, diversify its product range, and invest in new technologies. It recognised the potential of South Australia as a technology centre. The implementation of Technology Park was a major initiative by the former Tonkin Administration which has put South Australia on the map as far as technological advancement and innovation are concerned.

As well as establishing Australia's first Technology Park, which has been a major contributor to South Australia's reputation in the high-tech field, the Council on Technological Change was established by the former Government. That Government was successful in attracting Raytheon International, a major computer manufacturer, to establish its Australian factory in South Australia and it helped to establish a biotechnology company at Adelaide University. The Industrial Design Council was also revitalised. A nucleus for an electronics industry was established with the advent of VLSI, a computer chip research group. It is pleasing that the Government has continued with the initiatives put in place by the former Liberal Government. Hopefully, it will be able to come up with far more specific strategies than have been presented in this paper.

The Liberal Party agrees that much can be done at a State level to aid the further implementation of technology into South Australian industries and firms. The encouragement of management investment companies (MICs) is very desirable in the light of the Federal Government's recently announced tax relief scheme for investment in high technology type industries. If the proposed enterprise fund is successful in one of its principal aims (the encouragement of new ventures which concentrate on high-technological innovation), it will be to the benefit of the State's economy as a whole. Certainly, the number of proposed MICs which have already been set up in South Australia indicates the level of interest in implementing and investing in new technologies. Despite the fact that only eight licences will be issued by the Commonwealth in the current financial year, it is hoped that at least one and possibly two licences might be awarded to South Australian MICs.

The Opposition welcomes the commitment contained in the strategy to concentrate some effort on the education of both the South Australian work force and the general public. Although the advent of technological change has affected people through practical and first-hand experience of these changes (such as the gradual increase in the number of automatic teller machines as opposed to banking in the traditional across-the-counter method, the increase in the

use of computers in the home and by businesses (even the use of self-service petrol pumps with payment by credit card), there still needs to be a widespread education of those people whose livelihood is directly affected by any innovation being implemented. There are still a great many people in the community who do not understand the ramifications of technological change on their lives and on the economic life of the State.

We welcome also the reference in the strategy to protecting the privacy of individuals from interference facilitated by technology. The Liberal Party's roots are firmly founded in the concept of the rights of the individual and any moves to protect those rights are desirable. This is one area where regulation is acceptable, and the Opposition will look forward to legislation being introduced to ensure this protection. I am also pleased that the Government has given a commitment to look at the question of management education. Management must become more informed about the desirability, suitability and effects of various technological changes. It must also be educated as to the very clear need for far more research and development to be undertaken on its own initiative.

It was the Liberal Party which helped to establish the enterprise workshops at the Elton Mayo School of Management at the South Australian Institute of Technology, and I am glad that the Government has continued to support it. Private sector research and development is far too low when compared with other countries. The private sector contributes only 21 per cent to 23 per cent of the total amount expended on research and development in Australia, while in Japan, for example, the private sector spends 70 per cent of total funds spent. While Australia ranks in the middle of OEDC nations in terms of Government expenditure on research and development, it falls to very near the bottom in terms of gross expenditure on research and development because private industry spends so little. In Sweden, funding of research and development expressed as a percentage of GDP by business is more than five times greater than that in Australia. As a result, the Swedes sell us \$5 worth of finished goods for every \$1 we sell to them.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: They have tax incentives.

Mr OLSEN: The tax incentive proposal is quite a valid one, and my opening remarks were that we need to ensure that high taxing policies do not act as a disincentive to the development and investment of funds in this area. If Australia is to become an importer of licensed technology, the long-term effects on our economy will be very beneficial indeed.

The Liberal Party believes that, in discussing technology implementation into the South Australian industrial sphere, the Government must be mindful of the existing manufacturing base and what specific changes will best suit our industries. We must be mindful of the suitability of new methods and products to the firms and industries which are already in operation here. To ignore the existing base would be foolish and may mean that the beneficial effects of any innovations are lost completely. Any future proposals and strategies should concentrate on the specific nature of South Australian industry and not attempt to deal with the entire gamut of possible technological innovation. Suitability is as important as is the actual process of implementation.

To conclude, the Liberal Party appreciates the opportunity to debate the technology strategy in Parliament. While somewhat disappointed at the general way in which many important aspects of technological change are treated in the paper, I hope that this debate will be the first of a number and that it is a starting point for future specific strategies to be introduced and debated by Parliament. I also look forward to seeing the results of the Government's inquiry into the range of programmes to assist industry in due

course as well as the review of the public sector to determine those activities having commercial potential in the high technology area.

Mr KLUNDER (Newland): Much of the business of this House is the debating of legislation brought before it. As such, the House tends to deal for a large part of its time with minutia—something that I can perhaps gently parody a little by commenting that we are often concerned with the placement of a comma in paragraph (5) of sub-clause (12) of clause 35 of an amending Bill. This debate provides a welcome contrast, and I commend the Minister and his Department for enabling this House to deal with the broad issues of an important measure for the future of this State. Having said that, it comes perhaps as somewhat of a surprise for me to have to state that the first response engendered in me by this document was a strong sense of regret. The sense of regret does not come from anything the document said but from the fact that in my opinion it is 46 years too late.

Without going into the merits or demerits of the document at this stage, I will take the position that the economic state and economic future of South Australia would have been enormously different if this document had advanced as far as a White Paper and had had a number of its recommendations implemented 46 years ago. I think I can illustrate the importance of this document by digressing to what happened and what might have happened to South Australia. In 1938 an invention was made by several South Australians working in this State which could basically be described as firing electrons on to zinc oxide coated paper, discharging some of those electrons by lights, and then dipping that piece of paper into a highly volatile covalent liquid which contained fine particles and a resin, so that when it came out of there the particles had been fixed into position by that resin.

That process is known generally as photocopying and the inventors were Mr K. Metcalfe and Mr A. Clements who were working for the Commonwealth Government in South Australia. When I spoke to Mr Metcalfe about 15 years ago, he was still working at Finsbury for the Defence Standards Laboratories. I thoroughly appreciated the afternoon I spent with him when he brought a friend of mine and me up to the state of the then art of colour photocopying. We went away inspired to experiment albeit at a much lower level of intellectual ability than the level in the Defence Standards Laboratories at that time. Indeed, if it were not for the tremendous demands that this place imposes on its members I might still be fiddling happily in my garage with colour photocopying. Page 14 of the document tabled by the Minister of Technology brought this personal regret to mind, where it states:

Information and referral services will be provided... These services will cover technical, finance, patents, marketing, management assistance and manufacture.

I refer particularly to the word 'patents', which brought to my mind a whole range of events starting with an approach by Mr Metcalfe and Mr Clements to the Commonwealth Government in 1938, when they asked whether they could patent in their own names some of the photo-copying processes that they had invented. The Commonwealth Government at that time refused permission for them to do, so they went back to the Commonwealth Government and asked whether they could patent these processes in the name of the Commonwealth Government, but permission for that was also refused. They then breached that ruling and patented some of those processes, without Commonwealth permission, in the name of the Commonwealth Government. Some of those patents, if not all of them, were sold some years ago. I understand that Australia benefited from this major inven-

tion by about \$1 million a year for some years, that various organisations profited by \$30 million a year, and that the major international organisations which sell and service photo-copiers have since made enormous sums from this South Australian invention.

Compare the paltry \$1 million a year for some years with the process contemplated by the Green Paper. If the development of photo-copying had proceeded in South Australia under the guidelines contemplated by the Green Paper, licences could have been granted world-wide and the income from the invention would have made a magnificent difference to our balance of trade payments. Further, South Australia could have become a world-wide manufacturing centre with subsidiary industries such as electrical, optical, and microprocessing, as well as having the associated manufacturing base. No doubt, if that matter had been handled correctly the future of South Australia and the current economic state of South Australia would have been incredibly different from what it is today. I agree with the following statement appearing at page 15 of the document tabled:

Australia is a world leader in many research areas but has a dismal record of commercialisation.

As a postscript, I may add that, fortunately, there still appears to be some light at the end of the tunnel in this regard. Some work is proceeding in South Australia in the field of colour photo-copying which may be of significance. In this regard, I am happy that it is being helped by the State.

Earlier, I said that this document was of immense value because of its very existence, and I hope that I have illustrated its value by reference to what might have been the outcome to South Australia if the strategy foreseen by the Green Paper had operated in 1938. From time to time, great opportunities crop up on our front doorstep, but sadly we do not always grasp them. I hope that this document will help reduce our failure rate in this area. The Green Paper requires some things to be said about it. It is an optimistic document because, at a time when high technology is generally associated with the loss of jobs, it reminds us that jobs and prosperity can also be gained from high technology; because it reminds us of the great strengths which we as a people of South Australia have and can bring to bear on problems facing us; because it reminds us that a strong, dynamic and diverse economic future is possible; however, it is also somewhat too optimistic in that it contemplates co-operation on a scale not generally seen other than during wartime.

The Green Paper is an example of how the State Government, the public sector, can help the private sector to generate wealth. Although it may disappoint some economic troglodytes who see the State purely as a brake on private enterprise and who see private enterprise as the only possible saviour of the State, the work of the State, through a whole host of strategies and incentives, as well as through this technological strategy, is recognised by this document, as it must be recognised by reasonable people everywhere, as a necessary and important symbiosis if we are to make the most of our economic opportunities.

In a real sense, the Green Paper spells the death of the 19th century cult of amateurism and isolationism. It states that we can no longer afford the luxury of developing our various constituent parts in isolation: the various strands of our society that have input into technology must be prepared to rearrange their own structures, aims and philosophies around a common goal and those concerned with business, banking, design, management, marketing, education, research and government must all be willing to share the tasks, to note each other's priorities, and to be willing to submerge some of their prized notions of independence,

autonomy, purity of research and traditional methods under a need to observe a common goal.

In a report as comprehensive yet as short as this Green Paper, one could hardly be expected to agree with every statement, and there are some areas where I tend to disagree with the document. My areas of contention include the fact that the document encompasses both long-term and short-term aims but fails to differentiate between them; and that the document occasionally states complex problems in a way that implies that simple solutions are possible when I know full well that such solutions have been sought long and hard by capable people over many years and not found. For instance, what is the correct educational mixture that makes people into innovative thinkers? Another contentious issue is that Australia, by virtue of its small size, is forced into the international competitive market without the basis of a large home market to act as a back stop for its production. Problems such as these are raised but no solutions are suggested. Although raising such problems is better than ignoring them, it is an indication that, while in innovative terms the Green Paper is a major step forward, only a very small part of the total task has been done: that is, to translate this paper first into a White Paper and then into action.

In saying this, I do not wish in any way to decry the importance of the document. Indeed, this Green Paper is a major step in the right direction and its varied authors and progenitors should be congratulated on their foresight and envied for their ability. The document itself, albeit in a difficult context, contains the following statement, at page 7:

A State which has a sound reputation in these areas is more likely to attract entrepreneurs.

Indeed, the Green Paper itself will help establish for this State a sound reputation in this area.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport): At the outset, I compliment the Government for sponsoring a debate on the strategy to develop South Australian technology. It is an unusual debate and one that many members on this side would have welcomed more had it been longer because they then could all participate.

Certainly, I think that it is important to point out now that the debate has been limited to 2½ hours, which has excluded automatically a number of members on this side of the House from making a contribution. I want to say that their non-participation in the debate is by no means through a lack of interest in the subject. I also compliment the Government on trying to set out to achieve a strategy on technology for South Australia. It is, after all, the very role that Governments should be playing; I personally have felt very strongly about Governments in the past not doing that sort of planning. When Governments plan it need not be necessarily a complete interference with the economic system, but that does not mean that in putting forward a private enterprise point of view Governments do not have a role to establish a leadership and a framework and to lay out the policies, even though those policies require a strong input from the private sector to be finally achieved.

It comes through from the document that there is a very delicate balance as to what role the Government has and what roles the private sector and other sectors play. I would like to touch on that in more detail. I also compliment the people who have worked so hard in preparing, first, the initial draft that was released last year and now what we can say is the final draft of the Green Paper and who will now obviously have the difficult task of preparing the White Paper. They have obviously put tremendous thought and effort into it and I think that they have opened up a very broad and wide debate. In commenting on the report (and my comments in certain areas will be critical, in fact very

critical at times), I stress that I think that it is important that this be a constructive but positive debate which highlights where changes need to be made to the report. In making those comments in no way will I be reflecting on the people who have prepared the draft so far.

Without some sort of critical debate along these lines, I think that any debate would simply be a political grandstanding in this House and that is the last thing that Australia or South Australia needs in relation to technology. First, it is pertinent to consider what we are trying to achieve in any strategy. The *Webster* dictionary defines 'strategy' as follows:

The science and art of employing the political, economic, psychological and military forces of a nation to afford the maximum support to adopted policies.

A second definition states:

The art of devising or employing plans towards a goal.

The second definition in particular, although the first one is also quite pertinent, I think highlights what we are trying to achieve in this strategy paper. Therefore, in setting about those objectives laid down by that definition of 'strategy', we can break it down into several fairly simple steps. I do that because, frankly, I believe that the report should have done so without trying to tackle the whole area of technology in such a broad brush approach without coming to more specific recommendations.

First, the report should have tried to assess accurately where South Australia is now in comparison with other States of Australia and nations overseas on the subject of technology. Whilst it makes some passing reference to certain attributes, it does not come down with an overall assessment of the present position of the State, and I will refer to that in some detail. Secondly, I believe that the report should have considered specific resources in this State not only where we are but also what resources we have that can be used and engaged in the area of developing technology. Again, I think that there are some serious omissions. Whilst the paper pays tribute to certain areas of expertise, it does not try to come to any summation of what experience and expertise we have in this State at present and how we can use those resources in developing the strategy.

The report fails to highlight certain advantages and disadvantages that this State has. Some of those advantages, such as lifestyle (which I think is so critical in attracting the most appropriate or key people from other parts of the world) are enormously important to this State. We cannot over-estimate them. Reference has been made by the Premier this afternoon to Raytheon International, which I suppose was finally attracted to South Australia because the Government put up a package that was hard to knock back, but also because the Managing Director of the company wanted to live on a hobby farm not far from his work. It is small things like that to which I refer. I recall that we flew the Managing Director to Adelaide and talked about the development of that company here. However, on the same day we took him off to show him some hobby farms already on the market for sale. Whilst the company made its ultimate decision on the basis of economic factors and the best location, including technical back-up, there is no doubt that personal factors do play a part. Interestingly, in that case the Managing Director of the company had not even considered Adelaide as a possible location. In fact, he had never been to Adelaide. That is an example of how we must get out and sell. We do not really appreciate some of the advantages: we take them for granted.

The third matter to which I believe any strategy paper must refer is our goals—what we are trying to achieve. I think it is fair to say that the paper deals with that matter, but it deals with it in an extremely broad approach—so broad that one could say that it set no priorities and was

too broad, simply being a position paper rather than a strategy paper. Finally, any report like this must emphasise what tools we need to achieve these objectives and goals. How do we amend our education system? What technical back-up do we need? What assistance from Government do we need? What are the actual mechanisms by which we will achieve these goals and objectives that we have set for our State?

Again, I compliment the report for highlighting a large number of these points, but I do not think that it has attempted to quantify them and perhaps put them in terms of priority in achieving those tools that we so badly need. Therefore, I believe that that is the sort of approach that this report must start to take. I would ask the people involved in the rewrite of the report to consider that sort of emphasis.

I return to the first point—where we are at present. The Leader of the Opposition summed that up very well in his speech. With the development of Technology Park; the complete revision of industrial and commercial training in South Australia; the establishment of the CSIRO computer chip research unit; several significant electronic companies being established in South Australia; the promotion of industrial design; the establishment and promotion of entrepreneurial workshops in South Australia; the creation of a bio-technology company at Adelaide University; and other initiatives I believe that by 1982 this State was well placed to become what the Liberal Government had set out to achieve—South Australia as the technological centre of Australia.

Although that is a catch phrase, it is an objective that we must strive to achieve. We should aim to be the technological centre of Australia. I compliment the Government on following the initiative that was laid down. I was delighted that the present Government through the Premier immediately picked up without hesitation the Innovation House project, which was well advanced at the time of the change of Government, and allocated funds for the construction. I am concerned that in some of the practical areas much of the momentum that was being developed has been lost. In a constructive way, I will say why I think that it has been lost. The debate on developing technology in South Australia has become too broad and too philosophical; it has looked at the pros and cons of the technological debate rather than considering specifically what initiatives we need to maintain in South Australia.

I am concerned to see the extent to which the South Australian Council on Technological Change, which until 1982 had done an excellent job in preparing technology impact statements and bringing to the attention of the public the technological changes that were commencing, seems to have been pushed into the back rooms.

I know that the council is still in existence and that it is still working, but it seems to have lost the momentum and prominence that it had in putting forward a debate to the public. Also, a number of significant developments which were taking place in this State in relation to Technology Park in 1983 do not seem to have proceeded. It concerns me that those companies have not proceeded with the development there. I do not know the reason why but I suspect that it relates partly to the international recession that occurred and certainly to the recession that occurred in Australia in 1982, which created an uncertain business environment. Due to my involvement with this matter previously as Minister for Technology, I know that several people were about to build facilities. It disturbs me that 18 months later those facilities still have not been built.

The Government must put its best effort into this. It will require a great deal of energy. I am not suggesting for a moment that the Government is not pushing Technology Park, but it will require resources and energy to get the first

two or three private enterprise facilities established at Technology Park so that the rest will then flow from that. Experience overseas shows that the first two or three enterprises that form the nucleus of high technology private industry attract other industries to come in, and that is vital. That seed must be planted very quickly if Technology Park is to succeed. I think that the Minister knows the extent to which that is a personal ambition of mine, and I would do anything in my power to achieve it.

It is important to look at the whole scene of technology in both Australia and South Australia. I commend the Federal Government for setting up the summit on technology late last year. It has become a very general debate and it is now time to become more specific in what we are trying to achieve. A fundamental step we need to take is to look at what other countries have done in trying to develop their technology. There are lessons to be learnt from that experience. In the United States, Silicone Valley in California is almost entirely dependent on the private sector. It is a high technology industry which feeds upon itself with no Government incentives and no Government initiatives being required except in regard to land being made available. It is growing at an unbelievable rate. In Canada the Federal Government is very actively involved in promoting high technology in certain key areas such as satellite technology and other areas like that, where it provides resources for both private and Government enterprises. It is fair to say that some success has been achieved, but there has also been some failure.

I looked at developments in France in 1982, and it is interesting to see the developments that have occurred under the Mitterrand Government since that time. Possibly no Government in the world has ever decided to commit more resources and put more emphasis on economic recovery tied to high technology than has the French Government. Unfortunately, that has failed because of the techniques that were adopted. It has not been a total failure, but overall it has failed. My brother is involved in a high technology area in Paris and he has said that at present the French Government is trying to quietly slip away from the previous policies it instituted and is rethinking the stand it took.

Then there are the quite different techniques used in the Scandinavian countries, particularly in Sweden where in the 1970s there was a very high cost structure. That country was less competitive on international markets than were other countries and it was seriously losing its position. In conjunction, the Government and private industry there have developed very special roles whereby they can specialise in certain areas and in the past three or four years they have been very successful in turning the economy around through the use of technology.

I think Australia needs to assess what its position should be and how it should try to achieve technological advance. Of course, I should have added that the Japanese model is quite different again, where there is incredible co-operation between the Federal Government and the large investors and private companies. They achieve a co-operation that perhaps no other country, at least in the Western world, has been able to achieve between those two sectors. In doing that they put aside company competition and major companies work together to attempt to beat their competitors from other countries.

I would stress that the paper needs to develop public debate about what style and strategy we should specifically adopt here in South Australia. I think it has failed to do that. In fact, my criticism of the paper is that it is more a position paper rather than a strategy paper. As such it could just as well apply to Poland or San Francisco as it does to South Australia. In being so general, and in being a position paper rather than a strategy paper the problem is that it has

failed to look at what the priority ought to be. We all know that the human, technical and financial resources of the Government, the community and private companies are limited. If resources are limited, it is important to pick out the key priorities in a strategy. It is fair to say that the report lists under many areas a number of different options, but nowhere does it sort out priorities. I urge the Minister and the technical officers involved in rewriting the report to give some thought to those priorities, otherwise we will find that the Government will be chasing rabbits in all directions and not making any headway in achieving an overall objective.

Interestingly, the paper highlights some of the things that existing companies need to adopt and the attitudes that exist within those companies. However, it also places great emphasis on the need of sunrise industries. To a certain extent I think that Labor Governments in South Australia and federally (and I have been critical about this previously) have placed too much emphasis on sunrise industries and too little emphasis on our existing manufacturing sector and on how we are to get new technologies into those existing companies.

If we decide to set up sunrise industries at the expense of what I think the Minister last night referred to on television as being smoke-stack industries (or existing industries), there will be enormous human and social costs involved, because the majority of people and financial resources locked into existing companies will have to come out of those enterprises and go into other companies. Experience has shown that the trauma of that would be far too great. So, what is far more important and what will produce more rapid results is the introduction of new technology into those existing enterprises. They need to consider whether they can adopt new product ranges and new manufacturing techniques and the training programmes that they should implement for their existing employees. I think that needs to be the first priority. To a certain extent I suppose I am saying that it involves a balance between what exists at present and what can be put into it in terms of getting industries to change their thinking rather than our placing too much emphasis on entirely new enterprises.

I would urge both this Government and the Federal Government to rethink the emphasis they are trying to place on sunrise industries, because, ultimately, it will be the wrong emphasis and will incur enormous costs for Australia. Australian manufacturing industry is undergoing a very significant and permanent decline. The Leader of the Opposition highlighted the decline in saying that the workforce has been reduced from 27 per cent to 18 per cent. There is no doubt that this will continue, and at a very rapid rate. Therefore, some thought needs to be given as to how we can very quickly mobilise additional resources to allow those companies, which have limited financial reserves locked into existing manufacturing processes, to relocate their resources into new products and new techniques while at the same time maintaining their employment potential.

It is the old argument: 'You are on the decline; you cannot compete'. However, where does one get the resources and the finance to pull out of that decline and to go off into new areas? It is an area which is extremely difficult and must be done in the private sector, and that is where Governments can help, certainly not in trying to take over from the private sector but perhaps by making resources available through loan capital, by certain tax concessions, and by trying to stimulate the training of the existing employees within private enterprise.

One disadvantage that Australian manufacturers have had to bear for many years with successive Federal Governments, both Labor and Liberal, is the poor depreciation allowances on new equipment and facilities. Those countries whose

industries out perform ours almost inevitably have much more generous depreciation allowances than we have here. In other words our industries just cannot afford to re-equip themselves and the report unfortunately glosses over and at times ignores some of these fundamental and essential issues.

I mentioned earlier that the report was very general in terms of what technologies it was dealing with. What is important is that the report should start to look at individual technologies and pick out which ones will be the important ones. This is the mistake that the French have made: they have looked at technology in general, whereas some technologies will expand and develop at a far greater rate than others. In South Australia with our limited resources and opportunities we need to pick the right technologies. No doubt the information and communication technologies, which are all associated with the electronic industry and the development of the computer chip, will be the area of expansion and it is therefore the area we need to turn our attention to in trying to attract new industries to this State or expand our existing industries.

I will read to the House some figures that highlight the sort of growth that will occur in the micro computer and the personal computer areas. In the United States of America, in 1982, sales were \$1800 million and by 1986 it is predicted by the industry that there will be \$4600 million worth of sales in the USA. In Australia, the figure for 1982 was \$43 million, and by 1986 it is anticipated it will be \$120 million worth of sales. That shows the sort of explosion that is occurring in the electronic and micro computer areas, and that is where attention needs to be focused.

Whilst bio-technology and other areas like that have growth potential, their growth potential may well be down the track—it may be 15 years before that potential can be realised in terms of any significant employment opportunities. The report needs to be much more specific in what technologies it is to deal with, because we do not have the resources to cover all of the technologies. If we were Japan it might be another matter, but we are South Australia, and we do not have the opportunities that other areas have.

Finally, I turn to the area of education, because there is no doubt that a fundamental tool in trying to achieve these objectives must be initiated in our education, first, in primary and secondary schools, then our tertiary training, and certainly in our universities and CAEs. Education is a key part of any technology strategy. The report recommends an idealistic approach to cope with change. However, when the report is compared with the reality of our education system, we can see that a huge credibility gap exists. Take a practical example: our primary and secondary education system is slow, ineffective and inadequate in adapting to the role that computers should be playing within our community, and within the education system. A basic awareness of the use and role of a computer should now be an essential part of learning, as is reading and writing. However, our schools are poorly equipped with computers, and those that are there were bought with parents funds through the school councils rather than through educational funds supplied by the Government. Few teachers have been taught basic computer awareness, and how to use the computer as an educational aid. At the present level of training it will be many years before such teachers have skills available to use computers as an educational tool.

To put it bluntly, when it comes to computer training in schools, our existing effort is pathetic. We are slipping further behind other countries, and there is still no sign that the State Government is responding to the crisis. In making those comments, I am not being critical of the computer centre at Angle Park. I believe that it is trying, but it does not have the resources needed. I know that on this aspect

my colleague, the member for Torrens, will comment in far greater detail shortly. If it is like that for the most important piece of technology that will affect our community, why has not the report highlighted these inadequacies and recommended more specific remedial action in the educational area?

Again, I come back to the point that it was more a general position paper and a philosophic argument on the role of education and technology, rather than coming down to the realities of what we are trying to achieve. It is important that South Australia develops, as I said earlier, a bi-partisan approach, and I believe that it is possible to achieve it. This debate will be a significant step forward in encouraging further debate in the community on some of these issues. I wish the Government every success. It is so vital to the long-term stability of the South Australian economy, it is so vital to come up with other employment opportunities that this State is losing in its traditional manufacturing, and it is vital to the well being and the standard of living that South Australians will have in the future.

Technological change will have an impact upon us in the next 15 years that few of us will appreciate. It is best summed up by what one computer expert said to me as to what he saw as the impacts or the changes about to be. He said 'Add up all of the impact and changes that the motor vehicle has had on our Western society over the past 80 years', and, he said 'the computer chip will have a significant impact of that magnitude or greater on our community in the next 15 years.' If one looks at the extent to which our personal resources and earnings are spent on the motor vehicle, the time spent in a motor vehicle, the pride and status one gives a motor vehicle, the standing that motor vehicles have in the community in terms of Government resources, building streets, roads and highways, and parking stations etc., one starts to realise that the computer chip alone will have an enormous impact on our society. It is that sort of impact that we need to be flexible enough to cope with, astute enough to use the advantages of, but most importantly of all to make sure that when it does occur, it occurs to the benefit of our society and not to our disadvantage.

Ms LENEHAN (Mawson): I feel honoured to be able to participate in this historic debate today. On reading the report *A Technology Strategy for South Australia*, one is struck by the underlying philosophy which like a thread is skilfully woven into the fabric. That thread represents a commitment to the introduction of technology as a means of generating wealth and economic growth that will benefit the whole society, not only a technological or economic elite. The document states that it has as a prime objective the highest possible level of community well being and future prosperity of all South Australians.

As well as identifying the underlying structural problems, it also identifies a number of general goals and strategies to meet this prime objective. In welcoming this strategy plan for South Australia, I refer to two specific areas that I believe are vitally important. The first is the question of technological change and its impact on the specifically disadvantaged sections of the workforce. The strategy itself identifies these groups as the unskilled, the aged, the disabled, the unemployed, Aborigines, and women.

In particular, I wish to examine the impact of women's employment in respect to technological change. In a paper delivered at the National Summit Conference on Technology in September 1983, the Prime Minister, Bob Hawke, identified the position of women in the work force with respect to technological change. He said:

Despite the apparent improvement in the socio-economic position of women, the unfortunate fact is that the overall situation

of women in the workforce has not undergone the revolutionary changes suggested by the historically significant upsurge in their general participation rates. During the 1970s almost two-thirds of the growth of female employment consisted of part-time jobs—with all the disadvantages normally associated with part-time and casual employment: poor conditions and the reality of low-skilled activity with few career openings. Women have also been concentrated in 'traditionally female' activities: clerical and sales and service occupations still account for over 60 per cent of the female workforce in Australia.

In a recent report from the Task Force on Women's Employment and Unemployment, December 1983, which was commissioned by the South Australian Minister of Labor, Jack Wright, it was shown that in the period 1974-1982 women in South Australia lost 9 100 full-time jobs overall, while they gained 22 700 part-time positions. Specifically, in the same period 9 000 jobs in the occupational group, which included process workers, were lost. While in the clerical area there has not been an overall loss of full-time employment, many full-time jobs have now become part-time. This particularly disadvantages young women in the 15 to 19 years age group who are entering the labour market for the first time.

Obviously, any discussion of the labour market must include reference to the primary and secondary segments. The primary segment is characterised by high status, stable employment, high skill requirements, high earnings, and good prospects for advancement, while the secondary segment displays the opposite traits—low status, high turnover and employment instability, low skill requirements, low earnings, and few advancement opportunities. Women dominate the secondary segment.

What can be the likely impact of technological change on the socio-economic position of women workers? The probability is that women workers will be among the most seriously disadvantaged if technology improvements are effected in the absence of specific and appropriate strategies to address the position of the secondary worker. I again quote from the Prime Minister's statement:

Unless radical changes are consciously sought in the traditional labour market the position of women and their possibilities for entry and advancement in the new technological elite among the working population will be considerably restricted.

The technological strategy has highlighted the fact that this community, and indeed this State, is at the crossroads. We can go forward with radical changes that will ensure the implementation of the goals of the strategy, or we can go backwards and reinforce the already disadvantaged social and economic position of those disadvantaged groups in our community.

Specifically, unless we adopt an affirmative action policy at the very beginning of our future implementation programme, then I believe future redundancy and deskilling will occur within the segment of the workforce to which I referred. The education area will be absolutely essential in this process where workers must have the opportunity to be re-educated, to be retrained, and reskilled.

Education must provide, as a general principle, the ability for individuals to become more flexible, to have a basic education that will enable them to adapt to change, and be prepared to undertake retraining.

The second point I wish to raise relates to my introduction and is in respect of the redistribution of wealth. If I have a criticism of the technology strategy it would be that in this area there are no specific strategies outlined for the process by which the wealth and economic benefits that are engendered by the introduction of new technologies will be redistributed to the rest of the community. Under the strategy for new technology, employment is being challenged as the major distributor of wealth, since industries that do not modernise will die out and those that do modernise will be the major areas where labour is displaced.

Skills and jobs are increasingly based on the implementation of changes, and are being turned over in less than a generation. Obviously, distinct education and work phases of life are no longer appropriate. If, as we hope and as is suggested in the strategy, the primary and secondary sectors will be developed to internationally competitive levels, and these levels have associated low employment to provide an economic base that is the wealth production for the welfare and tertiary sector, how can this wealth be transferred?

This is one of the points to which I would like the Department to address itself when producing a strategy for implementation. I conclude by asking the question: what is the future of those workers, particularly those disadvantaged and women to whom I have referred who are not the elite in a technological future?

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON (Torrens): I, too, congratulate the Minister and his officers on preparing this discussion paper. It is a Green Paper and, although I believe there are a few faults in it, about which I will say something in a few minutes, I hope I will be constructive in so doing. I congratulate the Minister for bringing forward this important subject for debate. I hope very much that when the Government White Paper, (which will represent Government policy) is produced we will have an opportunity to debate it because that will be even more important than today's debate. I hope we will have more time to do so than we have today.

I deal only with that part of the paper that addresses education. I do so because I will not have enough time to go any further, but I say at the outset that the education section of the paper is not a strategy. The paper itself defines various issues: it attempts to define society as we are experiencing it at the moment, and it attempts to define goals. The most important part of the education section is the delineation of the terms of reference and the goals of the education task force, which is to investigate how technology can be best applied to the education system. We will await with interest the results of that particular task force.

The Minister will have no more important committee under his command than that particular committee which must not bring forward a report that deals in generalities or motherhood statements. It must bring forward a report that deals with specific recommendations on specific strategy, and will address the issues that my colleague the member for Davenport mentioned on the question of computers in schools and technology in schools, and the question raised by the member for Mawson about the disadvantage of girls in the school system when it applies to technology and computers. I would hate to see the situation, which is becoming apparent, that will result in most of those students trained in computer programming (I am not talking about awareness) being males, and I think that would be a great shame and one that I would oppose.

I now address certain aspects of the education section of the report. I must compliment the author of the report for bringing to the fore the necessity of entrepreneurial skills in our society. If we are to be successful as a technological society the entrepreneurial skills will be paramount. Page 29 of the report states:

A higher level of self starting and entrepreneurial skills should be evident more than at present.

I stress again how important that statement is. I add to that that we need diversity as well. I sound a note of warning to the Minister, and I do not wish my words to be misinterpreted, but I believe that we are facing a situation in education where we will be harming the prospects of entrepreneurial skills being developed in the education system in South Australia. I believe that we are moving towards a common level in education, shall we say, a dull grey medi-

ocracy. That is not the case at present, but I think we could well be approaching that point. I say that because if we are to develop entrepreneurial skills, we have to support the pursuit of excellence amongst students. Excellence has become a dirty word over the past few years. I want the Minister to take my words in the broadest possible sense and not in the specific sense where it relates to elitism.

I do not support elitism in the school system. I do not support specific groups of students being encouraged to achieve excellence at the expense of others, but what I am saying is that I believe every student in the education system should be encouraged to achieve excellence consistent with his or her own educational plateau. That means that those students who are slow learners or who are disadvantaged should be encouraged all the more to strive for their plateau of excellence, but what is of paramount importance is that all students should be encouraged to achieve excellence. If they are not encouraged to achieve excellence, the entrepreneurial skills that this report emphasises so much will not be achieved and if entrepreneurial skills are not achieved we as a society will not reap the benefits of technology that we should, consistent with our standing as an OECD country of some importance and consistent with what the rest of the world expects of this country and what this country should expect of this State.

I make those comments advisedly: I do not wish to be portrayed as being a supporter of elitism. I am very much against the concept that excellence is a dirty word, as it must be striven for by all students whatever their economic situation and whatever their academic ability. The task force will have to address itself as a matter of extraordinary importance to one other aspect of education. On page 28 the report states:

Policies are needed to encourage adjustment to new occupational demands . . . improving the quality and effectiveness of post secondary programmes and the apprenticeship schemes.

[*Sitting suspended from 1 to 2 p.m.*]

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I believe that this area is one of the most important in the report because it concerns students who are about to leave secondary school and enter apprenticeship schemes. The Minister has already set up a liaison committee comprising officers of the Education Department and of the Technical and Further Education Department to consider this subject. If these students are to be able to cope with the technological society, the liaison between those two departments must be paramount. At page 28, the document states:

'An examination of participation issues reveals, among other things, an increasing but still unacceptably low participation rate in education beyond year 11'.

In this area the Minister has supported the principle that students stay on beyond year 10, and I have stressed the importance of the Minister's stand because I believe that students should stay on at school rather than try to get jobs and be refused.

However, I hope that the Minister realises that there is a danger here. Indeed, I hope that the Senior Secondary Assessment Board realises it, too, because the Board's work will have a great bearing on what happens to these students. Students should not stay on at school for post-secondary compulsory education merely because they are thereby under an employment umbrella. It would be disastrous for them if they were encouraged to stay on at secondary school merely to keep them off unemployment relief. They should stay on to fit themselves for participation in the work force. It might be better for a student even in year 11 to leave secondary school and start pre-vocational training at a TAFE college. That is extremely important.

I suggest to the Minister and to the House that the secondary school system and TAFE should act as one in dealing with compulsory post-secondary education. The closest liaison is required in this regard. We are not just talking about fitting these students for the work force: we are talking about the current range of apprenticeship schemes and their expansion, and that expansion cannot be achieved without the closest liaison between TAFE and the secondary school system. I have spoken to secondary school principals and to many dedicated secondary teachers, and I would not want them to think that I was trying to downgrade the level of education that applies in secondary schools. I merely sound a warning that there is a danger of those students staying at secondary school under an employment umbrella.

Another part of the document points up a serious omission in the report. I have already mentioned this matter in casual conversation to Dr Elyard. The report deals with students going into our post-industrial society. If members of the task force have not already read Naisbitt's book *Megatrends*, they should do so, although I would expect they have done so by now. I also refer members of the task force and the authors of the Green Paper to a paper by Professor Headley Beare, of the University of Melbourne, entitled *Education and the Post-Industrial State*. Readers of that paper will find most of my remarks amplified in detail. The serious omission from this Green Paper is underlined by the following statement, on page 28:

An examination of participation issues reveals . . . a trend away from the natural and applied sciences, engineering and technology.

The authors of the Green Paper could have gone on to give reasons for this serious trend. In this regard, I believe that one reason concerns the information explosion. One of the great benefits of technology (and I suggest there are some dangers) is the information explosion. One cannot escape the televised news service where the news is almost instantaneous and where that service can run for an hour. One cannot read the daily newspapers without reading large slabs of information on foreign affairs. One cannot listen to the radio without hearing talk-backs on which experts give their opinion. One cannot escape the burgeoning of small magazines that are available to the public. Similarly, one cannot escape the consultant.

We live in an era of the consultant and everyone seems to have a consultant for a specific issue. It is necessary for students to be able to cope with the information explosion. How can one read the newspapers without a basic knowledge of economics or a basic knowledge of geography? One cannot read the *Advertiser* without reading about the consumer price index, international currency standards, and even the financial institutions duty. One must have a basic knowledge of economics today. More important, students will be unable to cope in our society without knowing how to communicate.

I believe, in retrospect, that it was a sad day when English was made a non-compulsory subject. The student must cope in this society, and Professor Beare's paper delineates what this society is moving towards. Students cannot cope without being able to assess the information supplied to them in huge quantities. Most homes will have a personal computer in the future. Indeed, the number of computers being installed in homes is legion. Will students be able to assess that information on software not necessarily produced in this country? How are students to apply for a job if they cannot communicate? How are they to assess the reports of consultants in their chosen field of endeavour if they cannot understand the language of communication? How will they learn computer programming unless they understand the basic language first? How will they be able to express themselves in a tertiary institution without the basic knowledge of communication—the English language?

I believe that the foregoing represents a major omission from the Green Paper, and I wish my criticism to be taken as constructive. I hope that the authors of the Green Paper will take cognisance of it when they write the next draft because I do not believe that the education section of the document stands up without much attention being spent on the subject.

As my time has expired, I conclude by congratulating the Minister and the authors of the Green Paper and, in anticipation, the members of the Minister's task force on education, the most vital of all his committees. I wish that committee well in its future deliberations.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker! Can you, either directly or indirectly, facilitate the suspension of the sitting of this House until the ringing of the bells in order to enable members to witness at first hand an issue of consequence which is about to happen in another place and which could have a great bearing on the procedures of our Parliament?

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order.

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): First, may I congratulate the Minister and those members of his Department's staff who have been involved in the preparation of the material contained in the document, *A Technology Strategy for South Australia*. Quite clearly he has carried forward with absolutely no reservations the very innovative approach taken by the previous Minister in this regard and in this very important policy area. Indeed, he has done so with distinction, and that is to his credit, because it is vital that such a Minister with such an intellect was given these enormous responsibilities which confront South Australia today. During the course of my remarks I intend to underline what I believe are those important responsibilities for our very immediate future, as the rate of change has accelerated to a point where it will overtake us unless we decide that something positive must be done to understand the consequences of that change before it does so.

I would like to consider the definitions of the words and make some comments which arise directly out of those definitions in the title of the paper which is called *A Technology Strategy for South Australia*. 'Technology' as has been defined by earlier speakers in the debate but by me so that it is here in context, is the science of the industrial art or technique in doing things. Clearly, that does not restrict us to an examination of those techniques which relate to materials being transformed from one form to another in the process of manufacture. It extends much wider than that and must be taken to embrace the techniques by which we make decisions in the abstract science of sociology, a science which is young and somewhat imprecise in most people's belief. This is not really so, if we examine the way in which it has developed since the time of Popov and his research in Germany during the 1930s.

Indeed, that was of a specific nature attempting to define the platform upon which we could build valid theories and practices. There was earlier work, though at that time not clearly defined as a separate scientific discipline from those disciplines of anthropology, psychology, or for that matter, in some part archaeology. Sociology is now recognised as a separate discipline. It does have enormous benefits for us if we will but take seriously the truths which have been established as a consequence of the sociological research that has been done by those scientists as it relates to our industrial scene in particular but our society at large and its interaction with that scene through the mechanism of the economy in general.

Let us consider the next word, 'strategy'—'the art of war' is one definition given to it. A more appropriate definition in the *Concise Oxford Dictionary* is 'management'. I believe

that it has some analogous relevance to consider a further definition—to impose on a battlefield the conditions for fighting preferred by oneself. If we in South Australia, indeed Australia, want to impose on this battlefield, the one that confronts us, to ensure the survival of ourselves as a prosperous society then we must impose on that battlefield with our economic competitors in the world, the conditions which we prefer. So, it is against that background of definitions that I wish to make some general statements.

First, this paper regrettably, defined as 'technology strategy', does not really come to terms with the substance of strategy. I must say in reviewing it that it is more in the nature of a review or a position paper of the present state of awareness and the present state of the art rather than, as much as I would like to have seen, relevant to the direction in which we should move from this point. Of course, strategy implies change and I hope that means change made in a predetermined direction in a predetermined fashion. I want to go immediately into the report and relate that remark to a paragraph found on page 18.

For those people who have the good fortune to review this debate at some future time, I suggest that it is almost essential that they consider the debate in the context of the substance of the report. To do otherwise will be to do the debate and its real meaning a grave disservice. On page 18 under the general topic of 'Protection of human rights', we find the following paragraph:

The Parliament should directly play a central role in such community debate, by both initiating and concluding discussions on issues of particular concern. The greatly increasing complexity of technological developments and their implications is making the politician's task of becoming and keeping informed, increasingly more difficult. The establishment of a Parliamentary Standing Committee on Technology, along the lines similar to standing committees established in the House of Representatives and Senate in the Federal area, to investigate technology related issues and to keep Parliamentary members informed, is an option Parliament could consider.

That is as may be. Parliament is clearly giving consideration to the former part of that paragraph right now. I want to emphasise the following sentence:

The greatly increasing complexity of technological developments and their implications is making the politicians' [our] task of becoming and keeping informed, increasingly more difficult.

The first subject that I want to take up is about the Parliament itself, literally. Presently Parliament seems to me to be unable to respond to the technological innovations which are outstripping its relevance in the total spectrum of decision making in society. Too often we find that the technologies of management (those techniques applied in management) have meant that the power has gone to Sir Humphrey, away from the Minister and that the Minister is not such an enduring figure as the permanent public servant; accordingly, the shrewder members of the Public Service, knowing that they can outlast the Minister, if he proves too difficult can bring him (or her) down or, alternatively, simply ignore what the Minister is saying, knowing that in due course someone else will come along who is more likely to be impressed with Sir Humphrey's wish. We have seen that.

I do not need to embellish it further. However, I do need to define what I consider a concern about the relationship between Parliament (this House and the other place), the Parliament and the Executive and, indeed, the Government and those institutions. It is not good enough for us to continue using Parliament in what is the form of increasingly irrelevant theatre. They are not my words and I am sorry that I cannot recall for the benefit of the House whom it was that first said them. I believe that they were said in this place.

I hope that in the course of further consideration, in the response to this debate prepared by the Department, some greater detail of options available to the Parliament will be

provided, addressing the problems to which I referred, so that the democratic institution upon which an orderly society is based, and in which the majority of people depend for their reliance on a sense of justice and fair play, does not become irrelevant, does not further increase the frustrations felt to the point where they, the public, lose faith in Parliament and in democracy as an institution. I now leave that matter.

I shall now deal specifically with an area of technology, following which I will refer to other aspects of the report. The area to which I refer concerns technology in agriculture. Only last Friday the Premier said at the Roseworthy Agricultural College that not only was he proud to be there but that he was aware (as I heard the Minister say during the course of the centenary dinner address when he delivered an oration to the assembled company on that occasion last year at the College) that South Australian agricultural technology had led the way in the world in a good many fields, and that no insignificant part of the State's direct success in that arena was due to the influence which Roseworthy College has had on the development of an awareness of the need of that technology.

I referred to that, because it is as relevant to other areas of human endeavour in the production cycle as it is to agriculture, and specialised institutions of that kind can indeed make a substantial contribution, as the South Australian Institute of Technology has done over the years.

Of course, agriculture here in South Australia has had to develop under very adverse conditions. We did not have wheat varieties that were suited to our own climate and soil types; we had to develop them. We did not have techniques by which it was possible for us to mass produce wheat on broadacres. We did not expect or ever believe that we would obtain the same yield as was possible in the wetter climates and more fertile soils of Europe from which we took the necessary technology and placed it here. Therefore, we developed our techniques and, I suppose, from the time that Ridley and a few others developed the stripper here in South Australia and the revolution of harvesting in grain got under way to the present time, we have indeed contributed an enormous amount to the world's knowledge of techniques in that arena.

Today one of the most important corporations is based in South Australia: Elders IXL is on the threshold of a further technological development (admittedly an adaptation of existing technologies in the ADP and VDU areas) for the marketing of livestock which will greatly improve the efficiency of that operation and the quality of the article which finally reaches the end consumer. It will now be possible, under what Mr Graham Higgins of Elders IXL outlined to the recent rural media luncheon, to sell livestock without ever having to load them on a truck, take them to a central sales spot, where they are inspected by the buyers who all take the trouble and incur cost to gather at that point to inspect them, bid on them, and then reload them into a truck to take them to wherever it is that the successful purchasers wish to take them for either repaddock or slaughter.

I commend that company. The Opposition spokesman on matters agricultural (Hon. Ted Chapman) has indicated a recognition of the very considerable benefits that this technology will provide to the South Australian livestock industry, and indeed to the whole of Australia. It will immediately make irrelevant our reliance on the saleyard and it will make far more efficient the fashion in which we sell livestock on the hoof. Using the same technology it will be possible to sell almost every agricultural commodity by objective measurement or by the production of video tape of the particular lot, regardless. That is something to be welcomed—not to be feared.

I now refer to the technology strategy for South Australia paper. It is stated in the preamble to the section concerning introduction and objectives that:

Past South Australian Governments have wrestled with the problems of diversifying the State's economy and brought about some desirable changes. Challenges similar in character but greater in scale and complexity to those of the past are apparent now.

Sure, that is a statement of truth, especially in the second sentence. More importantly, the first sentence plays down the very considerable success that this State's businesses have had when they have identified and in the past have met the challenge of emerging opportunities. No small credit must be paid to the foresight of that great South Australian former Premier of this State Sir Thomas Playford and the people whom he inspired and encouraged to establish manufacturing industry here after the Second World War through which it was possible for this State to diversify its population and employment base and therefore expand its population and the market place, and what is more, enabled it to become anything but the Cinderella State it would have otherwise have been if that initiative had not been taken. A statement is made in the first part of the paper that:

The reduction or removal of visible and non visible tariffs which had previously protected Australia's manufacturing industries exposed a largely complacent and often inefficient manufacturing sector to international competition.

Indeed, on the surface, that appears to be a fair comment, although I put it to honourable members that it is not, because, although there may have been an apparent complacency, that was only in light of the fact that continually there has been inadequate profitability in too many of our businesses to enable them to accumulate the capital with which they could then decide priorities for reinvestment on improved technology to ensure continuing relevance of the technologies of those industries.

Had there been a more realistic taxation policy adopted by Governments in the past with respect to the way in which new technologies were adapted and embraced, we would have been in a much better position in this State and in this nation right now than we are at present. Indeed, what we have done is to erode the profitability base of our manufacturing sector, and indeed of most industries, to the extent that they have been unable to accumulate the capital necessary. We have done that by allowing an escalation of real wage rates in the labour force, through an irrelevant industrial conciliation and arbitration system. The system has ignored the necessity to take increased productivity into consideration when fixing wage rates. This has eroded the capacity of industry to accumulate the capital so essential for the redeployment of its technological thrust, and, therefore, the investment in technologically modern, efficient and functional equipment and methods.

It is not good enough for us to simply ignore the profit factors in the position in which we now find ourselves. It would not be necessary for us to pay as much attention as we are now doing in the heat of the moment, knowing that doom is upon us if we do not do so, had it not been for the fact that indeed we did allow profitability to be run down, by the means to which I referred. Sure, there is ignorance in management which needs to be addressed. It is also a fundamental fact that not enough people engaged in the labour relations arena, are aware of the science of economics or the science of sociology. This is so, whether they be representatives of workers or people engaged in management of the business arena (be they middle managers or top managers).

That underlying ignorance has substantially caused our present problems. Furthermore, our preoccupation with the mistaken belief that profit is a dirty word has made it impossible for firms to undertake training programmes; the

few people, who understand the value and necessity for economics and sociology to be applied to the industrial arena, have been unable to get that message across to the far greater number of us who should have been aware of it to enable us to go through the processes of consultation and thereby develop the sort of mechanism which would lead to an economy that was more vibrant, more dynamic and more capable of coping with the competition to which it is exposed from other countries elsewhere in the world.

I would have liked to go through this report and comment on specific aspects of it, but it has not been possible for me to do that in the limited time at my disposal. In concluding, I wish to say that it is not good enough for Governments of the future to bury their heads in the sand, ignoring the information that has been put together about the importance of sociology in the decision-making process in industry, and to say things such as is presented at page 16:

The Government has a responsibility to identify and alert those who are likely to be adversely affected by the introduction of new technologies and who will require new skills in anticipation of change.

Perhaps the Government has that responsibility, but equally the individual has that responsibility. It will not be good enough for Australians in the future—indeed, it has not been good enough for Australians in the present and in the immediate past—to consider, (once schooling has finished, at the commencement of life in adolescence) that it will be no longer necessary for them as individuals to attempt to learn anything more.

Education must be regarded as an imperative part of an ongoing process in life. The individual who has skills and who ignores the necessity to continually update those skills, and retrain himself or herself into additional new skill areas in the work force, will end up on the employment scrap heap. The mechanisms by which retraining occurs will have to be determined through the political process, but clearly the responsibility for it rests with the individual. The sooner we in this place (and other people responsible for communicating to the public) get that message through to people in clear and unequivocal terms, beginning in their school life while they are children and adolescents, the more likely it is that we will be able not only to survive, but also to sustain the present level of prosperity, the present quality of life and the present position in the sun that we have occupied on this continent of ours during the past 200 years. We have had a fortunate past: we could well ruin it if we ignore the lessons of history and our responsibilities of the present. We will lose what we could otherwise have—an equally prosperous if not more prosperous future.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister for Technology): I would like to thank members on both sides of the House for their contributions to the debate, and I acknowledge the point made by the shadow Minister for Technology that other members would have liked to contribute but the time allocated precluded that from happening. That was the case in relation to members on both sides, and it is certainly not taken by the Government that a member in not speaking indicated that he was not interested in where South Australia is going in relation to technology.

Likewise, we are all aware in terms of political theatre that there are two shows playing at the moment, and one is of considerable short-term significance. May I say that we are considering the long-term significance. It is unfortunate that many members are naturally intrigued to know what is happening in another place.

The debate on technology strategy is an important part of a process that could help South Australia to achieve the benchmark status aimed at not only by the former Government but also by the present Government. It helps bring together an awareness that the community at large can have

an input into the question of technology and some effect on where we go with technology. The future is ours to make and we either make it or, as the member for Mallee was implying, we break it.

We look forward to considering the remarks made by members today in drafting the next document which will go to the Government for the preparation of a White Paper. We also hope that the community will take an interest in the various stages which have taken place: the initial draft; the second draft; the Parliamentary debate; and the final White Paper. I commend that to the community of South Australia.

I acknowledge the statements made by both the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition in canvassing the response of State Governments in relation to technology and South Australia's technological base. When being interviewed last night, I made the comment that South Australia in the past has shown its capacity to consider where it is and where it is going. We still have that capacity. In the 1930s for example it was believed that, while remaining an important part of our economy, agriculture would not be the pre-eminent part, and that we would need to develop a manufacturing base alongside that. In many ways that was a community decision of Government and the people. We need to show that we can do it again. There is an awareness by State Governments that that is necessary. South Australia can take some pride in the fact that it is the first State to go along the track of developing a strategy.

I noted the comments about the generalities contained in the strategy paper. It was stated that it lacks specificity. I will deal with that later. But really the question revolves around this: if there are to be technological imperatives that will effect South Australia in the years ahead, what should our response be? There are a number of options. We could simply do nothing and hope that things work out right. According to the laws of chance, that might happen, but the odds, I would suggest, are against it. Another option is to say that there are technological imperatives and we will respond to the lot—approach it in a harem scarem fashion and react to all the aspects of changing technology. That would not be a successful approach, because we have limited resources and we have to operate within that constraint.

The third option is to try to set some goals, to decide the real possibilities for South Australia, and to encourage economic and social development along those paths. It is my contention that that is the aim of this strategy. I acknowledge that the document does not contain a great deal of specifics, but it must be followed by further work that addresses those specific points that honourable members have raised. I would then accept the criticism made by members in this place that it would have been a failure if that process of coming down to specifics does not follow. If it does not follow, we will continue to talk about concepts: that would be a nice armchair debate, but it would not be very fruitful for the future of South Australia.

So, there is a clear understanding on my part, as Minister for Technology that we must get down to talking about specific strategies and options. Again, I refer to a sad and peculiarly South Australian situation. I say 'sad' because it is a pity that the other States have not adopted the strategy of combining technology and education. It was a conscious decision of the Premier that they should merge, and that, if we are to respond to technological imperatives in the future, we need a community that is educated about all the questions raised.

I note the comments of the shadow Minister of Education about the State-wide education and technology task force. I also hope it gives us that kind of leading edge and concentration on issues so clearly sought by the education community at large. I will comment further on that shortly. A

number of other issues will also have to be tackled when we look at technology—not just generalities or specifics about particular technologies, but processes that the community and the Government can work through relating to particular aspects.

How do we attempt to educate our community, to stimulate improved research and development programmes and to stimulate a greater entrepreneurial capacity in people? How do we re-educate employees in the work force whose jobs are facing serious change? We need to look at the proper process. Rather than simply looking at the long-term goal, we need to look very much at the means of reaching that point. The member for Newland referred to South Australia's connection with the photo-copier, but that story possibly has a positive outcome if we do not fluff it again. Let us hope that the second time around we will be successful. We might feel a little better about the photo-copying episode if we realise that we were not the only ones to blow it: IBM also blew it because that technology was offered to that company, but it responded by saying it was of no consequence. That was several decades ago. The company joins with us now in lamenting that decision. That highlights an important point—the development of research. As a society, I suspect that we all now agree that we need more research and development, not just in Government but in the private sector. We may believe that we have solved the problem by saying that, but I suspect that when we actually delve in and analyse what people mean by research and development, they really mean research only. Far too often the development aspect is overlooked.

That is where we have fallen down, because really, on basic figures, we are not so badly behind in terms of research, patents per thousand head of population, and the like. We are tolerably comparable with many other countries in the world, but we fall down in the development of ideas. The strategy talks about ways in which we can build up the strength of that second part of development by trying to tie in the needs and resources of industry with what could happen in the education community, where much research is carried out.

A number of efforts made in South Australia are commendable, under Governments of both persuasions. We need to spend more time looking at the reality of research being assisted by a co-operative union between industry and education. Also, I suggest that there is another question: industry itself should realise how much it has actually achieved. I have visited many enterprises in South Australia, and almost without fail at each place someone will point out to me a process, system or machine that they have developed. It may not be very big, but they are proud of it. It has done something to help their productivity, the manufacturing process, quality control or something similar, and it has been an innovation. But, in almost every single case, sadly enough, that is where it has stopped. It has not been sold as an idea. We have not yet got into our minds that we can sell ideas—we do not just have to sell products.

The longer we stay away from that, the longer we will miss out on what is a very big market in its own right—the sale of ideas and systems. I endorse the comment that we need to look at the development of research, and in looking at that we need to pay attention to design. I note the comments made by the member for Davenport about the Industrial Design Centre and the important contribution that it makes in that regard. I am also very pleased that members chose to raise their concerns and criticisms about the paper, and I take those remarks in the context in which they were meant.

However, I am a little perplexed by the comment of the member for Torrens that I might misinterpret people. But, I take in good faith all the comments made that the work

of those who drafted this report was not criticised. I acknowledge that the comments made were in the style of an intellectual debate. Aspects of the report were challenged and issue was taken with them. That is what we hoped would happen in this debate. It was stated that we need to differentiate between long-term and short-term solutions and that we should perhaps realise that in the short term different strategies may need to be followed, which may be somewhat different from the long-term strategies. There is much merit in that point when one looks at how one immediately answers some of the social and economic problems we face, which may result in different strategies later on.

The other point made was that we have a problem in that Australia is a small country which has been forced into the international market. It was said that not enough attention was paid in the strategy to how a small market can find its way into the international market with new technologies which presumably involve size, economies of scale, and so on. I do not necessarily accept that point, because I think one of the very big benefits of all the new technologies offered to us is the opportunity to escape from the prison of economies of scale, because some of them allow the economies of small-scale operation.

I recently had the opportunity to open the Adelaide branch of Laser Lab Australia, which does form cutting by laser technology. This Australian company has made major advances in machinery development that is being sold all over the world. One of the things that struck me was that previously some of the form work they were cutting would have had to be done in big batch runs on specific machines especially set aside with dies for that purpose. Now, by virtue of software changing within minutes, the laser can change its pattern and can do a run of one almost as cost efficiently as it can do a run of 10 000. So, the economies of scale argument can perhaps become less serious for us in regard to certain technologies because of the flexibility that technology offers us.

Computer aided design (CAD) technology offers us the possibility of getting away from the restrictions of economies of scale because it enables quick changes in design at much lower cost than was the case under previous technologies. The members from Newland and Davenport both said that we, as a State, have a sound reputation, which will help us in building up that sort of image. I noted the comment about the General Manager of Raytheon. I have noted similar situations in Adelaide. I was at Micro-Byte, a South Australian company. One of the partners had been a salesman for a major international computing company. He came to Adelaide to instal one of its computers. He liked Adelaide and looked for a company for which he could work. Eventually, he went into partnership with someone because he found Adelaide so amenable a place in which to live.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: The company is doing very well.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Yes, the glass typewriter which I launched has very good market possibilities overseas. I was pleased to note comments from both sides of the House in relation to the positive relationship between public and private sectors in regard to technology, because that certainly is important. We would be in real trouble if we refused to believe that Government has any contribution to make to the private sector, or the reverse.

I have noted that we should have asked where we are in regard to technology in comparison with other parts of Australia or the world. I think that point does need to be taken into account; whether or not that is appropriate for a strategy document, I am not absolutely certain, but I think that there is some value in our trying to take stock of where we are.

The office of the Ministry for Technology and the Technology Advisory Unit in fact are addressing that problem. They are starting to talk about developing a register of the resources we have in South Australia and trying to get some idea of exactly where we are so that we know where our shortfalls may be, where we have real problems, and where there are strengths which may not have been perceived before. That may give us a good idea of where we might go in the future. Likewise, the question of what resources we have is also an important one, providing we can get out of the stricture that resources are only something physical that we can touch rather than that they are brain-based resources as well. The future of our State will depend on the extent to which we can utilise brain-based resources in this State. One point that is made in this regard is that, by talking about brain-based resources, we are saying that the whole South Australian community has brain-based resources that it can bring to bear for our future. It is not a case of thinking that we want super technologists or scientists of the ilk of Einstein and that that is what we need. In fact, we need everyone in South Australia to realise they have a contribution to make and they can do it by their own abilities, which includes their own brain resources.

Another comment was made about where Technology Park might be going and some concern was expressed that some of the developments have not proceeded as quickly as had been originally anticipated. Certainly, the honourable member is correct in saying that the international economy has had some effect on that situation. That situation is being monitored closely by the Government: we are not disinterested; we are actively interested in seeing that the problems are identified as quickly as possible so that we can try to take away the cause of those particular problems.

One of the points which is of concern to me (and, I believe, to the shadow Minister for Technology) is the belief that Technology Park and its contribution to South Australia will be especially strong if in fact it will ultimately represent a hierarchy of types of enterprise from overseas, Australia and also South Australia. The South Australian enterprise would be smaller in size but very much based upon innovation in this State using the skills of people here. If we relied too much on the development of technological enterprise and innovation in only one of those three categories, we could face real problems. If we say that we will only look forward to development of multinational technological enterprises in South Australia, then we very much open ourselves up to the whims of the international economy where things sometimes do change quite dramatically. They do have a part to play, but we should not be saying that that will be the predominant part of investment in South Australia. Likewise with Australian enterprise and South Australian enterprise—we should recognise that they are part of that approach rather than the sole body of our investment approach in South Australia. If we were to say that the only thing we will be concerned about is the development of South Australian companies in technology, then in fact that could lead to real dangers. We should be going for a mix between the three levels, which will provide opportunities for good dynamic co-operation between them.

Mention was made of the Federal summit on technology that was held last year. That was an interesting summit, but perhaps some of the comments made here today were in fact made by Barry Jones, the Federal Minister, in his closing address to that summit. It was an interesting and useful conference but at the end of it the Minister came out with trenchant criticisms about comments that were made during the three days. He said that too often people were still refusing to remove the blinkers that were covering their eyes about what the future of Australia was really going to be like if we did not respond to these questions. People

were too often not prepared to break out of their own almost vested interests; they limited themselves to that and, if that kind of process continues, our development will be prejudiced accordingly.

Mention was also made of what other countries have done and whether those models are transferable to South Australia. Silicon Valley, Canada, France, Scandinavia and Japan were mentioned in this regard. I think we would all acknowledge that no one model is in itself completely transferable to South Australia and we must look for suitability, and I take the comment that suitability is an important benchmark against which we should be analysing things. I would also raise one other model that has not been taken into account—the Austrian model. I had the good fortune four years ago to meet with officers of the Ministry for Science and Technology in Austria and I was very excited about the kind of model they were developing for industry and Government co-operation and the development of innovation and research. They were in fact doing some very good work in researching ideas and then developing them and taking them to the marketing stage, both for internal consumption and for international consumption. I think the model Austria has developed is one to be commended to the House. Again, nothing is in itself entirely transferable to our condition, but I believe it has many lessons to offer us as have the other models already mentioned. Mention was made of the fact that Silicon Valley did not have much Government support. It did, however, have considerable support from the United States defence industry, which either directly or indirectly is a Government supported source of revenue. That was critical for its survival, particularly in the early days.

Another point was made about resources being limited and that we need to identify key areas of priority. I am really saying that this document is leading us to that stage and that really has to be the next stage. We have to start to identify those key areas. I would not accept the statement by the shadow Minister for Technology that biotechnology is a long way away in terms of offering us real benefits while microchip technology has immediate pertinence. It is certainly true that we have some things in South Australia to be pretty proud of in the microchip area. We do have the VLSI project and the work being done by Philips Industries as well as by other companies in South Australia. In the microchip field that is the good news side of the picture, but I was struck by a comment made to me one day when I visited Philips Industries: I was asked what was the use of developing a micro-electronics industry when there is no macro-electronics industry into which it plugs. I thought that was a pertinent comment.

Another point that needs to be made is that sometimes micro-electronics involves somewhat unusual job effects. Apple Computers have introduced the new Mackintosh II computer. That is being made in a factory by robots, one every 23 seconds, to supply the world market. Only 90 people are employed in the whole factory. That point needs to be taken into account. We do have some Australian micro-computing industry expertise that has been developed but, in relation to some of the overseas connections which we want to encourage, sometimes that has not been a transfer of technology so much as a transfer of the making of rudimentary parts for the machines. We want to see that any relationship with international technological enterprise does try to involve the development of technological expertise in this country rather than our being a component maker for other countries. In that context, comments in the strategy in relation to offsets are particularly important.

Another point was made about poor depreciation allowances and the effect that has on investment plus particular funding models. I agree that that certainly is an important

point. The SP Committee identified that quite well and the Federal Government has tried to pick that up in a limited way in regard to the MICS relating to tax concessions for investment in research. But, in terms of depreciation allowances, important questions need to be considered. It is also an important matter that must be looked at by Governments. I hope that the technology and education task force will look at how to fund the model. If we are to say that we need this kind of investment in technology to provide the educational services we want, it will cost a lot of money. Our system has been built in the past on a much slower revolving funding model. In fact, some of our schools have equipment in the tech studies area that is decades old.

We are relying on it staying there a little longer. The revolving funding model for that results in relatively small contributions each year. However, if we are to have changed circumstances in technology that result in rapidly changing needs, the Government must think how these are to be funded. Clearly, the Government is not a bottomless pit of resources. It needs to develop new funding models. That in itself will be an important achievement that we should look for from the study.

We have been told that we need to look at individual technology and comment on its importance and relevance. Implicit in that is the comment on the technology appraisals that have been operating for some years now. We need to look further in future into appraising specific technologies, but the promotion of individual technologies is also important. Next Monday, the Government will formally announce the formation of the Biotechnology Promotional Committee, which will promote technology throughout the community. Likewise, we are trying to promote the Can-Technology. We need to look at individual technologies, but we must realise that their promotion remains important.

Regarding biotechnology, I do not accept the comment that it is a long way off in offering benefits: real benefits are available to us in the short term. South Australia has developed expertise in biotechnology: that is proved by the proportion of grants we are winning from the Commonwealth Government. Our agricultural sector has shown its capacity to deal with many of the prime elements of biotechnology over a long period. One could cite the wine industry in this regard.

An important point was made that computer chips will affect our society as much in the next 15 years as cars have done in the past 80 years. That may be a good way of thinking about the subject: that it represents a serious change in the order of change that we should consider. The member for Mawson asked us to consider the critical question of how the benefits of technology will be shared throughout society. Can we guarantee that the benefits will be available to the whole community? The wealth available as a result of technology should be shared by the community so that everyone gets a fair right of entry to it. It is of concern that technology is in itself neutral to this question and therefore just as likely to go in a negative as in a positive direction unless we ensure that the social responses are attended to.

These include the needs of women in society and of all other groups including Aborigines. I note the comment of the member for Torrens in that regard, and we are trying to examine that aspect. It is being looked at by many people in society as well as by this Government. I was impressed by the newspaper reports that the ACER, in conjunction with the Institute of Engineers in Melbourne, is conducting a national survey to find why girls do not take up maths and science subjects leading to engineering. I believe that such studies will be important for us to analyse.

These questions must be addressed. If they are not, we will generate new groups of forgotten people, and that will be a travesty in terms of achievement of their life's objectives.

Further, it will create social disruption, which is an important point to consider. We talk scornfully about Luddites and the role they played in the industrial revolution, but perhaps the Luddites were a product of how things were done. We could create a new group of Luddites by going about things the wrong way. We should not create such a group if we were conscious of the need for people who, if we do not watch out, will be disadvantaged or whose disadvantage, if they are already disadvantaged, will be perpetuated.

In this regard, I ask members to compare the position of the Adelaide *Advertiser* with that of the London *Times*. That example shows a different style of proceedings. The Adelaide *Advertiser* wanted to introduce new technologies in journalism. It did so by consultation with the work force, by professional development of staff, and by setting specific goals. By and large, the management of that newspaper has achieved success and become a world leader. On the other hand, the London *Times* failed on almost every one of those scores and, by and large, it has been disastrous for that paper over the years. In fact, it has generated a group of Luddites within the industry there, whereas here the opposite has taken place because of a proper awareness of the needs for people in respect of social concern as well as economic concern.

I accept the point that the State task force is important. We are excited in South Australia that we were able to convince the other Australian Ministers that there should be an Australian task force into education and technology, and the Commonwealth Government has agreed to provide the secretariat for that task force. As the South Australian Minister, I will Chair it. That should provide national cohesion in the area. We want to develop South Australia but, to be fruitful, we must do it in the national context. We should not cut off each other's nose merely to derive a short-term benefit for ourselves. There are such matters as procurement which we need to sort out as a nation. The best interests of South Australia will not be served by trying to localise our own industry and increase its capacity while ignoring the other states. If we do that we shall be the losers.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: You must convince them that this is the best place to establish.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Premier has frequently commented on that matter, and he will lose no opportunity to do so in the future. The liaison between TAFE and the Education Department needs to be strengthened. Last year I said that this matter was critical, and it was dealt with in our pre-election policy. As a result, there was a worthwhile conference held in Mount Gambier last year to bring together officers of those departments so that they could talk together about this matter. There is now a working committee, known as the Giles-Greer committee, which should ensure that what has hitherto been the statement of intention by the Directors-General of both departments becomes a fact of life at the education institution level for many educational communities in South Australia. We are watching this matter with great interest, as indeed are many other people, and we should improve the liaison between the two bodies. I regret that I have not read the book *Megatrends*. My officers, however, would have done so, and I will remedy that defect myself.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: The other publication was Professor Beare's paper.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Yes. I met Headley Beare last year and found that many of his comments on these matters were extremely important. In the past we have relied on an education system that gave us a stock of knowledge by imparting to us a series of facts. We were crammed with facts and, if we got a certain number right, we were regarded as educated. However, things have changed qualitatively because of the information explosion. No-one

can possibly expect to learn and retain all the data coming out all the time.

We need to pay more attention in our education system to teaching people how to process knowledge, how to get the facts, and how to assess those facts rather than saying to them, 'We have given you 51 000 bits of information. You are now educated'. Instead, we should say, 'Throughout your life you will be besieged by millions of pieces of information.' We will give you the skill to cope with them. That raises other questions asked by members on both sides about the education process: that is, about both the formal and informal education system. If we do not make people aware that they must constantly learn and be involved in a system of education, both formal and informal, they will go backwards relative to others because the rate of change of knowledge is so great today. For example, in the 1930s the apprentice printer would be given a certain quantity of knowledge that would see him right for the rest of his career, whereas an apprentice printer today could not rely for the rest of his working life on the knowledge given him while training.

In other words, that body of knowledge does not remain static. So, the tradesmen of today, as well as the professional person, must be prepared to upgrade his knowledge during the whole of his working life, otherwise he will be left behind. The member for Mallee made important points concerning agriculture. True, agriculture in South Australia has been responsive to the need for change arising from advances in technology.

Roseworth is one sign of that. However, it is a fact of life that, if we had not had a willingness to change in agriculture, we would not have survived. What many people regard as a conservative (in a social sense) sector has been very often the most willing sector to respond to new technologies, and we need that kind of attitude to go into other areas. One model that we use in agriculture is a good working relationship of Government and the private sector by means of advisers from Government departments (extension officers from the Department of Agriculture) who go out and talk about agricultural technologies and ideas with people in agriculture, and there is a good relationship between the two. We need that kind of thing to show itself in secondary, tertiary and quaternary sectors of the economy as well.

I certainly recognise the importance of agriculture. It will continue to be an important part of our community. It will continue to need to respond to technology just as much as the other sectors will need to do. I want to make some final comments. First, the need for excellence is taken into account in our schools and their purposes and expectations. Schools should encourage all individuals to strive for excellence, because it is true that one does not have to be elitist. Every individual has his own excellence achievements that he can achieve under the right desire. I believe that this strategy has been an important part of helping us develop community awareness of where we ought to go. We will develop from this strategy more specific targets and objectives as to what the options for South Australia should be. I believe that that will answer some of the criticisms that have been raised about its generality. That will become a White Paper to the Government, and the Government will release it. I hope that it will serve South Australia well for the decades to come because we are not talking about one, two, or three years: we are talking about the rest of the century, indeed, even into the next century.

Motion carried.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL, 1984

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Road Traffic Act, 1961. Read a first time.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill provides for the extension of those provisions of the Road Traffic Act, 1961, dealing with random breath testing to the end of 1984. As all members will be aware a Select Committee of the Upper House is reviewing the operation of random breath testing in South Australia. However, the Committee is not expected to submit its report prior to Parliament's rising in May of this year. Unfortunately, the provisions of the Act dealing with random breath testing are due to expire on 18 June 1984. It is therefore proposed to extend the operation of those provisions to the end of the year so as to preserve the present situation until the Parliament has had a proper opportunity to debate the issue of random breath testing. I seek leave to have the remainder of the explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure. Clause 3 provides two amendments to section 47da of the principal Act. The amendment effected by paragraph (a) ensures that the Commissioner of Police will prepare a report for the Minister upon the operation of the section to the date of the expiration of the relevant provisions. Paragraph (b) will extend the date of expiration of the section to the end of 1984.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION (SEA DUMPING) BILL

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Marine) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the protection of the environment by regulating the dumping into the sea, and the incineration at sea, of wastes and other matter and the dumping into the sea of certain other objects, and for related purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time:

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The Commonwealth Government is a signatory to the 1972 International Convention on the Dumping of Wastes at Sea (London Dumping Convention). This convention prohibits the deliberate disposal at sea of wastes or other matter from vessels, aircraft, platform or other manmade structures and any deliberate disposal at sea of vessels, aircraft etc. except in accordance with the convention provisions. In 1981, the Commonwealth legislated to give effect to this convention in Australia, passing the Environmental Protection (Sea Dumping) Act 1981. There is power in this Act for the Commonwealth Minister to declare that the Act does not apply in relation to coastal waters of the State,

providing the Minister is satisfied that the laws of the State make provision for giving effect to the convention in relation to its coastal waters.

The Commonwealth is currently finalising arrangements for proclamation of this legislation. South Australia will be bound by the Commonwealth legislation unless it introduces appropriate complementary legislation. A failure by the State to act would have a number of repercussions in areas traditionally under the control of the State Minister of Marine. It is therefore both appropriate and desirable that the State should introduce legislation to accord with its traditional roles in the areas with which this Bill is concerned.

Accordingly, this Bill gives effect to the London Dumping Convention provisions and is complementary in operation to the Commonwealth legislation. It takes full account of international, national and State interests. The Bill will enable South Australia to formalise and strengthen the existing voluntary arrangements dealing with dumping by the establishment of regulatory machinery which will:

- Prohibit the dumping of wastes or other matter listed in Annex I to the convention, which include organohalogen, mercury and cadmium compounds, plastics, hydrocarbons and high level radioactive wastes;
- Regulate through the prior issuing of a special permit the dumping of wastes or other matters listed in Annex II to the convention which includes bulky objects, wastes containing significant amounts of heavy metal and low level radioactive material.
- Regulate the dumping of all other wastes or matter through the prior issuing of a general permit;
- Ensure formal consideration of all factors listed in Annex III. to the convention concerning criteria governing the issue of permits;
- Ensure the condition of the sea for the purposes of the convention is properly monitored.
- Regulate incineration and discharges arising from incineration at sea.

The regulatory machinery provided by this Bill will apply to all vessels, aircraft or platforms operating in or over South Australian waters, both coastal and inland. The Bill does not apply to the operational discharge of wastes from vessel, aircraft or platforms, which is covered by the Prevention of Pollution of Waters by Oil Act, 1961. The enactment of this Bill will ensure that a traditional area of South Australian Government responsibility will be preserved.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure. Clause 3 is the definition section. Included in this clause is a definition of 'coastal waters', which are proposed to be the waters to which the Act will apply. This section also refers to the relevant Convention and makes provision for the inclusion of future amendments that are accepted by Australia and then set out in South Australian regulations. Subclause (2) provides that an expression that is used in the Bill and in the Convention is to have the same meaning in the Bill as it has in the Convention. Matters defined by the Convention include 'aircraft', 'vessel' and 'dumping'.

Clause 4 provides exemptions in relation to the disposal of wastes arising from the exploration of seabed mineral resources (an exception provided by the Convention), and provides exemptions in relation to military craft. Clause 5 relates to the application of the Bill to the Crown. The clause ensures that the State is not liable for prosecution, but a person in charge of a vessel, aircraft or platform belonging to the State may be subject to prosecution under the Act. Clause 6 makes it an offence to dump any wastes or other matter into coastal waters, otherwise than in accordance with a permit.

Clause 7 makes it an offence for any vessel, aircraft or platform to be dumped into coastal waters, otherwise than

in accordance with a permit. Clause 8 makes it an offence to load any wastes or other matter on any vessel or aircraft in the State or in coastal waters, or on any platform, for the purposes of dumping, otherwise than in accordance with a permit.

Clause 9 provides defences for the proposed offences under the preceding three clauses. These defences are that the dumping was necessary to secure the safety of life, or the craft, due to stress of weather, or that the dumping was the only reasonable way of averting a threat to the safety of human life, or the craft, and it was probable that the damage caused by the dumping would be less than would otherwise occur. A report must be furnished to the Minister in all such cases.

Clause 10 provides the penalties for offences under the preceding clauses of the Division. The range of penalty depends on the classification of the substance or waste that was dumped or loaded, and whether the offender is a natural person or a company. Clause 11 relates to incineration at sea. It is proposed that the incineration at sea of most 'Annex I' substances be absolutely prohibited. The incineration at sea of other substances may only occur under a permit. Penalties again depend on the classification of the substance or waste incinerated, and vary between natural persons and companies.

Clause 12 empowers the Minister to take such steps as he considers appropriate to repair or remedy any condition, or to mitigate any damage, arising from dumping into coastal waters. Clause 13 provides that where a person is convicted of an offence for dumping, and the State has incurred expense in acting to remedy or mitigate resulting damage, the offender is liable for those expenses. Subclause (2) ensures that the State does not recover more than the expenses it incurred. Subclause (3) provides for the detention of a vessel or aircraft in the State or in coastal waters where the owner or master are liable under the proposed clause. It will be an offence to breach the detention.

Clause 14 sets out the procedures for applications for permits. Subclause (2) confirms that an application to dump Annex I substances cannot be entertained, and that the same situation exists in relation to the incineration of the majority of Annex I substances. In relation to other applications, the Minister is empowered to request further information and may direct that the applicant undertake certain research and analysis into the effect of the proposed dumping before an application is granted.

Clause 15 prescribes the procedures to be followed in granting permits. The Minister is specifically required to consider factors contained in the Convention. Subclause (7) provides that before granting a permit the Minister may require an applicant to undertake research and monitoring relating to the effects of dumping on the marine environment, and to investigate the possibility of avoiding the need for further dumping. The applicant may be required to reimburse the State for the cost of research and monitoring carried on by the State in relation to the proposed dumping.

Clause 16 provides for the suspension and revocation of permits. Clause 17 provides that the Minister may, when granting a permit, impose conditions in respect of the permit. Clause 18 provides special precautions for the dumping of radioactive matter (noting that radioactive matter under Annex I cannot be dumped on any account). Paragraph D of Annex II provides that in the issue of permits for dumping of radioactive matter the contracting parties will take full account of the recommendations of the International Atomic Energy Agency. One recommendation is that the dumping of radioactive wastes should be supervised by escorting officers with appropriate powers of direction. Clause 18 gives effect to this.

Clause 19 provides that the holder of a permit may apply for the variation of conditions applying to a permit. Clause 20 provides for the appointment of inspectors. Members of the Police Force are, *ex officio*, inspectors also. Clause 21 provides for the issuing and use of identity cards. Clause 22 empowers an inspector to board any vessel, aircraft or platform and then, if necessary, stop or detain it. Clause 23 empowers inspectors, with the consent of the owner, or under warrant, to enter premises. Clause 24 sets out the functions of an inspector under the Bill. Clause 25 sets out the powers of arrest of an inspector. Arrest may occur if a person hinders or assaults an inspector, fails to give truthfully his name and address, or might not attend court or not desist from committing another offence if not arrested.

Clause 26 provides immunity for inspectors. A liability is instead to lie against the Crown. Clause 27 provides that the Attorney-General or an interested person may apply for an injunction restraining a person from acting in contravention of the dumping and incineration provisions of the Act. An interested person is defined to mean a person whose use or enjoyment of any part of the sea is likely to be affected adversely by the proposed contravention. Clause 28 is a delegation power. Clause 29 makes it an offence for a person, in connection with a permit, to make false or misleading statements or present information that is false or misleading. Clause 30 makes it an offence for persons to fail to comply with conditions imposed in respect of permits. Clause 31 prescribes that offences under this Act are minor indictable offences.

Clause 32 provides for the production of certain evidence in proceedings for offences against the Act. Provision is also made to facilitate the proof of certain matters, such as the position at sea of a vessel, aircraft or platform. Clause 33 relates to the appointment of analysts under the Act. Certified reports from analysts may be accepted as *prima facie* evidence of the results of tests or examinations. Clause 34 provides for the imposition and payment of fees. Clause 35 clarifies that this Act does not derogate from the provisions of the Prevention of Pollution of Waters by Oil Act, 1961. Clause 36 is a regulation-making power. The prescription of regulations may be effected by reference to the relevant Commonwealth regulations.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Marine) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Fisheries Act, 1982. Read a first time.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill effects an amendment to section 48 of the Fisheries Act, 1982. The proposed amendment is consequential to the implementation of the Environment Protection (Sea Dumping) Act, 1984. Section 48 provides protection of aquatic habitat by forbidding unauthorised operations that involve disturbing or interfering with that habitat, or involve discharging or depositing any matter into any waters. The amendment will provide that a person who has a permit under the Environment Protection (Sea Dumping) Act, 1984, is not also subject to the restrictions imposed by the Fisheries Act. Duplication in regulation will thus be avoided. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is the short title, Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure. Clause 3 amends section 48 of the principal Act to include reference to the Environment Protection (Sea Dumping) Act, 1983. The amendment avoids conflict between the Fisheries Act and the proposed new 'Sea Dumping' Act.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

URBAN LAND TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendment:

Page 1 (clause 2)—After line 22 insert subsections as follow:

(2b) The Minister shall not grant an approval under subsection (2a) in respect of a project unless he is satisfied that the arrangement provides for substantial participation in the project by a person other than the Trust.

(2c) Subsection (2a) shall not apply except in relation to—
(a) the development area as defined by the Tea Tree Gully (Golden Grove) Development Act, 1978; and
(b) any other land prescribed for the purposes of this section.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

The amendment is self-explanatory. Briefly, it does two things. First, it requires that the Minister shall not grant approval for a joint venture unless he is satisfied that the arrangement provides for substantial participation in the project by a body other than the Urban Land Trust. It is to get over a fear that apparently some people had in another place that a person could put up \$100 or something like that and be involved in a joint venture.

Secondly, it confines the ambit of the amendment to the Tea Tree Gully/Golden Grove project and other land prescribed for the purposes of the section. Therefore, joint ventures could occur in areas outside Tea Tree Gully/Golden Grove, provided that the prescribed powers had been sought and gained by the Minister. Neither aspect of this amendment does any damage to the Government's aims in relation to the Urban Land Trust, and I commend the amendment to the Committee.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The Opposition supports the amendment. As the Minister has said, it has come as a result of consultation. I recognise it as being a compromise. The Committee recognised that we would have liked to have gone a little further than that. I point out again the importance of providing the opportunity for private enterprise to continue to be involved and private developers generally to be involved in development and the sale of land. I am convinced that the private sector is the best equipped in technical and financial resources to provide a stable supply of allotments to the South Australian land market.

However, we acknowledge that Golden Grove is a special situation, and accordingly the Opposition is prepared to support the legislation. It is important that matters to be considered as joint venturer arrangements are brought before this House, or at least that Parliament is notified of a matter being prescribed. The amendments take this into account, and provide the opportunity for Parliament to be made aware of any situations where this might occur. The Opposition supports the amendment. I think the legislation should go well for the development of Golden Grove, and any other ventures that the Government may consider, because

Parliament will have to be notified of that before any final decision is made. The Opposition supports the amendment. Motion carried.

STATE BANK OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 10 April. Page .)

Mr BECKER (Hanson): The Opposition supports this Bill. On a number of occasions in this House members on this side have detailed the benefits that will flow to all South Australians from consummation of the merger of the State Bank and Savings Bank. During the course of his speech on the merger Bill in November 1983 the Leader indicated that the Government did not have a policy on merger of the State owned banks at election time. This was confirmed in an Australian Bank Employees Union circular to all staff members in March 1983, which quoted in full a letter from the Premier dated 25 March 1983. It was not until the Liberal Party outlined the benefits of a merger of the banks, only a matter of weeks after the November 1982 election, that the Government took up our initiative.

The legislation passed in this House to consummate the merger of both banks gives the new State Bank a broad charter: it also gives the bank potential to attract new industries and employment opportunities to this State, a merger precipitated by the positive actions of the Liberal Party—the Party which will form the next Government of this State—the only Party with the vision and skills to make this State great again.

When speaking on the merger Bill, the Leader acknowledged at the time the complex task of bringing both Acts together as they related to staffing provisions. To ensure continuity of employment without reduction of existing benefits, the Liberal Party was successful in moving an amendment that the merger Act would not come into existence until the legislation we have before us today is passed by this House.

It makes sense that the two banks with the greatest history in this State (a combined history of 224 years service to the people of South Australia) should merge their operations on 1 July. On that day, like a sleeping giant awakening, two great banks will join together to give all South Australians better service and better facilities. They will be operating as one bank under a bright new image: the new State Bank of South Australia will be born. The new bank will be the largest banking organisation in South Australia, with total assets of more than \$2 500 million, a capital base of \$130 million, over 700 000 account holders, more than 190 branches, and 2 500 staff members.

Such a force in the local market place will place the bank in a much stronger position to co-operate with other State banks and to provide interstate services for South Australian companies through the link-up. It has been nearly a year since the merger was announced, and much behind the scenes preparation has been completed by the staff of both banks to ensure a smooth transition at merger date. A new red, white and blue State Bank corporate logo has been unveiled. Both banks have managed to develop a strong corporate theme over the years. The new corporate logo should be readily identifiable by all South Australians.

Branch instruction manuals have been completely reviewed with the objective of making information retrieval as efficient as possible. Stationery stocks have been standardised and greatly improved, systems have been enhanced to give the bank the benefit of the latest developments in technology. Banks, building societies, and credit unions all realise the

era of conservative savings habits has passed. Today, the consumer's emphasis is on making their savings work for them.

Accordingly, product rationalisation of the services offered by both banks has been undertaken, and new product lines have been developed. To avoid disruption to the banking habits of the majority of customers the selection of current savings bank products is a positive move in ensuring that customer confusion is minimised at time of merger if not avoided. To assist existing State Bank customers adapt to some of the new product services a limited range of savings bank products are already on offer in State Bank branches.

Branches set down for merger have been identified, together with any branch structural alterations, or new premises required prior to integration of dual points of representation. Since the passing of the merger Act, a Chief Executive Officer, Mr Tim Marcus Clark, has been appointed to guide the bank through the merger period and beyond. It will be the Chief Executive Officer's responsibility to oversee the formulation of the bank's new policies and achievement of its corporate goals to promote the further development of the State's economy and to act in the best interests of its shareholders—the people of South Australia.

Two line General Managers have been appointed for Retail Banking and Corporate and International Banking. The bank's operations have been divided into five operating divisions: five Chief Managers have been appointed to assume responsibility for Marketing, Planning, Personnel, Administration, and Finance. The State Bank will have a new, relatively young and aggressive management team. The effectiveness of these new roles lies not in their official position in the hierarchy, but their ability to sell new ideas to both top management and the various line managers shortly to be appointed.

The planned changes, I believe, are far from cosmetic, as both banks have been slowly restructuring themselves from heavy bureaucratic organisations since the late 1970s by becoming more responsive to changes in the market place. I believe that the new structure will involve the decentralisation of authority as far down the line as possible. Regional managers have been appointed, with a mix of senior staff from both banks. Through the introduction of regionalised, or area banking, the new structure will lead to a more expedient decision-making process and will particularly lead to a shorter time period in turn around of loan applications, a critical factor in increasing or maintaining market share.

The success or otherwise of a smooth transition during merger will be dependent on the particular strategies and management skills of Mr Marcus Clark and his executive committee. As with the recent bank mergers of Westpac and the National Australia Bank, the new group will face the inevitable loss of some business and the problem of staff and branch network duplication. These problems are part and parcel of every merger, and will present a special challenge to all personnel involved. Management has gone to great lengths to inform the staff of both banks about the implications of the merger.

In late August 1983 the first issue of *Merger News* was forwarded to each staff member assuaging fears about job security, detailing the activities of both banks, and emphasising the strengths and benefits of the proposed merger. Often the announcement of a merger has a human shockwave effect which leads to an immediate loss of productivity, morale, and perhaps staff as well. The merger team has obviously undertaken a thorough assessment of this type of situation. Unfortunately, all too often the decision makers in some larger merger or takeovers rely on cold, hard financial facts and statistics, and not the human factors. Projected earnings, profitability and market share are all very well, but it is people who create them. Staff make a bank what

it is: they are the ones who project the bank's image, and gain and retain business.

Improved staff knowledge and expertise will be needed to cope with the new systems and the expected increased competition from rival institutions during the merger period. The Executive of both banks together with the Australian Bank Employees Union have placed considerable emphasis on human accounting and human resources in planning for the merger. They are both to be commended in commencing staff training centre workshops with the objective of these sessions to identify problems associated with the merger, including anxiety and stress-related pressures. Regional managers have completed a visit to all branches throughout the State, meeting the staff of both banks and updating them on merger developments to date. I am also informed that Mr Marcus Clark has visited a number of branches Statewide in an endeavour to provide access to as many staff members as possible.

Over the past two years the banking industry in Australia has undergone the largest structural change in its relatively short history, and some of these have occurred as a result of the Campbell Committee of Inquiry. Further change is expected from the broad deregulatory thrust flowing from the recommendations of the Martin Review Group's report. Australian banks have been gearing up for increased competition (with or without foreign bank entry) during this time.

Banks are currently actively competing with each other to establish electronic funds transfer point of sale networks with retailers. The National Australia Bank is currently negotiating with a national sharebroker for a 50 per cent equity. Westpac and the ANZ are actively considering their future involvement in this area as an extension of customer services. The ANZ Banking Group has purchased a trustee company; Westpac has purchased a controlling interest in a gold and silver bullion dealer. It has recently been announced that the Commonwealth Banking Corporation will be restructured by having the Commonwealth Savings Bank, presently a separate statutory authority, made a wholly owned subsidiary of the Commonwealth Trading Bank.

In August 1983, both the State and Savings Bank together with the other six State and regional banks affiliated with Visa International and have begun issuing their own international credit cards in a very competitive market for this facility. In addition, all State banks have recently formed a national association of State banks, and between them account for approximately 20 per cent of total banking business in Australia. Our new State Bank will have an 88 per cent equity in local financier, Beneficial Finance Corporation Limited. Acquisition of Beneficial Finance, coupled with the resources of merchant bank CCF Australia, will greatly assist the bank to make its presence felt in both the commercial and corporate sectors of the State through utilisation of the widespread branch network. The bank has also become a shareholder in Austraclear, a company specialising in the electronic settlement of money market dealings. On launch date—1 July—the new bank will be well equipped to compete more vigorously in the South Australian financial market.

Branch managers of the past spent most of their day tied to their desks performing administrative tasks, leaving little time for business development. Australian banks for the first time in their history have been moving into a marketing era where they are required to initiate business, not merely react to loan requests. Management performance in the new bank will be more important not only in the progress of the bank but also in the career aspirations of individuals. The merger will not deprive people of their jobs and there is no need for staff to feel threatened by the inevitable changes that will take place in the coming months. Those prepared

to adapt to change will have a good future; there is tremendous scope for all involved. Integration of dual points of representation will lead to an upgrading of a substantial number of managerial appointments and downline classified positions. More opportunities will be created for staff members of both banks to maximise their career aspirations.

On 1 July the launch of our new State Bank, with a bright new image, a new young and aggressive management team coupled with a revitalised marketing philosophy, will provide an exciting challenge for all personnel involved. The Opposition has analysed the legislation we have before the House today and is quite satisfied that the rights and interests of the staff of both banks have been protected.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I appreciate the support given by the honourable member on behalf of the Opposition. Much preparation has gone into this measure, which is the second stage of the process that has been commenced and indeed was approved by this House at the end of last year. I do not intend to go into any of the points made by the honourable member: I agree with most of them. The whole object of this Bill is to provide a new dynamic and aggressive financial institution out of the amalgamation of two very strong and important financial institutions with a long history in this State.

The honourable member began by setting up an elaborate scenario of how it was all because of what the Opposition had done (the previous Government): I am not prepared to go into that. It is rather like the saying that imitation is the sincerest form of flattery: claiming the credit for something indicates how universally acceptable it is. We should not waste productive time by saying, 'I did it. No, you did not' and so on. It stands on the record that we as a Government took the initiative in consultation with and in conjunction with the boards of the respective banks. The merger committee has done a marvellous job. The measure before us, which is the final stage of the legal work that needs to be done, represents a document which has been agreed between the banks, the employees and their representatives, the unions, and the Government and, as such, can be commended to the House. I thank honourable members opposite for their support.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—'Insertion of new schedule.'

Mr BECKER: Can I deal with the first schedule contained in clause 5 at this point, and obtain the information that I seek?

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair will be putting the schedule, and the honourable member can speak to it then.

Mr BECKER: When can I seek information on the schedule?

The CHAIRMAN: It is the honourable member's right to speak to the schedule under clause 5, but after clause 5 is passed the Chair will put the schedule, which will give the honourable member the right to speak to it. There is no possibility of the honourable member being gagged from speaking to the schedule; he can do it now or when the schedule is put.

Mr BECKER: I will do it now. My question relates to the second schedule, paragraph 2 'Conditions of employment and dismissal'. During January of this year the State Bank advertised for trained bank staff with experience in general and international banking. The advertisement indicated that the salary would be in terms of the ABEU award or as negotiated for officers in classified positions. Following that advertisement, I was informed that a considerable number of staff members of both banks were concerned that their promotional opportunities for classified positions would be

diminished due to an influx of classified officers from other banks. That fear has always been with us in banking.

In years gone by, one did not poach staff from other banks. In the past few years, with so many mergers and the rationalisation of banking in Australia, the situation has changed dramatically and career staff naturally are concerned about their employment prospects. Will the Premier advise the Committee how many applications were received in response to the advertisement from bank officers in classified positions, the number of classified officers engaged, the number of bank officers in non-classified positions, and the number of officers engaged?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am afraid that I cannot obtain that information for the honourable member in the short term, but I can certainly undertake to seek it for him, if he is satisfied with that, and supply it to him. But, in relation to his general comment, it is fair to say that there is considerable sensitivity to the rights of existing employees and their promotional and other opportunities within the new bank. Obviously, as I think the honourable member mentioned in his second reading submission, any such amalgamation must involve some uncertainties and perhaps some fears on the part of employees.

Very strenuous work has been done within the banks to keep that to an absolute minimum. There has been full consultation at all times. The merger group worked very closely with staff and the union to satisfy them at each stage of consideration. Bearing in mind the widened scope of activities that the new bank will undertake and the whole concept of the merger, in fact, rather than a diminution of opportunities, opportunities for promotion and new and exciting fields of activity will be enhanced for existing staff.

However, obviously as well in the process of widening the scope and activities of the bank, specific skills will have to be called upon, and at least in an interim period, I think it is fair to say that in certain areas some recruitment will take place. I will get the detailed information for the honourable member. But I stress again that there has been concern throughout that the amalgamation be seen as a challenge and opportunity for staff employed in the two separate banks, and not in any sense to block their opportunities. That is at the forefront of management's concern in this area.

Mr BECKER: Can the Premier advise the total number of part-time employees currently employed by both banks, including the ratio to full-time employees, together with any arrangement negotiated with the ABEU relating to part-time employment opportunities with the new bank? Engagement of part-time employees is a field that appears to be increasing within the banking industry.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I understand that, looking at the two banks, there is a total of about 120 part-time employees. That must be set off against a total employment of some 2 500 people, so I think it is clear that the proportion of part-time employees is not high. I do not think there is any major intention to change that sort of ratio, although obviously there is some flexibility, and indeed, some demand in the work force, for increased numbers for part-time work. That will be very much a management decision taken in consultation with the work force. But, that is the rough proportion at the moment.

Mr BECKER: Paragraph 2 (a) relates to conditions of employment and classification of offices, and provides:

Subject to this Act the Board may:

(a) employ officers and other persons subject to such conditions as it thinks fit;

Has State Cabinet decided who are to be members of the first board of the new bank? If so, when will an announcement be made?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am not sure that that is relevant to the employment of officers and other persons, but it is relevant to the board and the board's policies. The short answer is 'No'. Until this legislation is passed and the formalities are in place we think it is inappropriate to make formal appointments. To date, there has been a merger advisory group superintending it, reporting to the respective boards of both banks.

That is, of course, under the aegis of the General Manager-elect, Mr Clark, who I think in strict technical terms is an employee of the Savings Bank of South Australia at this stage. But, it is the Government's intention to move very rapidly to the appointment of the board following the passing of this Act. As I think I indicated last year in making that appointment we will certainly attempt to get a mix of skills and a representative group. We are also conscious of the need to provide some sort of continuity from the boards of the two existing banks. Beyond that I am not prepared to say any more than that those appointments obviously once made will mean there is a board-elect in operation until 1 July and that they will formally take up their position after that date when the Act is proclaimed.

Mr BECKER: Clause 2 (b) provides:

Transfer an officer from one office to another office having the same classification.

Can the Premier assure the Committee that any branch manager displaced following the merger will not lose his house allowance and full managerial status benefits if he is allocated to duties other than branch management?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The answer is 'Yes'. It has been agreed that that position will be preserved.

Mr BECKER: Clause 3 relates to prescribed offices. How many incumbents currently hold prescribed offices in each bank? How many prescribed offices have been planned for the new bank?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am advised that presently there are 32 prescribed offices in the Savings Bank and two in the State Bank—a total of 34. No fixed or firm decision has been made, and I do not think it would be appropriate to do so, on the total number that may evolve following amalgamation. But, I understand that it would not be anticipated that there would be more than about 50 positions. In other words, there will be no substantial increase either in actual numbers or proportionately.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chair cannot allow too much latitude. It has tried to be fair. The honourable member would know that he is entitled to ask only three questions on each clause. The Chair has been more than lenient about this. It must put the clause. The honourable member can still ask one or two questions on the schedule if he so desires.

Mr BECKER: I wanted your guidance, Sir. I wanted the right to ask questions about the schedule, which is a large document, and very important if we are to protect existing staff rights. That is the whole thrust of the legislation. Speaking as a former bank officer, I say that the schedule is very important because this is the only chance we have from a legislative point of view to reassure the staff that they have no fears, that their employment is protected and that there will be an opportunity for additional classified positions (prescribed office positions) to go from, say, 34 to about 50. That creates an excellent opportunity and challenge for the staff. I want to be able to go through the second schedule paragraph by paragraph, because it contains about 13 paragraphs.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Perhaps the Chair should clarify the position. The Chair is quite prepared to accept that we go through the schedule paragraph by paragraph if the Committee wishes. I am in the Committee's hands.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is true that this is a five-clause Bill. The real burden of the Bill is contained in the schedule. I propose no objection to dealing with it paragraph by paragraph. Obviously, I would not like to see this protracted unduly. I remind the Committee again that we have before us an agreed document about which there has been long and adequate discussion. It comes to us with most, if not all, concerns satisfied or answered in some way. However, I appreciate that the honourable member might wish to raise more than three questions on the total of the schedule, and I will be quite happy to support a ruling that will see it operate that way.

The CHAIRMAN: We will deal with the second schedule paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1 and 2 passed.

Paragraph 3—'Prescribed offices.'

Mr BECKER: Is the Premier prepared to take a question on notice and advise me the salaries and allowances to be paid to the incumbents of the prescribed offices of the new bank and from which bank are the proposed incumbents announced to date to come?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not think that information can be supplied simply because it is too early to say yet what offices or skills will be needed. Considerable discussions have taken place with the unions, which are naturally concerned that this sort of procedure does not over-ride other rights within the bank. The important thing is to give the bank that flexibility. We are not talking about the very senior officers of the bank, but about particular specialist skills that might be required. In all cases they will not have been identified and I would imagine the normal procedure would be to see first whether within the banks those skills exist, and try to make appointments accordingly. Where they do not (and quite clearly in this early phase anyway of a new and revamped operation, they will not be in the bank), then obviously those specialists will be recruited from outside. Certainly, assurances have been given that the provision definitely will not be abused and those assurances have been given not only to the union but to the Government. I am satisfied there will be no major problem. After July some of those positions will begin to be identified and I think the questions can then be answered, but it is premature at this stage.

Mr BECKER: I would have thought that some appointments would have had to be made. In fact, a management team is working on the merger so they would be starting to put people into positions and those prescribed offices would be starting to be formed so that the merger will be smooth from 1 July. That is part of why I am asking the Premier to take on notice and advise me by letter the salary and allowances to be paid to the incumbents of the prescribed offices of the new bank, and to say from which banks the incumbents of the positions announced today will come.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: At this stage I understand the only such officers are the Chief Manager (Mr Clark), who was recruited from outside, two General Managers and five Chief Managers. Those appointments have been announced and they are already in operation. I received a letter from one of them the other day. We will not know, nor will the bank, what it will require until after July. It is not appropriate that information on salaries and other matters should be presented, because of confidentiality. Flexibility is needed in terms of remuneration packages for individuals, which is one of the points of a prescribed office. I refer the honourable member to the basic purpose of this merged bank and the Act which empowers it, which is to allow the bank to operate in a commercially competitive sense, and that goes simply beyond what sort of services are offered. I think it also goes to the way in which its chief executives and managers are employed and the sort of package of

remuneration that may be given to attract them or to retain them. I think that is a matter of confidentiality as between the board and management itself and those managers, and I do not think it would be appropriate for disclosure in these circumstances.

Mr BECKER: I appreciate that confidentiality is needed in remuneration packages for senior management and that the new bank must operate as a commercial undertaking, but fortunately or unfortunately it is a Government instrumentality and this is where the problem of open government and accountability comes in. I suppose that at some stage in the future the Premier will have to give serious consideration to just how far we do go with open government and accountability. Do we insist on total openness in all the executive structure within this new bank and any other statutory authority the Government has? In one respect the Parliament should demand this information.

At this stage I appreciate the sensitivity and the need for a certain amount of confidentiality but I do believe Parliament should look at this question. It is the difference between the free enterprise system and the public instrumentality system that governments can be challenged and perhaps embarrassed into having to disclose information that is not readily disclosed by free enterprise operators. At this stage I accept the Premier's explanation, but in the future we will have to resolve this question of open government.

Paragraph passed.

Paragraph 4—'Classification of offices.'

Mr BECKER: Is the Premier able to say how many officers of both banks are currently receiving classified salaries or the equivalent salary structure of clause 7 in the ABEU award, and what is the ratio of total number of officers on classified salaries to full-time employees?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There are about 620 classified offices, the bulk of which (about 500) are in the Savings Bank, compared with the 2 500 total employment figure I mentioned earlier.

Mr BECKER: How many officers are identified as needing upgrading of classified status following the integration of dual points of representation? How many assistant manager, accountant or additional classified positions will be created as a result of such upgrading? An article in *Merchant News* published in March 1984, sets out the branch rationalisation programme and some branches with duplicated staff are listed. What additional staff structures will be created and what will be the benefits from the merger in that regard?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This aspect has been considered closely by the merger group. All those in the accounting area and nearly all those who are currently managers will be absorbed into the new structure in their positions. Some managers, however, may be displaced, but in most cases that situation is likely to be only temporary, depending on the number of vacancies and the rationalisations. Great care has been taken to protect the rights of existing staff. The effect of the amalgamation should not be the downgrading or disadvantaging of people. Rather, there should be the opening of opportunities and, if the officers are good enough, they will seize the opportunities and enhance their career.

Mr BECKER: Some of my friends in the Bank of Adelaide who were managers at the time of the merger with the ANZ Bank became assistant managers. Some have since become managers but others are still awaiting appointment as manager. This also affects other ranks such as that of accountant.

Paragraph passed.

Paragraph 5—'Board may invite applications for appointment to office.'

Mr BECKER: What proportion of all appointments in each bank are currently made by invitation?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I understand that future practice will reflect what has happened in the past. With the exception

of certain classified positions, all positions are effectively called. There may, however, be isolated instances where, for specific reasons, that is not done.

Mr BECKER: Regarding the integration of the larger branches, where dual representation exists and specific management skills are required by the merged bank, will the Board make an appointment to the position or will it invite applications for each position as occasion arises?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It will depend on circumstances, but the end result will be a balance between the two approaches. The attitude taken will ensure that the skills of officers will be matched to the task to be performed. Provided that some flexibility is involved, there will be no major departure from past practices in this area.

Mr BECKER: Does the Chief Executive Officer of the new bank intend to discuss with the Board the possible introduction, in 1985, of a staff incentive scheme for all officers based on profit performance for the preceding financial year?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I cannot say. I do not think that that matter has been addressed specifically. To the best of my knowledge, there are no plans for such a scheme at present. It will be a matter for the Chief Executive Officer when he has his executive team operating. This matter may be considered then. If it is planned to do so, there will no doubt be consultations with employees and the Board's sanction will be required. However, at this stage nothing definite is proposed.

Paragraph passed.

Paragraph 6—'Appeal to Promotion Appeals Committee.'

Mr BECKER: How many successful appeals have been made against appointments and how many appeals have been considered by the appeals committees of both constituent banks during the year ended 30 June 1983?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not have that information with me, but I undertake to get it for the honourable member.

Paragraph passed.

Paragraphs 7 to 9 passed.

Paragraph 10—'Entitlement of fixed establishment officers to superannuation.'

Mr BECKER: How many fixed establishment officers are currently employed by the Savings Bank?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The number is 259.

Mr BECKER: What facilities exist for fixed establishment officers to transfer their accrued entitlements to the South Australian Superannuation Fund?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: None. They are covered by this superannuation scheme for the duration of their employment.

Mr BECKER: Is there no portability?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No.

Mr BECKER: Will the Board consider that suggestion?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I understand that there are arrangements to transfer part of this into a pension fund which is administered by the South Australian Superannuation Fund, but it is not part of that Fund. It is unlikely that there would be any portability of the nature that the member has discussed. I think that it is worth bearing in mind that in all cases the choice was made available to the officers more than 20 years ago when the scheme came in. At that time they opted for one or the other scheme, and I think that the understanding was clearly that one should assess the advantages. No doubt everyone received advice and did their figures. It would be a little unreasonable to do a reassessment 20 years on and say, 'Wait a minute; I will swap to something else.' I think that for sound policy reasons this scheme (which is an attractive scheme anyway) is one that is an entitlement of the fixed establishment officers. They made the decision and opted for it, and that will apply to them.

Paragraph passed.

Remaining paragraphs (11 to 13), passed; clause passed.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): During the second reading debate I said that the Opposition was quite satisfied that the rights and interests of the staff of both banks had been protected and in subsequent examination in Committee I was reassured that that will be so. I take the opportunity to compliment the executive of the banks, the new bank, the Australian Bank Employees Union and staff representatives of both banks who are delegates to that union for the work they have undertaken, which very quickly brought about a consensus in regard to the interests of the staff of those two banks.

It shows what can be done when everyone puts his mind to it, is concerned and works for the interests of the State and the new bank, which will offer a new challenge and a new deal in this State. We would like to wish it well. I hope that it is successful and fulfils the dreams that many of us now want to see for South Australia because, after all, South Australia is what it is all about.

I take a little latitude and place on record that for many years both banks together with their staff have become involved in many aspects of community life. Early in the Second World War the Savings Bank head office was selected as headquarters of the State civil defence organisation. These premises were one of the principal fire-watching posts in the City of Adelaide and staff members manned the post for four-hourly watches each night during the time of the Japanese southward advance towards Australia. During this national emergency the bank and its staff played their part and earned the gratitude of the people of South Australia.

Through this legislation we recognise the staff of those banks, what they have done, and what they are now doing within the community in many areas, such as in voluntary and sporting organisations, and in the community and welfare fields—in the community generally. That is what a bank is all about: it is about people and human resources. It is wonderful to see that the rights of those individuals have been preserved and protected. I am quite pleased that each member of this House is reassured that the new bank will get off to an excellent start.

Bill read a third time and passed.

INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 4)

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

REMARK IRRIGATION TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 22 March. Page 2779.)

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): This Bill is before the House at the request of the Renmark Irrigation Trust and is principally for the purpose of increasing the penalty which the Trust can apply on overdue accounts. At the moment, there is a penalty rate of 10 per cent on outstanding accounts. The stand, the intention and request of the Renmark Irrigation Trust is that it be able to increase that penalty from 10 per cent on outstanding amounts after three months, plus one per cent per month thereafter. That is the

manner in which it wishes to proceed in regard to the collection of rates.

I point out that the Renmark Irrigation Trust over its long history has had a very prudent financial management record and I do not think that any member in this Chamber will deny that. All irrigation industries face significant financial problems. The Renmark Irrigation Trust is the oldest irrigation undertaking in the country. It is interesting to note how the Renmark Irrigation Trust came into existence. Renmark was founded by the signing of an agreement on 14 February 1887 between the then Premier and Treasurer of South Australia (John Downer) and the Chaffey brothers.

Unfortunately, some six years after its founding the Chaffey brothers' undertaking failed. In 1894 the Renmark Irrigation Trust was formed to take over the operations of the Chaffey brothers' irrigation undertaking. It came into being as a result of a special Act of Parliament in 1893, which established the Renmark Irrigation Trust Act. The first Chairman of the Trust was Colonel Sam Moran. As a result of the success of that undertaking, the State Government became involved in irrigation development in its own right in Government irrigation areas.

Members would be well aware of the problems that had confronted industries dependent on irrigation. In an attempt to keep up with the times and to provide a better service to ratepayers the Renmark Irrigation Trust endeavoured to improve the system it was using for delivering irrigation water to ratepayers. In January 1965, the Premier of the day, Sir Thomas Playford, visited Renmark and advised the Trust that the Government would finance a new pumping station on the river as well as rising mains across the flood plains, which was to cost something like \$1.12 million. That undertaking led to the development of the rehabilitation of the Renmark irrigation area. The undertaking given by Sir Thomas Playford was that eventually the Trust would have to repay five-sevenths of the \$1.12 million to the Government. In addition, the Government undertook to grant the Trust \$1 million (provided that the Trust found a matching amount of \$1 million) towards the cost of reconstructing its channel system.

As a result of that undertaking, a rehabilitation committee was established in February 1967; it was known as the Renmark Irrigation Trust Rehabilitation Advisory Committee (commonly known in the area as RITRAC). The pipe laying in the new irrigation distribution system commenced in May 1968. That irrigation distribution system put in by the Trust is the basic model that was adopted by the State Government in the rehabilitation of the Government irrigation areas. The fact that the Trust has been able to manage in the way that it has done is an indication of its very efficient and prudent financial management, which is a model that the Minister could well take note of. Many lessons can be learnt from the operation of the Renmark Irrigation Trust. I recently attended the annual general meeting of the Renmark Irrigation Trust at which time this proposed legislation was canvassed. No objection was raised by ratepayers attending that meeting. Therefore, I indicate that I have no objection to the legislation and that I am quite happy to support the Bill.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Minister of Water Resources): I thank the member for Chaffey for his support for this matter. This legislation has been introduced at the request of the Renmark Irrigation Trust, as the honourable member said. Members will recall that last year similar legislation was introduced in regard to other irrigation areas in South Australia. As the member for Chaffey said, over a period of years the Renmark Irrigation Trust has been very prudent in its financial management in what I acknowledge is a very difficult area, namely, the Renmark fruitgrowing area. These

amendments to the legislation will ensure that the Trust will be able to continue to exercise its ability to manage its affairs in the most efficient and prudent financial way.

I am grateful for the support of the member for Chaffey. The matter has been around for some two or three years or more. The legislation is important in providing a 10 per cent interest rate on outstanding Trust accounts (with an additional 1 per cent after three months) to ensure that people pay their accounts rather than investing that money and thereby obtaining a much greater interest rate. Certainly, I believe this is a step in the right direction and I ask honourable members to support the Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL, 1984

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 4 April. Page 3205.)

Mr BAKER (Mitcham): I shall address my remarks to this Bill as well as to the Racing Act Amendment Bill, as they are related Bills. In supporting this Bill I will canvass a number of issues associated with illegal bookmaking. It is recognised that it has a number of very undesirable impacts. Because of its illegal nature substantial police control is required, so there is a drain on public resources. Further, within its area of operation there are linkages with other forms of crime. The House would be aware that bookmakers need a link-up mechanism with other people involved in gambling.

There needs to be some form of enforcement for those people with bad debts. There have been instances where SP bookmaking has been set up with the assistance of people involved in the supply of telephones. No moneys are forthcoming to assist the racing industry from bookmaking fees. It reduces the income to the sport, and that is quite undesirable. Concerning the wider sphere, illegal bookmakers are part of the criminal subculture and pay little or no income tax and form a drain on the resources available to the community. For those reasons, we believe that every action should be taken to stamp out or limit illegal bookmaking activities.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: They don't believe in turning a blind eye either.

Mr BAKER: I will deal with that matter shortly. Vice Squad officers have informed me that since January 1981, 83 persons have been apprehended for illegal activities associated with bookmaking (there are three pending) and all those apprehended have been convicted. The maximum fine to date has been \$3 500 as against the maximum penalty provided in the Act of \$8 000. Some fines are as small as \$60, and have been imposed for offences which, I consider, are serious ones. Penalties provided in the Act are not being imposed as Parliament intended, yet this Bill seeks to increase those penalties. I agree with the police that higher penalties are required, because fines are inappropriate for those large-scale SP bookmakers, of which there are four or five in this category, and a fine of \$8 000 for a first offence would be insufficient to dissuade them from even one day's operation. To that extent, the measure has support on this side.

I question whether the penalties prescribed will act as a deterrent, given some of the problems that appear to be apparent in the courts. In time, all illegal bookmakers will come to the attention of the police. It is common knowledge that a person who has lost a considerable amount of money, a relative, wife or spouse of a person involved in illegal bookmaking, will eventually inform the authorities, so that

all illegal bookmakers will at some stage come to the attention of the police. It is unfortunate that the courts do not impose the proper penalties that should be handed down in those circumstances. It is important that offenders bear the full brunt of the law, and not an amount less than that intended. No-one has been sent to prison for offences against this Act.

The Minister has consistently declared his opposition to SP bookmaking and said that the racing industry is suffering from a loss of revenue, and we on this side agree with those sentiments. However, it was with some amazement I notice that last week in response to a question concerning the Windsor Hotel the Minister said:

It is not my prerogative to be a pimp or informer like some people and, indeed, the action that needs to be taken is a prerogative of the police, not of the Department of Recreation and Sport.

There have been innumerable police campaigns asking for assistance from the public to stamp out illegal practices. On that count alone, the Minister should seriously consider his position. As he is in charge of the racing industry and it is his responsibility, he has further demands placed on him to stamp out this practice. If the person concerned at the hotel is a personal acquaintance of the Minister, the Minister has an obligation to inform that person that, if he continues his operations, he will be reported to the police. The Minister has not lived up to his obligations in this matter. It is up to the Minister and everyone in South Australia to stamp out illegal forms of bookmaking. The Minister does not have to be a pimp or informer, but he has to live up to his responsibility and inform the person concerned that he will be reported unless he desists. The Minister did not even reveal that he had done that. It seems that double standards now apply. The Bill is a short-term measure. I draw to the House's attention sections of the Police Offences Act that are getting out of step with other parts of law. For example, section 6 of the Police Offences Act provides:

Any person who assaults any member of the Police Force in the execution of his duty shall be guilty of an offence. Penalty: Two hundred dollars, or imprisonment for twelve months . . .

How does one line up that penalty with an offence of illegal bookmaking? Section 15 relates to a person carrying an offensive weapon, and provides a penalty of \$100 or imprisonment for three months. Section 38 deals with false pretences and fraud, which is a common offence and affects very importantly the elderly of this State. People go around and procure money under false pretences and in so doing cause a great deal of harm to people. The prescribed penalty for that offence is \$200 or imprisonment for 12 months. Section 43 provides:

Any person who wilfully and without lawful authority destroys or damages any property shall be guilty of an offence. Penalty: One hundred dollars or imprisonment for three months.

They are the types of penalty prescribed in the Police Offences Act, and they are areas that fundamentally affect people and take away some of their rights. One can see those penalties are far less, in fact, infinitesimally small, compared to clauses in this Bill.

It is a short-term perspective. It is supported on this side of the House, because we believe it is necessary that we should take that stance in these circumstances. We must, however, take a long term perspective. Concern has been expressed to me about the possibility of a person placing a bet illegally being subjected to a fine of \$2 000 or 6 months imprisonment. Whilst we understand that the law recognises that both the SP bookmaker and person placing the bet are acting illegally, we believe the penalties imposed on the person placing the bet are unrealistic.

In the long term we must find another solution to the problem. I know that the Minister has considered a number of possibilities. He has introduced a Bill to support another

form of TAB betting, and he has tried the Pub TAB experiment. However, he knows that sanctions against starting price bookmakers and other forms of bookmaking will not be sufficient to stamp out such practices.

People in isolated areas have used the services of illegal bookmakers and will continue to do because they have no alternative, such as access to TAB facilities: unlike people in the metropolitan area who are well serviced by race courses, greyhound tracks, and TAB agencies. The Opposition supports the measures contained in the Bill, and realises that a criminal element is involved in SP bookmaking. Penalties are insufficient for those offenders. In some cases, \$8 000 would only equate to a day's takings after meeting commitments. It is undesirable to allow organised crime elements to flourish and, for that reason, we support the higher penalties contained in this Bill.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Minister of Recreation and Sport): Although I agree in principle with most of the member for Mitcham's comments, I take exception to some remarks he made about me, which related to questions asked last week. The racing industry is important to South Australia's economy and according to the Racing Committee of Inquiry (set up by the previous Government) it employs about 11 000 people full and part-time, which is significant. It provides social contact and entertainment for South Australians.

The penalties provided in this Bill will be imposed by the courts. First, we as a Parliament enact legislation, the police act as an investigation agency and lay charges against an offender, then the court determines the penalty based on the circumstances of the offence. I noted recently that there have been 83 prosecutions of this type and three are pending. The gaming squad has done much work in recent years apprehending SP bookmakers.

This legislation will not be the be all and end all. However, a number of factors need to be considered in relation to SP bookmaking. Possibly the most significant occurrence recently was when the Federal Minister for Communications, Mr Duffy, announced the setting up of an inquiry into Telecom, because most SP business is done by telephone. I have wanted this to happen for the 18 months I have been Minister. At a Ministerial conference in November last year I was probably the motivating force behind sending a letter on behalf of the State Ministers present to the Federal Minister asking for greater co-operation from Telecom and law enforcement agencies in regard to SP bookmaking.

We need to pursue a combination of factors to try to eliminate illegal bookmaking. I usually use the word 'minimise' with respect to SP bookmaking. We need a public programme to educate people that betting with an SP bookmaker is breaking the law. Many people do not believe they are doing anything unlawful by betting with an unlicensed bookmaker. We need to improve the opportunities for people to bet lawfully, either at TAB agencies or subagencies or with bookmakers. I now move to the comments made by the member for Mitcham.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: We will do the State Bank Bill today.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Yes. I was asked by the member for Bragg if I was aware of SP bookmaking and if I had informed the police. I was not aware of SP bookmaking at all. My knowledge came from a report of the staff of the TAB through the TAB General Manager. If one reads that carefully, one sees that it says 'suspected bookmaking'. It is no prerogative of any member of this House to go around as an informer about what one might suspect in one's electorate or the community at large. As a legislator, I should not play the police role in regard to that matter. I am not an informer.

The answer I gave was a simple one: I do not believe that that is my prerogative but I believe that the police should act in that way. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is quite agitated about all this, because he wants us to finish before 5 o'clock. I thank the member for Mitcham for his comments and support for the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Unlawful bookmaking.'

Mr BAKER: What is the estimate of the amount of illegal bookmaking in South Australia, and how is the figure arrived at? The figures of \$100 million and \$150 million have been bandied around in the press, but I believe it is more likely to be \$50 million. Perhaps the Minister could tell us how this figure has been arrived at.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: There is no way of estimating it: it is a guess. One never knows because no returns of any sort are made. The only figure we have is the one that came from the committee of inquiry which mentioned \$100 million, but that was made four years ago and it was only a guess.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

RACING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 4 April. Page 3205.)

Mr BAKER (Mitcham): The Opposition supports the Bill for the reasons given for its support of the Lottery and Gaming Act Amendment Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): During this speech I wish to refer to the difficulties I have encountered since my election to office in respect to strata title companies. In the district of Henley Beach the number of strata title properties is quite high. Not only have units been built on the spare blocks left in my district but some of the big homes have been pulled down to provide space for strata units. Most of the flats established under the pre-strata legislation have been converted to strata titles in recent years.

Many of the complaints that I receive relate to the actual running of the strata title companies. Basically, some of the strata title companies are being run in an unbusinesslike way. Some of the complaints that have been put to me relate to the common ground where rubbish has been stored, where people have been parking their cars illegally, and where structures such as shade-houses have been established contrary to the strata title regulations. In addition, there is a steady stream of complaints about the charges being levied for maintenance, insurance, etc. It is not easy to run a strata company because differences of opinion can arise because of such mundane objects as garbage bins and the garbage belonging to one proprietor being deposited in the tin of another, or over such items as a wet mop left to dry on a verandah. Proprietors must come to realise that most of

these complaints are only minor and it is foolish to be disturbed by these occurrences.

Some companies are being run in such a haphazard fashion that no sinking fund has been established for the outside maintenance of the block of units concerned. Then, when the managers of the strata title realise that outside maintenance must be undertaken, a surprisingly high levy is struck in order to provide for this maintenance. This, in turn, usually causes consternation by the unit owners, especially those unit owners who are elderly and are on a fixed income. Provisions to call special meetings are often ignored, and the maintenance of proper minutes and accounts have also been known to be ignored. The Law Reform Commission of Western Australia in its report on the Strata Titles Act Project No. 56 also referred to the problems of office bearers in strata title companies. The report stated that office bearers of strata companies have complained from time to time about the impracticability of enforcing by-laws under the existing Act. Allegations have been made of proprietors and tenants parking their vehicles in a manner contrary to that prescribed by the by-law of the strata company, of noisy behaviour by residents, and on the unauthorised constructions by proprietors on improvements on the common property for their own use.

Councils concerned found that they were unable to deal effectively with such matters. This particular report also referred to the problems arising from the inability of proprietors in some strata schemes to organise the schemes on a businesslike basis. This may arise not only from the lack of goodwill on the part of those involved but from their lack of management skills.

The Real Property Act, 1886-1975, contains within it all of the necessary regulations so far as a strata title company is concerned, including the regulations that minutes of proceedings should be kept, that minutes should be kept in a minute book for the purposes of recording proceedings at all general meetings, that proper records and books of accounts be kept in respect to assets and liabilities, all sums of money received in respect to the preparation of proper accounts relating to all moneys of the corporation and the income and expenditure thereof and the presentation of a balance sheet at each annual general meeting of the corporation. Also, there is authorisation for any member mortgagee of the unit to be able to inspect the books at any time and there is regulation also to provide for at least one annual general meeting. In fact, there are pages and pages of regulations in the Real Property Act to properly control strata title units.

The problem relates both to the inability of the mortgagee to complain against the Titles Office and, on the other hand, to the inability of an officer of a strata title company to enforce the regulations. At present, in South Australia the only way that redress can be obtained is by taking a legal tort. This is both time consuming and, above all, extraordinarily expensive.

I have been given a photo-copy of an account by a lady in my district who took her complaint to a solicitor to seek redress. After she had incurred a bill of \$200, she had to stop the action because she simply could not afford to continue it. To that point in time she had accomplished nothing. The Western Australian Law Reform Commission had this to say about the need for an alternative dispute resolution system (page 302 of its report):

From preliminary submissions, comments made on the working paper and the inquiries made by it, the Commission is convinced that there is a need for a simple and inexpensive system for the settlement of disputes in strata schemes. Although sometimes the acts or decisions complained of may seem relatively minor to outsiders, nevertheless they can be a source of friction and disharmony within the strata scheme. The person or persons affected may be unwilling to take legal proceedings (supposing a remedy

were available) because of the trouble and expense involved, or may lack the financial means of doing so.

After having had some experience in trying to handle the complaints of strata title owners in my district, I can only conclude that the Law Reform Commission of Western Australia stated the correct view. In South Australia, consideration was given in 1978 to providing for a commission to look after strata titles. A Bill was introduced in this Parliament and laid on the table on 22 March 1978. That Bill amended the Real Property Act, 1886-1975, and made consequential amendments to the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1977. It provided for the establishment of a commissioner to provide a service to unit holders who wished to complain against the strata title companies and, also, to provide the strata title companies with the ability to settle disputes. A commission with a commissioner would be one way of providing a service for people who wished to resolve, without too much cost, problems within the strata title companies. Alternatively, other means could be taken, as they have been taken in Queensland, where the legislation provides for a referee who has similar powers to those of a commissioner. Employed part-time by the Queensland Government, he has the power to settle certain disputes in strata title companies.

The 1978 Bill contained provisions for cluster unit titles. Because of the controversial nature of the Bill and the connection between the two Acts, the Bill lapsed and was never reintroduced. The opportunity to provide a service for South Australian unit holders was therefore lost. I understand that this matter is now being considered by the Attorney-General's Department and that certain advice has been tendered to the Department by the Lands Titles Office. That office, I understand, constantly receives complaints from unit holders but, hitherto, it has been unable to do anything about providing an answer or a solution to those complaints.

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

Mr EVANS (Fisher): Recently, by way of question and comment to the press, I have referred to a problem concerning the condition of the South Australian passenger rail service and that of the track that carries goods trains. Before expounding on that matter, I refer to the plight of employees working on those lines. When I first received a complaint from passengers, I walked along the line and saw for myself the faults pointed out by complainants. I was fortunate enough to inspect the line in the morning, just after the Melbourne express had passed through, and I was amazed that in this day and age, when we can put a man or woman on the moon, the railway employees, whether of Australian National or the State Transport Authority, are expected to work on tracks immediately after a train has gone by dropping faeces and other toilet waste from passengers. I am amazed to think that we have on houseboats toilet facilities that catch the waste and dispose of it properly, yet we expect employees to work under the conditions I have outlined.

Mr Becker: Is that still going on?

Mr EVANS: Yes. It was just after the express had passed through. There must be a health risk as well as discomfort to employees as a result of these conditions. As a result of the publication of my comments in the press, I have received telephone calls from relatives and friends of people working in either of the rail services. It appears that some of the rail crews are concerned about the risk of accident, not so much in respect of the lighter passenger trains, but in respect of the possible derailment of a goods train which could result in members of the train crew being either killed or injured if the locomotive left the track. There was a deep

feeling among these people that the railway line has been neglected.

Other people having an interest in rail as a form of transport believe that it is the best form of transport if it is properly cared for. By telephone, they pointed out that the maintenance methods are so outdated in this country, especially in the Hills area, that the sort of equipment made available to maintenance employees charged with keeping the line safe is outmoded. It seems that our employees still use metal forks, shovels and other equipment that was obsolete 30 years ago in other countries that today use machines to lay the track in one action.

In discussing this matter with engineers involved and interested in this area, I find that there is a problem with a single track in the operation of modern equipment, because a bypass is needed to enable trains to get through. However, I understand that a bypass can be provided. I make a plea to Australian National and the State Transport Authority to think of the employees who must maintain the line. I understand that only six employees work on the maintenance of the Noarlunga Centre line with little modern equipment. Parts of that track are not up to standard. Even though part of the line has been completed only recently, there is a speed limit of 90 km/h on that line, and that is the standard limit throughout the metropolitan area. Indeed, on parts of the Hills line trains are restricted to 20 km/h.

Unless we give the workers satisfactory equipment and enough personnel there is no way the line can be maintained properly. We are now using big Victorian locomotives of the C30 type, which are heavy. To use a term retailed to me by an enthusiast, those locomotives have knocked hell out of the Victorian line and are doing the same here. We have also bought two locomotives that are heavier than the C30 type locomotive. Unless the standard track is upgraded to carry that sort of weight, trouble will result. If we do not get better equipment and more men to service the railway line so that an increased quantity of freight may be carried, we will have even more trouble than we have now.

The Government, we have been told today, is using concrete when laying an alternative type of road. Indeed, many European roads are concrete. Further, modern methods are used by the Highways Department in laying hotmix to form a road, and the railway seems to be the forgotten area in this regard.

Mr Hamilton: Why?

Mr EVANS: I am asked why. Since the South Australian Government in the Dunstan era sold the main railway network to National Rail, under the Whitlam Government there was very little maintenance, and there has been conflict between the two bodies about who will spend the money on it.

I refer to the State Transport Authority and some of the areas of concern. It is knocking down some of the shelter sheds and putting up small sheds which in the winter months would not even hold the number of passengers who need to congregate, particularly at the Blackwood railway station, who change from bus to train. Many passengers will be wet because of the lack of facilities. Also, if one looks at the track I pointed out in an article (in the *Advertiser*) that at one point outside the National Park tunnel on the Adelaide side half sleepers have been cut to try to prop the line into place.

At that point broken sleepers in the main interstate freight track are waiting to be replaced. Under the Pinera bridge, I am told, in recent times when the Melbourne express went through at that point, a passenger was thrown from his seat and injured. The next day a large number of State Transport Authority workers were there pushing the track back into line, but have allowed it to deteriorate to a point where an STA passenger was thrown out of his seat. I am told by

many STA workers that many of the trains used are underpowered, while new engines are sitting at the workshop. At times, up to 20 of the 300 class, entailing two cars with four motors, had three motors driving them instead of four. Now many of them are underpowered and cannot go into the hills to carry out the service. They break down or are late.

We also find that there were not enough brake shoes to put the supertrain on the line all the time, so in off-peak periods it was taken off the track. In the hot weather because the air-conditioning used up more fuel, it was cheaper to have it off the track and put on the old red hens. Many of the old red hens are in such a condition that they are an embarrassment and a disgrace to the employees. They are dirty, the seats are cut, one cannot see through the windows and the seat tops are loose. In some cases the seat tops virtually fly off and passengers sitting on them are thrown to the floor.

I refer to the area of communication. Points have been made to me, so I thought that I would actually do the hike and look at certain sections where I could. I find that there are tree branches lying on the communication and signal lines. They already have banjo type wires now. When they get wet and water settles on them many of the lines will snap. I was given an example which occurred last Friday when the trains and passengers were held up because of a breakdown of the signal equipment coming into Adelaide. The condition of the STA lines and facilities in the State is a disgrace. The Government knows it and I am sure that the employees know it. No consideration is given to people who are trying to provide a service to the community.

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

Mr MAYES (Unley): This evening I would like to turn my attention in the brief minutes I have towards the issue of who will benefit from the economic recovery. Many economists apply jargon to the discussions and debates surrounding their particular trade. In many ways it mystifies people's understanding of the economy and it maintains the barrier between lay people and those who act and live in the profession and purport to be economists. Economic theory can be broken down in simple terms. One aspect I want to consider is the terms which deal with the distribution of income and wealth—a critical factor in dealing with economic theory.

I want to attempt to predict who will benefit from the much publicised economic recovery. Before I do that, however, I would like to examine the term 'average weekly earnings' as used in political and economic discussions. It is often carelessly bandied around by conservative members of Parliament in a context which tends to mislead the community and gives some workers a false impression of their own purchasing power and influence within the economic framework. Average weekly earnings is regularly dredged up by conservatives crying political doom and woe for the economy as a consequence of any wage movements which may occur. If we look at average weekly earnings it can be seen to convey a very misleading picture of the way in which market forces operate in the wage area. If we applied a weighted average mean, that is, showed a distribution of persons to income over the various levels (per annum or per week), we would get a much clearer picture of how incomes are distributed within Australia and the whole economic community. In fact, by using average weekly earnings, we get a somewhat distorted picture.

Let us take an example: the latest average weekly earnings are approximately \$380 per week. There must be many workers in the community saying, 'I am nowhere near earning \$380 per week.' In the large areas of services and consumer

goods industries there must be very few taking home \$352 or \$380 a week. Most award wages would be in the range of \$200 to \$300. So how is it we get an average which is some \$50 or \$80 per week above what must be seen as the wage which the majority of Australian workers take home in their pay packets? If we look very carefully at how it is constructed, we find that the average does not include a weighting factor. Let me cite an example. If there are six wage earners (six salary earners) three of whom earn \$200, two of whom earn \$100, and one earns \$1 000, the average weekly earnings of those six people are \$300 per week. Yet five of them earn less than \$300; one earns more than \$300; collectively five earn less than \$800 in total; and only one earns \$1 000 a week.

For conservative politicians and economists to bandy around that figure and argue that the economy is not recovering because average weekly earnings have risen dramatically will give a false impression to the Australian community of the impact of an insignificant movement in the community wage. We can see quite clearly from all of the business review papers that the large wage increase expectations are not for award wages for the average worker or salary earner, but for the captains of industry who will in fact reap the rewards. They are the people who, by the terms of their conservative press, economists and politicians, are ruining the economy because they are the ones who are pushing average weekly earnings up—not the average wage and salary earner, who may get a 4.1 per cent rise, as in the recent decision of the national wage case, but those at the top.

I have taken out some figures of predictions put forward by some of the more conservative business reviews published in this country. However, before I examine those predictions I would like to consider a change in income distribution which has occurred in the Australian economy over the past 15 years. These figures are from the Australian Bureau of Statistics. In 1968 the top 10 per cent received 10 times the income that the bottom 10 per cent received. In 1982 the top 10 per cent received 56 times that which the bottom 10 per cent received. Now, the top 20 per cent (salaries over \$32 000 per annum) receive half the total income in the Australian economy. The bottom 30 per cent receive just under 10 per cent.

Therefore, I put forward this view. There has been a major redistribution away from the poor in our community towards the rich over the past 15 years. In fact, that distribution has dramatically affected the average weekly earnings, that so-called measurement of the impact on the economy which is often referred to by the press, politicians and economists. My argument is that, with this economic recovery which is predicted (and I notice in the *News* today that unemployment has dropped again), in fact the top 10 per cent or so will receive benefits. The bottom 30 per cent will continue to suffer.

The potential is there for those in high income brackets to reap any income growth benefits arising from any economic recovery that may occur in 1984-85. I have prepared some figures relating to income distribution and average weekly earnings of the population. In 1973-74 the mean average income, at \$70 a week, was maintained by .2 per cent of the population; 29.6 per cent of the population had an average income of \$11 760 per annum. In 1978-79, .5 per cent of the population maintained an average income of \$390, while 28 per cent maintained an average income of \$20 700. In 1981-82, .3 per cent had an income of \$318, and 29 per cent had an average income of \$28 000. Thus, it can be seen that at the bottom end of the scale the poor are getting poorer, and at the top end the rich are getting richer. It can be seen from these figures that income distribution has become less equal. In money terms there has

been a drop for those at the bottom of the range but an increase for top income earners in this country.

In the few moments that I have left I would like to refer to some of the articles that have dealt with predictions as to who will reap the benefit of the economic recovery. *Australian Business* of 15 February 1984 contained an article headed 'Young dynamos will do best—the biggest rewards in the salary revival will go to the top performers in computers, sales, retailing and merchant bank', which states:

By the end of the year, top men in one of these sectors—merchant banking, retailing or marketing—could be showing a 20 per cent hike in salary package, which coupled with about 30 per cent in 1983—

a period when the rest of the community gained very little in wage increases, as there was a wage pause for half of that period—

will give some a 56 per cent hike over a two-year period. Salaries of other top performers in the service industries will increase by about 10 per cent to 15 per cent.

So, we now have predictions that there will be about a 6 per cent rate of increase in wages this year, and yet people in the industries referred to will receive increases of the order of 15 per cent to 56 per cent, depending on the area in which they are working. The article continues as follows:

Executive salaries, which have mostly run parallel with wages over the past 12 months, will now rise faster than wage earners with pay packets tied to the consumer price index through half-yearly indexation.

That is an important point, because employers and conservative politicians are claiming doom because of the indexation decisions being handed down by the Federal bench, tied with a complete movement in the CPI, as it is currently measured, and yet it can be seen that the captains of industry, and perhaps those who are just below that scale, are in fact expecting income increases not of 6 per cent, but of the order of 50 per cent. That is the basis on which ordinary workers in the community might well ask who in fact is dragging up average weekly earnings, who in fact is inflating the figures. The articles which I have researched pose the question: who is pushing up national weekly earnings? The *National Times* ran an interesting article on this matter.

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

Motion carried.

At 5.24 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 17 April at 2 p.m.