

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 28 August 1984

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

PETITION: VOLUNTARY SERVICE AGENCIES

A petition signed by 18 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to subsidise charges to voluntary service agencies and to keep any price increases within the parameters of wage indexation was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

PETITION: EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

A petition signed by 129 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to ensure that the course in early childhood education at the Magill campus of the South Australian College of Advanced Education be retained in its present form was presented by the Hon. Michael Wilson.

Petition received.

PETITION: KINDERGARTEN UNION

A petition signed by 76 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to reconsider its intentions to disestablish the Kindergarten Union and to allow it to remain under the care and control of the Minister of Education was presented by the Hon. Michael Wilson.

Petition received.

PETITION: HARDY'S ROAD

A petition signed by 95 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to prevent Hardy's Road, Torrensville, being used by through traffic was presented by Mr Plunkett.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the following written answers to questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 18, 31, 32, 34, 36, 41, 43, 49 to 51, 55, 59, and 62.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—

- Pursuant to Statute—*
- i. Planning Act, 1982—Crown Development Report by South Australian Planning Commission on Alterations to the Caravan Park, Belair Recreation Park.
 - ii. South Australian Planning Commission—Report, 1982.

By the Minister of Marine (Hon. R.K. Abbott)—

- Pursuant to Statute—*
- i. Boating Act, 1974—Regulations—Fees.

By the Minister of Tourism (Hon. G.F. Keneally)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. South Australian Health Commission Act, 1975—Regulations—Health Services Advisory Committee.

By the Minister of Local Government (Hon. G.F. Keneally)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Local Government Act, 1934—Regulations—Qualifications Committee.
- ii. Corporation of Hindmarsh—By-law No. 22—Keeping of Dogs.
- iii. District Council of Cleve—By-laws—No. 32—Repeal of By-laws. No. 33—Amendments to Existing By-laws.

By the Minister of Water Resources (Hon. J.W. Slater)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Sewerage Act, 1929—Regulations—Water Service Fees.
- ii. Waterworks Act, 1932—Regulations—Water Service Fees.

By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. J.W. Slater)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Betting Control Board—Report, 1983-84.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: CAR REPAIRS

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Minister of Mines and Energy): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: During Question Time last Thursday the Opposition directed a series of questions to me and the Premier in connection with repair and service work to private vehicles carried out at my Department's Thebarton workshops. At that time, I explained to the House that I had authorised such a scheme during April for employees within the Drilling and Engineering Services branch, as a means of providing some fill-in work during a temporary downturn in the depot's workload. I also outlined what happened when the depot's principal engineer issued an unauthorised circular on 8 August inviting all departmental staff to participate in the scheme.

When the circular came to the notice of the Director-General on 14 August, he ordered the scheme terminated immediately. It was clear from the Opposition's line of questioning that they were seeking to drum up scandal. Without the slightest evidence of any wrongdoing, the Leader carelessly threw around the word 'racket', and suggested that a 'cut price' had been arranged to benefit public servants. However, amongst all the innuendo and imputations, a number of matters were raised that should be addressed.

First, the only arrangement that ever operated was the scheme which I authorised for employees who worked at Thebarton. The wider scheme envisaged in the unauthorised circular never got off the ground. No work was carried out under it. The member for Torrens had asked why payments by employees who had work done were directed to the depot's social club treasurer, how much these payments amounted to, and what happened to the money. The Engineering Services Division Social Club was involved in the scheme for a number of very good reasons. It was to be the body to which the Department rendered its accounts for labour. This was done to ensure that immediate payment was received for all work done. It was the social club's task to pursue recovery from the individuals concerned. Also, parts and oil for the jobs were not provided by the Department. I understand that this was arranged by employees through the social club, which had negotiated trade prices with various suppliers—a very common service offered by social clubs.

As to the amount of work undertaken, 19 jobs for 17 customers were carried out between 16 April and the closure

of the scheme, about four months later. The jobs represented 69½ hours of labour which, at \$18 an hour, amounted to \$1 251. What happened to the money? On 31 May, the Department presented invoice No. 45355 to the social club for labour costs totalling \$418.50. It was paid on 1 June, one day later. On 21 June, invoice No. 45363 for \$400.50 was rendered. It was paid the same day. Invoice No. 55371 was presented on 22 August for labour costs of \$279. It, too, was paid the same day. The Department expects the final invoice for \$153 to go out this week, and I would expect the social club to maintain the superb record of prompt payment which it has demonstrated throughout. So much for the suspicions of the member for Torrens.

The Deputy Leader, in a question to the Premier, raised the spectre of sales tax evasion. Were the parts used for the jobs obtained from Government stocks, thereby evading sales tax? The answer is 'No'. The Department supplied only labour. The parts were obtained by the social club from its own suppliers, and the Department was not involved in any way. The Opposition Leader made much of the fact that the depot's charge for labour was only \$18 an hour, and claimed this was \$7 an hour below the average rate charged by metropolitan service stations. The implication was that the \$18 charge was artificially designed, as the Leader put it, 'to give public servants the privilege of a cut price car service not available to taxpayers'.

This of course is nonsense. I pointed out last Thursday that the Thebarton division is a recharge operation that has long carried out a wide range of work for other Government departments, local government, and other groups in the community. The most recent list of man-hour charge rates published by the Department, dated 1 July, listed workshop services at \$18 an hour. If members wish to verify that this is the rate charged to other users of workshop services, they are welcome to inspect photocopies of ledger sheets, dated from April to July this year, which I have obtained from the Department. Those sheets show a labour cost of \$18 an hour to such organisations as AMDEL, the Woodville council, Mount Osmond Golf Club, the Pukatja Community Incorporated, and the Departments of Lands, Environment and Planning, E&WS, and Community Welfare.

There was no special rate for social club members: they paid the standard charge, neither more nor less. I should have thought that the difference between the \$18 labour rate charged by the Department and the \$25 quoted by the Opposition Leader might consist largely of the profit margin required by the private operator.

The member for Light asked for an admission that the Thebarton workshops had a surplus of staff. He should have addressed the question to his colleague the member for Kavel, who as Minister of Mines and Energy in mid-1982 received the results of a departmental review of the depot's activities and staffing. The former Minister took no action over the report, and it was left to this Government to implement the recommendations. I can report that a voluntary early retirement scheme late last year reduced the depot's work force by 16 employees.

In addition, 14 positions have been identified as surplus to working account requirements, and payment for them has been transferred to vote funds. A requirement for that arrangement is that the number of staff in the Drilling and Engineering Services Division be reduced by that number. That will be achieved over time by attrition. It should be noted that 24 staff at the depot are 55 years of age or older, and it is realistic to expect that this reduction will be achieved in a reasonable time.

Finally, on Friday the Opposition Leader sought to give his unfounded allegations some legitimacy by calling for a Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee inquiry into both the depot's car servicing activities and the question of staff-

ing. While I would not attempt to pre-empt that committee's right to make up its own mind on such matters, I suggest that the information I have provided to the House in this statement has left the Opposition with no 'racket' (to use the Leader's words) to pursue.

The only car servicing and repair work carried out by the workshop was under the limited scheme approved by me. The labour charge of \$18 an hour is the depot's published standard rate for workshop services. What private industry charges is irrelevant. The social club was the body invoiced for departmental labour charges at the standard rate. It paid its bills with a promptness that I am sure would delight the private sector. Parts and oils were obtained by the social club from its own suppliers. There was no sales tax fiddle. Finally, the Government is actively addressing the question of staffing at Thebarton on a continuing basis.

QUESTION TIME

WINE TAX

Mr OLSEN: Does the Premier agree that the imposition of a sales tax on wine included in last week's Federal Budget will generate more income for the State Government as well and, if he does, will he reduce liquor licence fees to help limit the impact of the sales tax? The State Government's liquor licence fees that the Premier increased last financial year to the highest in Australia are payable on the wholesale value of purchases by liquor retailers. The wholesale wine prices are expected to increase by about 10 per cent following last week's introduction of the Federal Sales tax.

Based on current levels of receipts, it is estimated that the sales tax will produce a windfall to the State Government of between \$800 000 and \$1 million a year in receipts from liquor licence fees. Late last year, after the Opposition exposed a major miscalculation by the Premier in receipts from higher liquor licence fees, the proposed increase from 9 per cent to 12 per cent was limited to 11 per cent. However, the Premier refused to amend the legislation, and the 12 per cent rate remains on the Statute Book. Rather than any further increase in the rate, the Premier should cut it back to 10.5 per cent to ensure that the industry and wine consumers are not hit further by this tax on a tax.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his suggestion: he has been making a lot of suggestions about the State's revenue over the past few weeks. He, like many other commentators, has that fundamental inability to understand the difference between the tax base and the tax rate. He, like some others who are uninformed, obviously believes that as our colony grows and prospers in some way Government revenues, which are related to economic activity, should not grow and prosper.

However, I make the point that if they do not, and the Government is to be excluded from any of the benefits of prosperity, in the sense of being able to assure its revenues, the deficit that the Government carries (the public sector debt) will increase and run out of all proportion and, in so doing, will jeopardise that very recovery. That is a basic fact of economic life.

In relation to a wine tax, I have already made quite clear my attitude to the Federal impost and, indeed, I made it clear to the Premier of Victoria, when a discriminatory tax was applied on wine in that State last year in the Victorian Budget. In the case of the general liquor franchise tax we do not make distinction between sales on particular types of liquor: it is a general tax based on that turnover. I remind the Leader of the Opposition that we did in fact reduce that rate from 12 per cent to 11 per cent, and that afforded considerable relief to the industry.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT VOTING SYSTEM

Mr MAYES: Is the Minister of Local Government aware of the concerns of the Adelaide City Council regarding the voting system for local government, and what action does he intend to take as a consequence? This morning's *Advertiser* carried a report of the Adelaide City Council's meeting last night in which reference was made to a resolution of the council calling upon the State Government to change the voting system for local government elections, established in the Local Government amending Bill which came into effect on 16 August. The article states:

At last night's meeting the council unanimously called on the State Government to change the voting system proclaimed in amendments to the Local Government Act earlier this month. The system, known as the optional preferential 'bottom-up' system, was described as 'undemocratic', 'absurd' and 'a mistake'.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question. At the outset, I must say that the newsclipping to which the member refers is indicative of wider reporting of council affairs which flows from the recent legislation—a trend which I am sure the Adelaide City Council and all councils in South Australia would approve. I am aware of the council's concerns regarding the method of counting votes at local government elections as prescribed in section 122 of the Local Government Act. Indeed, the Lord Mayor and the Town Clerk of the City of Adelaide met with me and the Director of the Department of Local Government last week and discussed this, amongst other issues.

It needs to be stressed that any voting system needs to be assessed against the objectives which underpin it. In this regard, the following objectives were set for a local government voting system during the preparation of the Bill:

1. The introduction of a system of optional preferential voting, designed to promote consistency in voter responsibility at Federal, State and local government elections.
2. A system which is simple and easy to administer, in the light of the varying administrative capacities of councils.
3. A system which would promote broader community representation on councils.
4. A system which would not promote or facilitate overt factionalism or the entry of Party politics to local government.

This last objective was inserted in the light of representations repeatedly made by representatives of local government, the Local Government Association, and by successive Lord Mayors at various stages of the extensive consultation process entered into by myself and the previous Minister of Local Government. The system was designed in close consultation with the Electoral Commissioner, who, I might add in passing, administers the same system for elections to the Superannuation Fund Board. The system is also more favoured by the Local Government Association than are other preferential or proportional systems.

It is important to understand that the system requires individuals to stand on their merits in local government elections and provides for the election of the candidates most individually preferred by the electorate. A particularly popular candidate will not be able to transfer votes to another candidate held in no regard by electors. By such means, the Government has given credence to the view consistently expressed by representatives of local government that parties and factions have no place in local government. Apparently, the Adelaide City Council is now less forceful on this point than on previous occasions.

In relation to the reported remarks that the system is undemocratic and absurd, the clear advice from the Electoral

Commissioner is that any of the 300 systems that we could have suggested could potentially result in seemingly unusual results. Is it fair, for example, that, under first past the post voting, of two candidates elected one could have 90 per cent of votes cast and another 5 per cent, yet each has equal voting strength in councils? The system in the Act now provides an opportunity for votes which under the previous system would have been eliminated to now be included in the final count. By such means, council membership should reflect broader interests than those which a crude simple majority system is able to provide.

Nevertheless, I acknowledge the concerns of the Adelaide City Council and have undertaken that, following the May 1985 elections, a thorough review of the electoral arrangements in the Local Government Act will be undertaken by officers of my Department to see whether any of the concerns expressed by that council have, in fact, occurred. I look forward to the participation of the Adelaide City Council in that exercise.

PUBLIC SERVICE REDUCTION

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Premier say how many Public Service jobs are to be cut by his decision to reduce the senior level salary bill, and how much this move will save the taxpayer? A report in this morning's *Advertiser* states that the Premier has outlined a 'no soft options' approach to senior public servants on the need to reduce their salary bill. However, a report in the *News* suggests that only 12 positions are to be cut.

Whatever the extent of the cut, the decision represents a major about-face by the Premier, who for the past five years has criticised any suggestions that the size of the public sector should be reduced and specifically promised no cuts at the last State election. In view of the contradictions in today's media reports of the decision, and the about-face to which I refer, I ask the Premier to explain in detail how many jobs are to be cut and how much this will save.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The target, as reported in the *Advertiser* this morning, is 5 per cent in the executive officer range, which would involve something in the order of the figure that the Deputy Leader mentioned.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Twelve.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In that executive officer level, yes. We are talking about 5 per cent of that; that is right.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: A 5 per cent cut overall would be very significant indeed, and we are talking about salaries in the order of \$40 000 to \$60 000. That is the first consideration. Secondly, there is a reduction target of some 20 jobs in the management services area. A further examination is being carried out of where we can make savings in terms of non-replacement of positions in that other management level. By so doing, we will free up funds to ensure that we get the double benefit from it, first, by ensuring that greater responsibility is taken at various levels in the public sector, which will result in increased efficiencies. Secondly, it will give opportunities for others at the lower end of the scale either to get some promotion or, more importantly, at point of entry—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —it will allow our school-leaver entrance programme to be developed. This is a very important point. I refer members opposite to the fact that under the previous Government's policy of attrition, the wrong people left the wrong jobs at the wrong time and millions and millions of dollars were wasted as a result. It is impossible, in certain areas, to rely on so-called natural

attrition and expect that that will yield either financial benefits or efficiency. It does neither unless it is part of an overall and total programme. That is indeed the overall and total programme which has been canvassed very thoroughly in the review of Public Service management in the Guerin Report.

I make a further point: I made clear at the time of the election (and this is quite consistent with the policy announced this week) that the overall level of public sector employment as at 1 July 1982 was an adequate and sufficient level which should be maintained.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Leader's interjection is totally erroneous, as the figures will demonstrate. In fact, there is a deviation of less than 0.5 per cent in that area. We are talking about a few hundred jobs which are mainly concentrated in the Woods and Forests Department in the South-East, as a result of the natural disasters.

If the Leader of the Opposition wants those jobs to be abolished, particularly as they relate to a commercial activity, he had better say so, and by doing so again he would indicate the mish-mash of Opposition policies in regard to public sector bankruptcy. The target will be met so that jobs in the public sector will be available for school leavers. The age profile of the Public Service, which is grossly distorted at the moment, can over time be corrected. All of that will yield the benefits I am talking about: efficiency, productivity, and a better and leaner public sector that will be able to deliver the goods. That is what this Government is all about, and that is precisely why this step is being taken, in beginning where it should begin, that is, at the top.

MINING EXPLORATION

Mr FERGUSON: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy advise the House of the likely effect on the South Australian mining industry of the Commonwealth Government's decision announced by the Federal Treasurer in the Budget last week to allow expenditure incurred on general mineral exploration and prospecting to be deductible against income from any other source?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: First, I applaud this very positive and far-sighted step taken by the Federal Labor Government. Today's exploration is tomorrow's development project.

Mr Ashenden: What about Honeymoon and Beverley?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I expect that over the next few years we will see a significant increase in exploration as a result of this decision, and with a bit of necessary luck we will see some new mining developments as a result.

Mr Becker interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I do not know whether or not the member for Hanson would like to see some new development.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I am certainly pleased to hear that at least someone on the other side has a little bit of sense. Exploration is a high risk activity, and this decision by the Federal Government will obviously permit greater exploration expenditure and investment in exploration by a broader range of companies, many of which would not have been in a position before this announcement to consider engaging in mineral exploration.

South Australia has some highly prospective areas, particularly for oil and base metals, and I expect that we will enjoy a disproportionately large share of the resultant increase in exploration activity. I note that the Deputy Leader does not seem to disagree with that statement. Some of our successful local oil and mining companies may in future

seek to diversify into other industries, whether by acquisition or otherwise. I point out to honourable members that some speculation along these lines was evident recently in the financial pages in regard to Santos and its relatively strong emerging position. I think that the honourable member has been very sensible in raising this question, and I welcome the opportunity that has been provided to outline to the House the benefits that will ensue nationally, and particularly to South Australia, as a result of the decision made by the Federal Government.

ROXBY DOWNS

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Has the Minister of Education seen a recent edition of the Blackwood High School magazine *Scoop*, in which blatantly misleading information about the Roxby Downs project was published, and will he use his influence to see that the misinformation is corrected? The Opposition has received complaints from parents of students of the Blackwood High School about an article on Roxby Downs published recently in that school journal. The article is based on Campaign against Nuclear Energy material which, I might say, is notoriously misleading. While the article purports to state facts about Roxby Downs, it includes allegations that people who live at Olympic Dam are four and half times more likely to die of cancer than are people not working at Roxby Downs; that huge quantities of tailings will contaminate the soil, water, plants, animals, and people in the area; and that northerly winds will blow radioactive particles south to Port Augusta, and even to Adelaide.

The article also promised that the next issue of *Scoop* will deal with the subject of 'Roxby Downs uranium and nuclear weapons—Australia's link in the nuclear war chain'. As the Minister is a member of a Government which supports Roxby Downs, does he not accept that these statements are completely misleading and have no place in a school journal seeking to objectively inform students without at the very least an opposing case being presented? Some of the parents who have contacted the Opposition have suggested that those responsible for the publication should ensure that these misrepresentations are corrected in a subsequent issue. I ask the Minister to say that this will be done.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I have not seen the issue of *Scoop* referred to by the honourable member, the shadow Minister. I am not a subscriber to it so I cannot immediately inform this House whether it is a publication of the Students Council of the school or some other publication of the school. Maybe the shadow Minister can inform the House on that. Is it a Student Council publication?

The Hon. Michael Wilson: I will give you a copy.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Is it a Student Council publication?

The Hon. Michael Wilson: I'm not sure.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: For someone who has apparently read this journal thoroughly he has not bothered to read some basic details like that. There are some important questions to be answered in that regard. If in fact it is a publication that is being funded by State funds and by the school officially, then certainly this is a matter I will have to look at but, if it is a publication being published by the Student Representative Council of the school, is the honourable member proposing that I should use my Ministerial prerogative to conduct censorship of that publication? Is the honourable member proposing to me that I should say that that is the way to answer this kind of debate raising those sorts of facts? Is the honourable member saying that I should not go out instead and say that those who have

opposite points of view should in fact write a letter to the Editor of *Scoop* and ask for those points of view to be included?

I would like to know exactly what he is saying, because I can recall (and I hope other members of the House can recall) that, when I was shadow Minister, I raised some queries about a certain book by John Grover (a pro-uranium book which made some outrageous and scurrilous assertions and some defamatory remarks about people and groups of people in the anti-nuclear area), which was going into every school library in South Australia. When I used the forum of this House to attack that, I did not do so on the basis of saying there should not be pro-uranium arguments in schools: I thoroughly defended the right of students to participate in debate on this issue and have facts put before them representing both sides of the case. At the time, I based my arguments not upon saying, 'Replace that book with some other anti-nuclear book': I said, 'Why are not school libraries encouraged to use the International Fuel Cycle Evaluation document put out by the International Atomic Energy Agency Commission?', which is a pro-uranium source of material. I said that that was a dispassionate and considered study of the industry that was well worth while students considering if they wanted to examine the arguments in favour of uranium. I believe that dispassionate material on both sides of that debate should be available to students.

The answer I got when I raised that issue was all sorts of hysteria from the other side, asking what I was trying to do: was I trying to censor school libraries, was I trying to censor information that was available to students? The fact that this book was I believe a defamatory book about many people to which it referred just did not seem to occur to them. In fact, they then fed this to various journals around the place, and I was attacked in those journals as well, because I was wanting to keep this document out of schools. In fact, I was not wanting to keep it out of schools: I was asking that school libraries investigate it to see whether explanatory notes ought to be provided with the book so that it could be put into its proper context.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I think that the Opposition ought to be very careful when it starts raising issues of this kind, because it is exactly as the Minister for Environment and Planning says: sauce for the goose. The Opposition has not even bothered to do enough homework on this matter to find out the source of the publication. I will certainly do that, and I will certainly make inquiries about it. I will certainly find out exactly what the nature of the article was. May I suggest in the intervening period that for those who take exception to the points made in that article (the honourable member has read out some of them, and it seems as though the article does in fact put across certain points that are not correct) that should be the subject I would have thought to stimulate debate by way of a letter to the Editor of the Blackwood High School *Scoop* which could be published in the next issue of that publication.

NOVELTY PENS

Mr PLUNKETT: Will the Minister of Community Welfare ascertain whether his colleague the Minister of Consumer Affairs is aware of the availability of imported novelty pen drinking straws in Adelaide, and can he say whether action can be taken to ensure that children are not at risk if they buy these novelties? Recent publicity has been given to potentially dangerous toys, particularly an imported novelty pen drinking straw. In the *News* on 21 August a brief article referred to the concern of the Victorian Health Minister

(Mr Roper) that these novelty pen straws could kill or seriously injure small children because the top of the straw-like pen is not always attached firmly to the end of the straw and could therefore be accidentally inhaled or swallowed by children. I have one of these pens with me, but I am aware that I cannot display it here. However, any member wishing to see it may do so. The pen cost \$2.15 but consists of only about 10 cents worth of components, and this is robbery as well as dangerous.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for bringing this matter to the attention of the House. I understand that certain legislation in this State provides for the banning of a product from sale or distribution if it is declared dangerous. However, that serious step is taken only when the product presents a specific hazard and the danger is greater than the hazard presented by similar goods. No doubt, the Department would not hesitate to take that action if the product proved a major danger to the health and well-being of South Australian children. I understand that the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs has purchased from certain stores the novelty pen to which the honourable member has referred, as well as similar pens, and is currently considering the safety of these toys. Officers of the Department are also aware of the concern expressed by the Victorian Minister (Mr Roper) and of the actions that are being taken by their counterparts in Victoria. The Department is keeping the sale and purchase of these items under strict surveillance.

TRAIN STRIKE

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Will the Minister of Transport say what action he is taking in relation to the State Transport Authority train strike: first, to exempt the metropolitan train services from the union strike and, secondly, to minimise the disruption to commuters that has been caused by the current irresponsible strike? The effects of the strike have been compounded by the school holidays. In addition to seriously inconveniencing thousands of daily commuters, the strike could prevent schoolchildren from attending the Royal Adelaide Show and participating in other holiday events.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I am fascinated to see that the member for Elizabeth seems to think that the train strike is nothing but a joke and seems to come out on the side of the strikers. I should have thought that the people of Elizabeth were some of those who would be severely affected by this strike. The former Government drew up contingency plans to deal with industrial action of this type, including arrangements for car pooling, extra buses, and making available additional car-parking space in and around the city. If there are no extra STA buses, as the ABC news claims this morning, surely private buses should be engaged. What is the Minister doing to limit the inconvenience to the public resulting from the indefinite nature of the stoppage? So far, the Minister's attempts to exempt STA trains have been rather weak and totally ineffective.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: This is a very serious matter and one of great concern to the Government, as it should be to all members. We are doing everything that we possibly can to have the STA services running as normally as possible. The honourable member has asked what I have done about this: I sought the exemption immediately from the union for the STA to continue, but, unfortunately that was not granted. I have sent an urgent telex to the Federal Minister.

I have a copy of that telex with me. I mentioned to the Federal Minister that, as he knows, I am concerned about the effect of the rationalisation measures being carried out

by Australian National on South Australia's economy and have expressed this view to him on several recent occasions. However, the purpose of my telex to him was to express my total dissatisfaction with the fact that the stoppage associated with this dispute spilt over into the metropolitan rail system and affected innocent Adelaide commuters, when the issues in question had nothing to do with the STA. On that point, according to some of the press comments made by the member for Davenport (and, again, he seems to have it all upside down), he believes that the dispute relates to the money available from Australian National to the STA. That is nonsense: it has nothing at all to do with this dispute.

I am also meeting with STA management to identify the special problem areas where people are isolated because of the rail strike and to investigate ways and means of alleviating those problems to the best of our ability. Most rail commuters in general have been able to make other arrangements. With bus services available in most areas, the number of people critically affected will, I hope, be quite small, and I understand that most of them are making satisfactory alternative arrangements. I renew this Government's call on the Australian Railways Union to give serious consideration to exempting the STA, which is not involved in the current dispute.

This morning I received a lengthy telex from the Australian Railways Union listing issues that have been in dispute over many years, and I will be attending to that as soon as I possibly can. I am trying to trace the Federal Minister. I understand that he is in the north of Queensland, but I was advised before the House sat at 2 p.m. that he will ring me this afternoon at about 4.30 p.m., when I will talk to him. I hope that he will come to Adelaide and we can talk about the matters in dispute in order that we can get a speedy resolution to this dispute.

TOILET FACILITIES

Mr HAMILTON: Can the Minister of Local Government say whether it is a fact that there is no legislation to compel developers to provide toilet facilities in shopping centres and unlicensed eating establishments and, if there is not, can the Minister advise what action will be taken by the Government to redress this matter? I have received a number of inquiries recently from aged persons and young mothers wanting to know why developers are not compelled to provide toilet facilities in the aforementioned centres.

My constituents have pointed out to me that legislation controlling toilet facilities in licensed premises exists under the Licensing Act and where staff and employees are engaged in shops and factories operating under the Industrial Code and the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act. However, it does not cover the situation outlined in my question. Finally, I am informed that the Health Commission has made some recommendations and referred the matter to the Department of Local Government.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for this important question, which has been in contention for a considerable time from when the Hon. Robin Millhouse was in this place, and my recollection is that he raised the matter more than once. No legislation now compels developers to provide toilet facilities in shopping centres and in unlicensed eating establishments. There is some history to this matter that I would like to relate for the benefit of members. This matter has been considered by the Health Commission, which carried out a survey of all major shopping centres, department stores, and unlicensed restaurants, and it was recommended that consideration be

given to the introduction of legislation for toilet facilities for these premises.

The matter was then referred to the Building Advisory Committee through the Minister of Local Government at that time, the Hon. Murray Hill, MLC, because it was considered to be a requirement for building regulations. The Building Advisory Committee discussed the matter, and forwarded draft provisions back to the Health Commission for its consideration and agreement. The draft provisions included requirements for toilets on an area basis or number of shops in a group for shopping centres, and numbers of people for unlicensed eating premises. The question has been complicated by a simultaneous request that facilities for disabled persons be included in the provisions. All members would agree that that matter should be considered. There have been suggestions of unisex toilets but my advice is that that particular suggestion has not met with approval from all sources.

A response has been received from the Health Commission mentioning these problems and, in addition, that the scale of toilet facilities for small premises is also a matter of contention and further consideration must be given to these aspects. The Building Advisory Committee has yet to discuss the latter problems raised, but will forward a recommendation to me once they have been resolved with the groups concerned. I am concerned that a matter as important as this has taken so long to be resolved. I give the honourable member my undertaking that I will do the best I can to ensure that we have an answer with which the honourable member and this House would be content.

TRAIN STRIKE

Mr OLSEN: Will the Minister of Transport operate more buses to cater for the needs of commuters for the period of the rail strike?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I indicated in my reply to the member for Davenport that I am meeting with the State Transport Authority management to identify the special concerns and the problems. I will discuss with the management whether it is necessary to put on additional buses and, if it is necessary, I will discuss that matter with them.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: As far as I am aware—

The SPEAKER: Order! With all of this shouting it is impossible to hear the Minister.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I said that we would investigate ways and means of alleviating those problems.

HOUSING COSTS

Mr GROOM: Can the Minister of Housing explain a claim made last week by the Housing Industry Association that housing costs in South Australia had risen by 33 per cent because of unionism in the building industry? A similar claim was made recently in this House by the Leader of the Opposition and also by the member for Light, and the Minister refuted the claim shortly after it was made. Now, the housing industry has repeated the claim in the media, and the State Secretary of the Builders Workers Industrial Union, Mr Carslake, is reported to have said in an article recently that most subcontractors were receiving the same prices as seven years ago. Mr Carslake stated:

It cannot be the cost of labour that is the problem: it is the cost of materials, land, and other charges. If a minimum price were agreed, subcontractors would be judged on workmanship, not by a cheap price.

Can the Minister explain this issue, which is important to many families in the community?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Yes. The Opposition and, unfortunately, one official of the Housing Industry Association, are persisting with an accusation that tries to cast the blame for increases in home building costs entirely on building unions. I simply say this: I would be interested to see the strong evidence to which the Housing Industry Association and the Opposition referred to support the claim, so that I could react to it.

My own investigations have failed to substantiate the claim that labour costs are responsible for a 33 per cent increase in the cost to the Housing Trust of building a house. Perhaps the figures used by the Housing Industry Association and the Opposition relate to a period longer than 12 months, in which case they are meaningless. This is certainly the case if, as the member for Light has stated, the Opposition is talking about the fourth and sixth design and construct calls. The time span between these calls was 16 months.

Furthermore, the member for Light has admitted in this House that he does not know how much increases in the costs of building materials have contributed to the overall cost, nor does he know how much of the increase in the cost of building a house is the builder's own profit. I ask the Opposition and the Housing Industry Association to provide specific evidence to support the claim. Otherwise, this continuing attempt to pit home buyers against unions is disgraceful and completely unjust.

FRITZ VAN BEELEN

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Can the Minister representing the Minister of Correctional Services obtain a report on the cost to the Government of allowing the convicted murderer, Fritz van Beelen, to run in last Sunday's marathon? I have been informed that significant Correctional Services Department resources had to be deployed to guard van Beelen during the marathon, and I seek information from the Government on the cost of providing that supervision.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: While I will seek that information from my colleague, I take the opportunity presented to me by the honourable member to congratulate the Premier on his remarkable performance in the marathon on the weekend. I think he took about 2 hours and 47 minutes to run the marathon on a new track in adverse conditions.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I have been so motivated by the Premier's performance that I am looking forward to running a marathon within the next few years in better than six hours!

ESTATE AGENTS

Mr MAYES: Will the Minister of Community Welfare ask the Minister of Consumer Affairs to investigate urgently a practice being undertaken by certain real estate agents? These agents are attempting to exploit vulnerable aged members of the community by offering standard agency contracts to sell their homes and endeavouring to enforce those contracts by advising the occupiers that they are obliged to pay for the commission on sale, irrespective of who might sell the property. I ask the Minister to warn the public of these practices, and to advise the Real Estate Institute of them.

A serious problem has been brought to my attention by a number of solicitors representing constituents in my district. Real estate agents are, uninvited, entering homes of

constituents who are aged and who have properties in the Unley area. They are valuing the properties and advising these home owners that the values are realistic and within current market prices.

Owners who have informed me about this have said that they have not invited these real estate agents to enter their homes, nor are they interested in selling. The practice has then been taken one step further by the real estate agents, as I am informed by a solicitor representing a particular constituent. In fact, an agency agreement was put before the constituent who was asked to sign it. After several hours discussion with this particular agent, the person signed the document, and was later telephoned by the agent and informed that he would be required to sell the property through that agent. If he did not do so he would still be required to pay a commission. He contacted the solicitor who contacted me about the concern and distress caused to my constituent.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Presumably there are three immediate sources of reference for this matter: first, to the Real Estate Institute whose contract I think the honourable member referred to. It is common in such real estate contracts for a sole agency clause to be inserted but I think that the honourable member is suggesting that there might be an unlimited provision in that clause. Obviously, that would need to be attended to by the Real Estate Institute. Secondly, there is a suggestion of misconduct by licensed agents which should be referred to the Land Agents Board. Thirdly, the constituents could pursue legal remedies for any damages that may have been caused to them or to release them from that type of contract. Obviously, the honourable member's constituents are in the process of seeking legal advice on these matters, but I will refer the matter to my colleague in another place for his investigation of the matter also.

ASER PROJECT

Mr INGERSON: In relation to the ASER project, will the Premier say when will the construction of the convention centre begin and how long will it be before that part of the project is completed?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The finalisation of the detailed construction design is going on at the moment, and in fact the overall plan is before the City of Adelaide Planning Commission, subject to the 30 day notice that is required, as stipulated in the indenture Act. Work is developing and, indeed, plenty of work is going on behind the scenes. Relaying and resiting of tracks and station refurbishment is occurring. As to when the convention centre will open, I remind honourable members that we have already made statements that this year we will commence marketing the convention centre world wide. An allocation will be made in the Budget, and the brochures and marketing material are being prepared. We are anticipating that the convention centre will open towards the end of or during 1986—obviously, the sooner it is opened the better. We are now engaged in preparing the marketing plan strategy in order to attract convention business to the centre from that time.

SHOW BAGS

Mr PLUNKETT: My question, concerning show bags that will be available at this year's Royal Adelaide Show, is addressed to the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs in another place. Has the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs been able to assess that there is value for money in the show

bags that are for sale so that parents and their children are not ripped off?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: It is now established practice for the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs to examine the contents of all show bags each year. This assessment is currently taking place to ensure that contents of show bags are safe, appropriate and good value for money. I suggest that this is a very valuable service and one that will be widely appreciated by the community. I noticed a report in last weekend's *Sunday Mail* on the contents of sample bags that will be obtainable at the 1984 Royal Show. I know that my eight year old son read those two pages very carefully—in fact, even before he read the football pages! Obviously, it is a very valuable service that assists consumers making these purchases. It is particularly valuable in regard to children, who have less capacity to make proper judgments, being made aware of what they are paying for, particularly as many of them each year save up for a considerable time so that they can make these purchases at the Royal Adelaide Show.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Will the Premier replace the Minister of Agriculture currently serving in South Australia—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask for order, so that the Chair can hear the question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I invite the member for Alexandra to embark on his question.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: —with a member of his rank currently serving in Government who might be in a position to show a little more sensitivity to the industries which that portfolio represents? I seek leave to explain my question. I recognise by the mirth that it is an unimportant subject to members on the other side, but in explanation let me identify certain factors regarding that appointment. Immediately after the appointment of the current Minister he announced to the rural sector in this State that he had absolutely no knowledge of the job whatsoever and that he was prepared to learn. It was an initial approach that was well received in the rural sector.

However, reports indicate quite clearly that since then he has progressively—in fact hastily—become very aware of everything and, indeed, as those reports further reflect, has disturbed and disrupted a significant number of the component factors associated with the rural industry. I raise in explanation to the Premier but a few of those areas where the Minister has demonstrated a total lack of sensitivity towards the subject. Indeed, I need not canvass—

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Is this the question or the explanation? It does not sound like a question and, if it is the explanation, I do not believe the honourable member has sought leave.

The SPEAKER: As I recall it, the honourable member did seek leave and as I recall also it is an explanation, but I think the honourable member is straining the patience of the Chair in the way in which he is approaching his explanation.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: With respect, I hasten to cite those several reports that indicate a total lack of sensitivity by the Minister to the rural industry in South Australia about which I raise my question. We all know the saga that has surrounded the closure of the Port Lincoln abattoir, because that has been widely reported in the press

over a period of weeks and still appears in the local press as a result of the disturbance it has caused in that region. We are also well aware of the report in the *Stock Journal* last week concerning the closure of the Port Augusta abattoir, about which it is claimed in the article that the Minister has shown a total lack of sensitivity in relation to the absence of control over the authority in his Department.

We then come to the *Advertiser* of last week which stated in a headline 'Blevins out of touch'. The report said that the South Australian Stud Merino Sheepbreeders arena had become out of favour with the Minister. Last week in the other place, two days in a row, the Minister attacked the wine grapegrowing industry, branding it as the most disorganised industry that he had ever known. Hence, the violent reaction that has come forward from that industry. In the *News* today is a report which shows that the Minister has again abdicated his role, this time in relation to the control of vertebrate pests in this State. The article states:

It is uneconomical to control rabbits in South Australia's Far North-West, the Agriculture Minister (Mr Blevins) said today. Once they reach plague proportions it was best to let them run out of food.

Irrespective of all the other items to which I have referred in my explanation, surely that particular quote of the Minister of Agriculture says it all—indeed, wraps it up and demonstrates much better than I can by way of explanation his abdication of his role and his total insensitivity to the rural community of this State.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That was a pretty basic question and there is a fairly basic answer, which is, 'No'. I would just say that the feedback that I get from the rural community and those who have to deal with the Minister is that he has earned their respect. His methods are direct and precise but he is always prepared to listen and to learn. Indeed, he has had a considerable impact on the reorganisation of rural policy and his respect in all sectors of the industry is very high indeed. That is the feedback I have of the Minister's performance, which is something to his credit and the credit of the Government.

GRAND PRIX

Mr PETERSON: Is the Premier confident that Adelaide can cope with the proposed car race that is to last for several days when it has been reported that the marathon last Sunday created utter chaos in the city? The foot marathon was run on a Sunday but the road race for cars will be run over a number of days during the week. With the greater flow of vehicles and people in the city it could be assumed that there would be much more confusion and disruption. I therefore ask whether we can cope with such a disruption.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There are a lot of differences. Obviously, the organisers of the marathon will learn from this year's experience. I think there was some confusion about the length of time that the roads were closed and access to them. There was certainly some misapprehension, too, by various churches and others who believed that their services would be interrupted or made inaccessible, whereas, in fact, they were not. I guess that that is just part of an education process, but the difference is worth stressing. It is true that the Grand Prix will be held over a period of about three days, as I understand it. There are practice days and the actual race day, but it is for only a couple of hours each day, so we will not see a wholesale closure of the route over the total time. There will be an opportunity to open sections of the route during the period even of those three days every year.

The second aspect of the question is that it is a very much shorter route. The marathon route went right down

Anzac Highway and back again, and then right around the parklands perimeter. The documents that have been published show that the suggested route of the Grand Prix will be much more contained. In fact, the route is being planned in such a way as to provide access. Apart from street access itself, some overpasses and bridges will be built which will enable pedestrian and other access. There will be a minimum of disruption to business because of the way in which the route has been planned. When I say 'disruption of business', I am talking about those on the immediate flank of the route. In fact, in terms of business in this city there will be an enormous increase in business, the income that will be generated through such an event, the tourist attraction, and so on, will be absolutely enormous. I can assure the honourable member that very adequate planning will take place to ensure minimal disruption of facilities. We have precedents in other cities and other places to work on.

ABC STAFF POLICIES

Mr BLACKER: Can the Premier state whether his Government supports the moves of the ABC to extend housing and other privileges to employees who have homosexual partners? Secondly, if the South Australian Government does condone the actions of the ABC, does it intend to condone, support, resist or totally oppose any moves to extend similar privileges to employees of the State Public Service or any Government body or statutory authority under the jurisdiction of the South Australian Government?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The policies of the State Government in relation to employment are not relevant to the ABC, nor in that sense I guess are my comments. I am not sure why the honourable member has raised the matter in that context. The State Government's employment policies are clearly stated. We believe in equality of opportunity and I think there has been bipartisan support for those employment policies over a number of changes of Administration. I have nothing further to add.

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Has the Minister of Education decided to refer the matter of the early childhood education course, at the South Australian College of Advanced Education, to a working party for inquiry and report and, if he has, who will constitute the working party?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: This matter will be referred to a working party. I have resolved that way. I had to consider the changes that were made by the academic committee of the South Australian College and consideration of them by the College Council. However, I believe that some questions still remain to be answered in this matter, so I intend to proceed with the establishment of a working party to advise me on the important issues, especially the terms of the Act that allow me to communicate the community interest to the college. The make-up of the working party is still being considered, and we are approaching people to be on that. I am aware of the points that have been raised by various members of this place, including Opposition members: that it is essential that the working party be seen to represent the concern of various people and groups in this matter. That certainly will be the case. The Chairman of the working party will be Kevin Gilding, who is Chairman of the Tertiary Education Authority of South Australia, and I will announce the other members of the working party as soon as we have finalised their nominations and obtained their acceptances, being assured that representation on the working party will canvass the issues at hand. So far as it

is possible, this Government wishes to protect the teacher-training opportunities that exist in South Australia and to ensure that whatever takes place will be in the best interests of children at all levels of education and of all ages, be they from birth right through to the pre-school process and through primary and secondary schooling.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT REVISION

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Local Government say what progress has been made with the preparation of phase 2 of the rewrite of the Local Government Act? Is it still intended that the local government community will be consulted through the preparation, and how and when will this take place?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Phase 2 of the Local Government Act Amendment Bill (the second Bill is probably the easiest way to describe it) is still being prepared. The first stage is the completion of a discussion paper that will be circulated among the local government community in South Australia so that we can get feedback from that community itself and indeed from the wider community, because this legislation will not be directed purely at the local government practitioners (that is, council members), as was the previous one. This legislation will affect the whole community, because it deals with the funding of local government. That discussion paper is still being prepared and I cannot tell the shadow Minister exactly when it will be completed. However, when it is, it will be circulated, and responses will be requested and evaluated, and then the legislation will be drawn up. I cannot give the honourable member an exact time table, but we will be pressing on as quickly as we can. This is an important piece of legislation that needs to be canvassed thoroughly within the community that will be affected by it.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that His Excellency the Governor will be prepared to receive the House for the purpose of presenting the Address in Reply at 3.25 p.m. this day. I ask the mover and seconder of the Address, and such other members as care to accompany me, to proceed to Government House for the purpose of presenting the Address.

[Sitting suspended from 3.15 to 3.30 p.m.]

The SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that, accompanied by the mover, seconder and other honourable members, I proceeded to Government House and there presented to His Excellency the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Opening Speech adopted by this House, to which His Excellency was pleased to make the following reply:

I thank you for your Address in Reply to the Speech with which I opened the third session of the Forty-Fifth Parliament.

I am confident that you will give your best attention to all matters placed before you.

I pray for God's blessing upon your deliberations.

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister for Environment and Planning): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the Libraries Act Amendment Bill, Dog Fence Act Amendment Bill,

Prices Act Amendment Bill and Commissioner for the Ageing Bill, respectively, when called on, to pass through their remaining stages without delay.

Motion carried.

TOURISM DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Tourism): I move: That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice.

Motion carried.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I move:

That the time allotted to debate the motion be two and a half hours.

Motion carried.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I move:

That this House notes the policies and strategies of the South Australian Government in implementing the Tourism Development Plan.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Two hundred copies of the Tourism Development Plan 1983 amendments have been circulated, including (according to my instruction) to members of Parliament. The wording of this motion has been devised to offer the maximum scope for members to comment on tourism as they see it. Quite deliberately, it is not a motion that allots praise or blame. I am not saying that controversy does not exist, but I fail to see why we should talk our way into argument where there is clearly substantial bipartisanship and agreement.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Members opposite have two and a half hours, and I will try to get through my allotted time if they give me that courtesy. Devoting an afternoon in this House purely to tourism is one way of demonstrating that we are heavily committed to its success. Members get little Parliamentary opportunity to raise tourism matters, because there is no tourism legislation that can come before the House to generate debate.

Consequently, this debate and the technology debate last session are historic variations from the normal procedures, variations that I hope will be the forerunner of other debates of public interest. Using the Tourism Development Plan as a basis for this debate provides the most appropriate vehicle for a comprehensive discussion. It is opportune to discuss tourism today, just a short time before the 1984-85 Budget is announced. We now have the chance to put before Parliament a critique of this State's tourism performance, as compared with the ideals of the Tourism Development Plan, and to air constructive views on the best future directions. I would be disappointed if these valuable minutes were to be wasted on arguments related to our forthcoming Budget, as time will be provided—particularly during Estimates—for that purpose.

Most members would be aware of the general history of the Tourism Development Plan, and those taking part in this debate would be presumed to have far more than a passing acquaintance with its origins and purposes. The date on the first published plan is August 1982. It was updated after the 1983 Tourism Conference. The plan is there as a framework to guide forward planning by all involved in the tourism industry. The 1983 conference set itself the task of evaluating the plan and undertaking any necessary fine tuning. None of the original 14 objectives has been altered, although some of the strategies that are to be used to reach those objectives have been altered. Some of the strategies have been completed, while many are well advanced. We must bear in mind that the plan was devised to cover a rolling five-year period. The task of monitoring progress is

being shared with the Tourism Development Board and the South Australian Tourism Industry Council.

Before going on to outline our 14 stated objectives as listed in the plan, I think that it will be instructive to detail exactly what has been happening—as measured by responsibly gathered statistics—to our performance in tourism.

1. The year 1983-84 was for the industry a time of consolidation.
2. The most recent figures have been particularly encouraging: there has been an increase of 5.7 per cent in visitor nights in the March 1984 quarter compared with the March 1983 quarter. This contrasts with a national growth of .2 per cent.
3. We have increased our market share of international visitors significantly—up 37 per cent since 1979, compared with a national rise of 19 per cent.
4. A long-term trend is showing up, revealing an increase in trips in South Australia taken by local inhabitants and by people interstate. The source of this encouraging development is the domestic tourism monitor.
5. While there was a dip in motel and hotel room occupancy rates during the bottoming out of the recession in 1982-83 and some effects carrying over into 1983-84, recovery is showing up, and the same sort of growth is also noticeable in caravan park site occupancy.

On investment, the story is now taking on rosy outlines. There is no doubt that investors both here and overseas now see South Australia as a place where they can with confidence go ahead with new developments. Of course, not all these developments or planned developments are Government-sponsored or Government-initiated, but their growth indicates a confidence in South Australia and our future as a tourist destination.

Let me list some of the new projects that immediately come to mind, and the list is by no means exhaustive:

the construction of the Kangaroo Island car ferry *Phlanderer III*, now in very advanced stages, which will have an immense impact on Kangaroo Island tourism next year;
Porter Bay, the most ambitious marine recreation resort south of Port Lincoln township;
our ASER project involving the badly needed convention centre, plus office block, plus international hotel, associated with a casino at Adelaide's central railway station;
the huge foreshore project announced last week at Glenelg.
These projects alone total about \$400 million worth of new tourist development which is on our drawing boards or which has progressed further.

The debate is about the Tourism Development Plan, and I refer to each of the objectives. First, 'Identify or devise a common identity for South Australia as a year-round visitor destination with strong, tangible, appealing and positive images for each of the intrastate, interstate and overseas markets'. In large measure this objective has been realised.

Appropriate images for our various tourism media advertising activities have been expressed expressively since mid-1983. Our corporate slogan Enjoy!—devised by the Department of Tourism—is now being widely used throughout the industry, with our positive encouragement. To back up this slogan, we are now showing, in our promotional material, people actually enjoying themselves in South Australian settings. No longer is a fine photograph of the rugged Flinders Ranges enough by itself. We ensure that in such a scene there is included the human element, thus creating a very positive image, which speaks for itself, virtually without words.

However, what we have done within our own State borders and for similar use interstate is not always appropriate for use overseas. That is because people overseas do not recog-

nise Australia's State boundaries. As a result, it is essential we try to obtain the utmost mileage from the campaigns of the Australian Tourist Commission. Brandishing slogans or logos from six distinct States and our handful of Territories serves only to confuse potential customers. This is one area where to insist on being parochial is to be supremely counter-productive.

This Government is pressing for greater co-operation between the States in their international marketing. We cannot hope to impress one State's identity overseas—except perhaps in nearby Singapore or in Great Britain, places where either proximity or historical ties can justify some State emphasis. So, that is why we are not leaping in to copy those States which are 'going it alone' in such places as the United States and Asia. We will be placing our officers in strategic areas under the umbrella of the Australian Tourist Commission. I feel quite convinced that by doing this we are acting correctly, and my recent calls on Australian Tourist Commission officers in the United States and Singapore have confirmed me in this approach.

In the potentially huge United States market, we must back ATC efforts to sell Australia, just Australia—and then try (as I have been trying) to see that resulting Australian tour packages include South Australia. To assess the effectiveness of our marketing strategies, the Department of Tourism has undertaken three consumer research studies to monitor consumer perceptions. We are also jointly involved with the ATC in similar research in New Zealand.

The second objective is to 'achieve a greater awareness of what South Australia has to offer the target markets through effective marketing'. This objective is going to need more effort, even though a lot has been achieved. I will not deny there have been some snags, some problems, but we are working on them. In South Australia, tourism for many years has been under-funded, but this Government is coming to grips with that. We do need greater help from the media. There is still too low an appreciation by South Australians of their own tourism product, there has been shortfall in our capacity to exploit ATC publicity, and there has been some lack of flair in properly promoting the 'uniqueness' of our attractions. In the past this State did not take tourism seriously enough, nor did it allot to the Tourist Office adequate resources—

The Hon. H. Allison: That's nonsense.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: It is not nonsense: it is quite clear. The shadow Minister would agree with me that in the past South Australia did not take its tourism industry seriously enough. Indeed, the trouble with the member for Mount Gambier is that he is trying to be partisan about this when that is a bipartisan statement.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I have always admitted it. I do not know why the honourable member is so concerned about it. I freely acknowledge that point. Part of the reason why this State did not take tourism seriously enough was that many South Australians did not really believe we had something special to offer—'It's a nice enough place and we like living here, but why would others want to come?' was their thinking. Very few of our regions made much of a concerted effort to attract tourists. In fact, our 'coming of age' as a confident and properly organised tourist destination is a very recent vintage indeed.

Our self-confidence needs further expansion, and I say this knowing that we are not alone in this. When in Toronto recently (a fine city, as those members who have visited it would agree) I found that tourism authorities there had faced exactly the same problems. A survey revealed to their surprise that many inhabitants thought they lived in a 'sleepy hollow' and had to be convinced that anyone would want

to visit there. It is in this area that the 'SA Great' campaign is having a welcome effect.

Personally, I find it strange that so many South Australians do not fully appreciate what a lovely and distinguished city is Adelaide. I find it strange that many people also have difficulty in 'selling' their beautiful countryside. It is yet another variation of the often commented upon 'cultural cringe' that I would have hoped we had gone past. Finally, on objective 2, I would like to put on record a number of firm departmental actions:

- increasing liaison with the Commonwealth (we regularly meet the marketing division of the ATC);

- appointment of Elders Travel to represent us in Western Australia;

- appointment of a public relations firm in Queensland;
- placement of departmental officers with the ATC in Auckland and Singapore;

- the engaging of a full-time journalist as press and promotions officer, allowing us to obtain regular editorial support in the news media for South Australian tourism;
- the preparation of a product book detailing our holiday packages for national distribution; and

- the development of a document outlining the role and responsibility of the country tourist office.

The third objective is to 'improve visitor access to the South Australian holiday experience'. We have recorded continual progress in this area. More attention is being given to signposting and provision of visitor information services of all kinds. The Tourism Development Plan lists many areas where the Government can help operators. It also 'homes in' on one very important factor which has great potential for opening tourist doors wider or narrowing them considerably and, that is, air fares. Air fares, of course, are not within our area of responsibility. All we can do—and we do not let up on this—is to keep hammering on the doors of both domestic and overseas airlines pointing out what extra traffic they can gain by offering special tour concessions.

Equally importantly, the cost of internal flights can determine how many tourists we can tempt to add Adelaide, the Barossa, Kangaroo Island or the Flinders, for example, or all other of those marvellous attractions we have in South Australia to their traditional Sydney, the Reef and the Rock itinerary. Obviously, the establishment of an international air terminal at West Beach and the expansion soon to come of the *Philanderer* operation have helped, or will help, visitor access.

The fourth objective is to 'encourage an environment conducive to tourism investment and the development of high quality tourism products'. Our aim here is to improve the range and quality of what we have to offer—and we are certainly doing that. This is an appropriate point to refer again to the ASER convention centre facility which will serve in the years ahead as a major drawcard to a certain sort of tourism. Also, the Porter Bay development will provide a major addition to the range of activities and experiences we can offer the jaded overseas tourist who visits our State.

The fifth objective is to 'encourage tourism development which is in harmony with, and preserves and enhances the State's environment and lifestyle'. This objective is one upon which I have personally placed considerable stress. I have warned people on Kangaroo Island, for example, of the extra pressures likely on their Island that will inevitably flow from the introduction, later this year, of the new *Philanderer III* car ferry. I have also warned, many times, of how fragile are the Flinders Ranges and how carefully large-scale tourism has to be arranged in that semi-arid area.

Those remarks relate to the effect of tourism on our very special environment. The environment is itself both an

attraction and, to a certain extent, a deterrent—deterrent at least when large numbers of tourists are involved. Our lifestyle is a different matter. Our lifestyle goes back to our particular historical origins, to the policies of those who set up this city and laid down the rules of land settlement, to our position of supplier of produce to gold rush States, and to our climate. All those factors, and more, made our society recognisably different from that of the other States. We believe it has produced a tolerant, moderate, responsive community, lacking most of the world's major social problems. We believe that our social stability can be a major selling point to overseas tourists who do get tired of hijacking, bomb threats, civil wars and race riots. We have peace and a relaxed lifestyle to offer.

The sixth objective is to 'identify key development projects and encourage their establishment'. To some degree—perhaps inevitably—some of the objectives in the plan have to be cast in such terms of generality that they might appear excessively vague. That objection cannot be held to apply to objective 6. It asks us to pinpoint some key projects and get on with them. I have already identified key projects like the convention centre, its associated hotel, the casino, and the development being considered in the centre of the city's metropolitan coastline at Glenelg.

They are all key developments, but, standing alone, they are not enough. We must generate activity, and provide jobs right around the State. This is being done in dozens of ways through caravan parks, fun parks, motels, river cruisers, dryland safaris, and aerial flights. But, to pull in the big money, to attract the major tour operators, we need some supremely visible attractions that can show up on a world scale—structures of the stature of our existing Festival Centre which will become permanent parts of our city landscape.

The seventh objective is to 'minimise the effects of cyclical demand'. Here we are hoping for a big breakthrough of a four-term school year. The Minister of Education says, if I recall his words rightly, that the change is possible, but not before 1987. We are looking for a firm decision. The delay of a year or two will help travel operators to adjust their timetables. In many other ways we can work to spread the demand for our tourist facilities. We start with the significant advantage that our climate has not the same marked peaks and troughs that dog many other of the world's tourist regions. In Miami, for example, mid-summer sees some of its scores (if not hundreds) of hotels with something like 5 per cent occupancy, yet in winter the State is hit with a shock wave of 300 000 northern United States students taking their annual break within one week, which taxes all local facilities to the limit, and at times beyond.

I appreciate that the total market for Florida is more than 300 000. In fact, I think that the throughput in Miami is something like 22 million people annually. Even so, in South Australia we have to recognise that we need to work to go beyond the traditional pattern of summer holidays, and encourage employers to make it easier for their staff to go on leave over the rest of the year.

Our eighth objective is to 'improve product quality and develop a professional approach within the industry'. We are all working at this all the time. That is why various parts of the industry, sometimes involving the Education Department, and sometimes involving the Department of Tourism and other Government bodies, hold seminars, workshops, and conferences, to provide examples, give instruction, and explain the value of improved service to the tourist. If there is one message that is universal, allowing no ifs and buts, it is that in the travel, accommodation, and entertainment industries, money spent on better service is money that will come back with interest.

One of the organisations that has done most to improve the quality of service in our hotels, motels, restaurants, and

resorts in South Australia is the Tourism and Hospitality Industry Training Committee. That committee's training programmes, in co-operation with key institutions like the Regency Park College, has been responsible for substantial improvements.

Mr Becker: What's the whole idea of it?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: In this tourist development plan there are 15 objectives and strategies about which we are talking, the ninth of which is to foster and maintain a good industrial relation by developing a mechanism for consultation and co-operation.

Mr Oswald: Has the member for Mawson got a copy?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Yes. Honourable members should be patient, because they will not distract me. I will finish my speech. If honourable members are informing me that the shadow Minister and those people who will speak on this debate do not have access to this plan, I will take up the matter. But, my information is that 200 copies of the plan were distributed early this year. Also, copies were distributed to members of Parliament.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: My own colleagues were given an up-to-date—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:—copy yesterday at the same time as we distributed four copies to the Opposition so that its members would have up-to-date information. Four copies went to members—

Mr Becker: Where are the four copies?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I will have someone check on that matter straight away. Instructions were given to give copies of the 1983 update of the report to the shadow Minister and those people who would speak in this debate.

Mr Oswald: How can we debate it if we do not have copies?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: That particular person was not involved in it at all. It was departmental officers. Has the shadow Minister not got a copy?

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: I have not ever been formally given a copy of the Tourism Development Plan.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Was the shadow Minister not given a copy of the plan yesterday by the Department?

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: No.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Every delegate to the Tourism Conference was issued with a copy of the report.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: They were not.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: If that is the case, I will most certainly take up the matter with the Department. I was unaware of it and, frankly, I am most disappointed, because it is totally inappropriate that that should have happened. I fully appreciate honourable members' concern, but I was not aware until today when honourable members raised the matter with me that no such copy was made available to them yesterday.

The ninth point is that we do not have much trouble from industrial disputes except occasionally in the transport area where, in general, the responsibility rests in other hands. I know this matter was discussed at some length at a workshop at this year's tourism conference and those who took part, who were mainly people with considerable experience in the industrial field, recognised that there were certain constraints within which the industry had to operate and that, by and large, most of the main interest groups had to come to terms with those constraints. Instant solutions, such as a dramatic reduction in the number of awards involved in the industry, were urged largely by those with only a passing acquaintance with reality.

The tenth objective is to 'develop a cohesive and co-ordinated industry'. Through its representation on the Tourism Industry Council and the Tourism Development Board,

the Department has acted positively to promote industry co-ordination. To assist the industry, the department now has eight regional managers serving 11 regions in all.

I now come to the eleventh objective: 'establish an awareness among politicians, unions, the community, business and industry, all levels of government, and the media, that tourism is an industry of expanding economic and social importance'. I have repeatedly spoken along the lines suggested in this objective, and at all kinds of functions, to all kinds of groups and I imagine other members of this House have done the same. I know that the members for Mawson, Henley Beach, Coles and Albert Park, to mention but a few, have taken the lead in this public awareness programme. The *SA Great* organisation has produced radio and television material stressing the economic importance of tourism, material of high quality and great value and we thank them for it.

I think that representatives from all groups mentioned in this objective have attended and contributed to our annual tourism conferences. The contributions of John Brown and television performers like Paul Hogan have provided backing from a national level. This has helped persuade South Australians that it is not just a parochial concern of ours, but tourism growth carries with it nationwide approval. The personal emphasis on the high place of tourism given by the Premier himself has gone to convince people, if indeed any further evidence was needed, that tourism is high on this State's official agenda.

The twelfth objective is to obtain a strong Government commitment to the tourist industry at local, State, and Federal levels. This is very much a continuation of the previous objective. We do have this commitment and only the churlish would deny it. I think we were all forcibly prompted to turn our minds to some alternate sources of economic wealth when our manufacturing industries began running into troubles—troubles often caused by the altered structures of various industries and thus beyond local solution. Tourism was seen as doubly welcome, as it was quickly found to be labour intensive.

Governments at all levels now know what the score is, and appreciate the economic potential of tourism when properly handled. I believe that there is a high degree of bi-partisanship in all this. On the local government front, there is no doubt that council support for regional tourism has greatly increased over the past two years. Few local governments in the State are not involved in some way, either through the local Regional Tourist Association or through development of plant product and infrastructure (for example, roads, signs, and information offices). Use of CEP funds, via local councils, for tourism projects is becoming more evident.

The thirteenth objective is 'to improve co-ordination between the industry, Federal, State and local government, and local communities'. This fits in fairly well with what has gone before. The aim here is to avoid excessive parochialism and to deploy resources more effectively. That is precisely why South Australia is lining up behind the Australian Tourist Commission overseas, instead of insanely pushing South Australia overseas at all costs.

I think my dual responsibility for local government and tourism automatically provides a chance for progress with this objective, as with objectives 10, 11 and 12. One obvious line of communication between the groups mentioned in the objective is for the department to provide a regular industry publication with wide distribution, and this we are doing with the quarterly *Grapevine*.

Objective 14 is to establish a means of maintaining forward planning and monitoring growth. Both the Tourism Industry Council and the research branch of the Department of Tourism help with this. Indeed the Council was set up

largely to undertake just this function of reviewing progress. I should add, in reference both to this final objective and the one preceding it, that the Tourism Development Board is busy reviewing the role of our annual tourism conferences. One decision the Board has already taken is that an essential part of all future conferences will be a review, and, if necessary amendment, of the Tourism Development Plan.

Finally, I shall provide a little more information for members about the growth of what might be called the 'heart' of the tourist industry, that is, the regional tourist associations. Reference to these associations could fit under any one of nine of the 14 objectives listed in the Plan. Regional tourist associations received \$154 000 in grant and subsidy finance last financial year. A good deal of advice and assistance was provided by the Department to these associations to ensure that they develop a sound structure and member base from which objective activity can spring. Most regions have responded well to this approach. We need to make sure that well structured and effective regions are not impaired by lack of assistance (including finance) which, in the past, may have flowed to less deserving areas that have been unable to demonstrate a sound base. We simply cannot constrain initiatives in one area because we continue to fund and assist non-realistic objectives in another. Generally, the industry has responded with a cash and kind effort far beyond that provided by Government grant and subsidy assistance.

The Government is prepared to continue to play its part in the promotion of South Australia as an ideal tourist destination, with attractive facilities and good service, but we cannot do it alone. Tourism by its very nature consists in the main of a large number of small individual enterprises. I call upon the tourist industry itself to show a confidence in its product, and join us in making this industry more satisfying and profitable.

In conclusion, I apologise to those members who do not have a copy of the plan, although I should point out that the 14 objectives are exactly the same as those determined in the plan of 1981-82 that was distributed by the former Government. That does not excuse the fact that the plan has not been distributed, but the basic objectives have remained the same and the strategies have changed very little. I commend the motion.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I indicated at the beginning of the debate that I would be making a brief contribution to indicate the importance the Liberal Party places on tourism as an economic component in the development of South Australia and on the importance of broadening that economic base. The member for Coles, the shadow Minister of Tourism, will be the principal speaker on behalf of the Liberal Party. I indicated that I would deal with several important areas. I point out to the Minister that members of the Opposition have not been supplied with copies of the development plan. I am disappointed about that, particularly as members of the Government who will participate in this debate have been provided with copies of the tourism report.

The motion specifically identifies policies and strategies of the Government in implementing the Tourist Development Plan. It has been pointed out that the policies and strategies are the same as those laid down by the former Liberal Administration, in which the member for Coles was the Minister of Tourism. It is difficult for me to debate the specific strategies point by point because an offer to make a copy of the plan available to me was not made until I was about to rise to speak.

I turn now to the substantive part of the motion. I agree with a great deal of what the Minister has said in this debate: after all, we are debating a plan undertaken as a co-

operative venture. Tourism is a key to South Australia's future economic development, and as such should be given bipartisan support. I am pleased that the Government has at least realised that, because that approach was not encouraged by the present Premier before the most recent election. In his policy speech he said that the then Liberal Government had adopted a 'scattergun' approach to marketing and promotion.

The comments made in this House this afternoon defeat the logic of that statement and deny it any credibility, because it was the former Liberal Government that initiated the plan we are now debating. Before the last election the former Leader of the Opposition on more than one occasion, by way of smart alec criticism of the former Minister, said that under a Labor Administration tourism would not be an appendage to a major portfolio. However, this represents yet another broken promise, because on coming to office the Premier failed to honour that commitment. In the next Liberal Government the Minister responsible for tourism will hold only one portfolio. I can think of no-one better for that role than the member for Coles who, as Minister of Tourism, initiated the original plan with enthusiasm and zeal and who subsequently, as shadow Minister, has followed through with the matter.

At least the present Minister of Tourism was big enough to give credence to what the Premier sought to deny before the last election, that his predecessor the member for Coles (who will be his successor after the next election) made a most significant contribution to tourism in South Australia. I acknowledge that the Minister was big enough to say that. I remind the House of the former Government's record. In 1980 there was a complete review and re-organisation of the Department of Tourism. It was given a new role in marketing and promotion, research development and regional liaison. Spending on tourist promotion was increased significantly. The vital role of regional associations was recognised. For the first time grants were provided to regional associations, and the first regional managers within the Department were appointed.

The South Australian Tourism Development Board was appointed in 1981, and the original development plan was initiated by that Board. In more visible terms, the International Airport was secured and built during the Liberal Party's term of office, and Adelaide got its first international hotel. Further, detailed negotiations were initiated at that time that have resulted in the Adelaide Railway Station development project as well as the Porter Bay marine project. For three years, we resisted successfully a wine tax and kept the Alice Springs to Darwin railway on the national agenda of new projects. That is the excellent track record of the former Liberal Administration in relation to tourism promotion and development.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: And the fact that we got a commitment from the then Prime Minister that it would be built.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed, we did obtain a commitment about that railway line being built. Despite the promises made to the people of South Australia by the present Prime Minister, the promise made in that regard was broken. The relevant figures continue to provide tangible evidence that at the time of the last election the former Government's tourism policy was working and that our promotion and marketing strategies were really paying off.

In the March quarter of 1982—the busiest period of the year for the tourist industry—room occupancy rates for South Australian hotels and motels was at 60.1 per cent, an 8.1 per cent increase on that of the previous year, and by far South Australia's best ever result. The corresponding figures for 1983 and for this year were 51.8 per cent and 57.7 per cent respectively. It is beyond doubt that, despite

the Premier's attempt at the time of the last election to tamper with the facts, the Labor Government inherited a sound and realistic framework for tourist development. Most of what the present Government has done since November 1982 has been a logical extension, and therefore an endorsement, of many of the things that the former Government did or was planning to do.

This is because there is a bipartisan recognition that tourism as a labour intensive industry can provide jobs and many other benefits for South Australia. As the Tourism Development Plan points out, tourism involves part of 26 of 109 industries classified by the Australian Bureau of Statistics. It makes a significant contribution to the State's economic, social, and cultural development. It is a naturally decentralised industry offering the opportunity of employment stability to towns and regions with a narrow economic base.

It also supports a wide range of community facilities, including shops, restaurants, sporting and other leisure and cultural facilities, which in many local areas would not otherwise exist. It needs to be recognised however that in seeking to fulfill this potential, South Australia has to compete against more populous States with broader tax bases and greater financial resources. This means that South Australia needs to be imaginative and efficient, and to work with the private sector and the community generally in a co-operative way to achieve the increased employment and prosperity that tourism can bring. As a result of some of the initiatives of the former Government, I believe South Australia now has the right objectives and thinking to meet these challenges.

Too often in the past we thought simply in terms of achieving unbridled growth with the promise of project upon project as plan after plan rolled off the printing presses. That was the style of the Dunstan era. What it overlooked was the possibility of uncontrolled growth destroying the very fabric and features which make South Australia such a desirable location. Many of the bold, brassy plans often promised during the 1960s and 1970s did not become projects (and I suppose in many respects we should be thankful for that) because South Australia remains our nation's most friendly and clean visitor destination.

We have an ideal Mediterranean climate and unique and extremely varied attractions beginning with our lifestyle—a significant attraction in itself. Then there are the vines and the valleys, the ranges and railways, opals and oranges, deserts and the dreamtime, beaches and bushlands. The variety, the contrasts, go on and on. With this Development Plan, South Australia now has a realistic and positive strategy on which to base the marketing and promotion of all these natural attractions. Like many of the attractions it seeks to promote, the plan itself is unique. It has involved a joint industry-government approach setting a framework for forward planning by individual industry sectors, the Department of Tourism, other Government departments, local government and regional tourist associations.

Fourteen common objectives for the industry as a whole are set in the plan. (I assume there are still 14 objectives in the revamped plan we do not have.) Strategies are identified to achieve those objectives over a five year period. The aim of the plan is to achieve a healthy, manageable and viable industry in keeping with South Australia's environment and lifestyle. A minimum growth of 5 per cent per annum is achievable, but 10 per cent is the target. If a 10 per cent annual growth rate can be achieved, there is potential to create 22 000 jobs in South Australia—or to reduce current unemployment by more than one-third. This is the economic reality staring us in the face.

Tourism means jobs, and the Government has a key role to play in ensuring that they are created. My colleague, the

shadow Minister, is now developing a detailed strategy to ensure that under the next Liberal Government this growth rate can be achieved. During our last term of office, we achieved more in tourism in three years than previous Governments had achieved in a decade. There was much to catch up on, but we took South Australia ahead. Recently, there have been some setbacks. The wine tax battle has been lost after hardly a shot in anger from the Premier. Federal and State Liberal Governments will reverse that decision. The Alice Springs to Darwin railway has been shunted up a siding by the Prime Minister, and again the Premier threw in the towel. That railway would have opened up exciting new opportunities for tourist promotion in South Australia.

We must do more to promote combined South Australia-Northern Territory packages, because they can span so many different environments and specific attractions—the tropics, the deserts, outback lakes, opal mining, desert treks, Ayers Rock and the Flinders Ranges, and coming further south, the coastal and recreational attractions of the northern parts of South Australia. Combined package holidays to the more remote tourist areas of South Australia and the Territory have great potential to lift the numbers of local, interstate and overseas visitors to these regions, and must be more actively assessed.

Another Government imposed disincentive to tourist development is South Australia's rate of liquor licence fees (the highest in Australia imposed by this Government) which add to the cost of hospitality. There must be no further increase in the Budget on Thursday. In fact, there should be a reduction in the percentage of those fees because, as was highlighted in the House today, the fact that we now have a 10 per cent wine tax imposed by the Federal Government means a windfall to the South Australian Government of \$800 000 to \$1 million. It was suggested that the Government should be realistic and wind down this liquor licence fee so that it does not get windfall profits from a tax on a tax. If it is not going to do that for which it is responsible, it ought to promote and give at least that to the development of tourism in South Australia.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: The Premier did not seem too responsible this afternoon.

Mr OLSEN: That is the disappointing part about Question Time this afternoon: in fact the Premier walked away when the question was asked and no specific answer or any commitment whatsoever was given in relation to this tax on the tourist and hospitality industry of this State.

The Berri bridge has been scrapped. It would have been invaluable to tourist development in the Riverland. The scrapping of the Finger Point sewage treatment works could be harmful to tourism in the South-East. Federally, there has been no revision to the depreciation allowance for new traveller accommodation or an extension of the allowance to include renovations and extensions to existing hotels. These and other issues will be addressed by the Liberal Party when we announce our tourism policy for the next election. It will be the most comprehensive policy ever presented to the people of South Australia, drawing on our experience and record in Government and our proven ability to work with the industry to make the very best of what is an outstanding tourist product.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I will not be taking my full allocation of time in this debate, because I must give my colleagues an opportunity to have a say on this important subject. This is the third time I have been able to speak on tourism since the commencement of this Parliament, and that is because I believe that tourism is of great importance both to the State of South Australia and to my own district in particular.

It gives me great pleasure to support the proposition moved by the Minister of Tourism. During this debate I would also like to pay a tribute to the former Minister of Tourism, the member for Coles, for her part in the development of the South Australian Development Plan. The Development Plan was a necessary foundation and springboard from which tourism development has occurred and will continue to occur in the years to come. I understand that it is possible for deviation from the original plan as time and experience proves it expedient to do so. The Government allocated an additional \$1.3 million in funds to the Department of Tourism during the plan's first year of implementation, thus complying with strategy 12.1 of the actual plan.

The investment in tourism was a sensible thing from a point of view of a Government with the difficulties inherited by this Government. The high levels of unemployment and the downturn in the manufacturing industry needed an investment in a direction on which money would not be wasted and where job opportunities could be created. One has only to look at the strategies adopted by the United States of America, which has proved to have had the most dynamic recovery of any Western economy to see the sense in moving in this direction. The United States in the past decade has been able to create 20 million additional jobs, whilst in the same time Western Europe has lost 2 million jobs. About 5 million Americans have found new work in non-agricultural jobs since the bottom of the recession, making this the best recovery on the job front since the 1950s.

About 105 million Americans are now employed, compared with 99 million when the recovery began in December 1982. The American experience was therefore one to follow, and American Administrations have concentrated their efforts on high technology and the service industries, with the service industries being highly related to tourism.

It is not surprising, therefore, that anyone seeking a strategy to reduce unemployment would concentrate on both those factors—high technology and tourism. Further, in the American economy it is expected that by 1990 the service industries would have continued to expand to provide more jobs. For example, in the area of restaurants and other retailing it is expected that the present 17 million people employed in that area in the United States will increase to 20 million by 1990. Therefore, it seems logical that the increase in the investment in tourism as a job-creating factor in the last Budget should continue in the next Budget because, if the United States considers that the number of jobs that it now has by a further investment in the service industries (including tourism) should be increased, then it is a sound strategy for the South Australian Government to continue to do so.

I have previously referred to the initiative taken by this Government in the tourism industry, especially to the opening of centres in Melbourne and Sydney, and it is pleasing to see the staff at Melbourne expanding to cope with the demand that has been created by the 'Let's Enjoy' Campaign, which was an award winning campaign. No doubt, members have seen the press, radio and the new style of posters and brochures that are used in this campaign. Indeed, the consequential increase in tourism as seen by the latest figures in the State of South Australia must to a large extent be put down to the success of this campaign. Other initiatives include a review of the Licensing Act, increased funding for tourist roads, and Government support of tourism and the hospitality industry. I refer also to the possibility of providing finance under flexible terms and conditions for the industry and the South Australian Government's objective of finding more finance for the tourism industry.

By the end of this year, we will see the introduction of the South Australian Enterprise Fund, which I believe will

be totally successful. I understand that the fund aims to have \$15 million from financial sources mainly in South Australia and that enterprise investments will consider applications from many South Australian businesses which require finance and which cannot, or choose not to, use conventional sources of finance. These businesses will be likely to have a small to medium size operation.

I also understand that a flexible and innovative approach to investment has been adopted by the company to provide equity and loan finance and, where appropriate, management, technical or marketing advice. I know that it is extremely early days, but I hope that Enterprise Investment South Australia Limited considers the needs of the tourism industry in relation to providing finance for that industry.

Time does not permit me to refer to everything that has happened in the tourism field since the introduction of this Government: the proposed promotion in the Japanese market; the South Australian Tourism Conference; the familiarisation visits by tour operators; the introduction of video machines; the joint ventures entered into in agreements with the Port Lincoln council and the investment that is occurring there; the strategy plans for Kangaroo Island and the Flinders Ranges; the subsidies provided for local government to develop tourist infra-structures; the development of the Adelaide station and environs; and many other things. I take this opportunity, however, to mention specifically my enthusiasm for increased tourism within the Western Region and especially in my district of Henley Beach. I especially express my enthusiasm for the increase in funds that the former Adelaide Convention Bureau has had to expand its activities. This organisation, having taken on the role and the function of the Adelaide Tourist Region Association, is now known as the Adelaide Visitors and Convention Bureau.

I have taken the opportunity with my colleague, the member for Albert Park, to visit the Board meeting of this association. I was totally impressed by the way in which this organisation is going about its business. It is always interesting for a parliamentarian to visit an organisation and see the spade work in operation producing the ideas that are eventually presented to the Parliament. As a parliamentarian, one is often confronted with the finished product and, after all the experts have had their opportunity to input into any project, little is left. Therefore, it was of specific interest to me to be able to see a meeting where the original ideas are generated. I hope from time to time to be able to continue to visit this group.

I am especially enthusiastic about the subregion grouping and the coastal region which takes in Port Adelaide, Woodville, Henley and Grange, West Torrens, Glenelg and Brighton. A strong foundation has been laid by this regional tourist organisation for an increase in tourism within this region. An opportunity exists to increase tourism at the beautiful beaches of Henley and surrounding areas. This area was once extremely popular for day visitors from the metropolitan area and I believe that, with proper promotion, day visitors can be increased in number. I hope the coastal region of the Adelaide Visitors and Convention Bureau will be able to help do this in due course. There is also an opportunity to increase visitors to the local heritage area, and I would like to see the promotion of heritage tours in the western coastal areas.

The member for Albert Park, in a recent speech to this Parliament, referred to the sites that could be visited, including the Sturt Memorial Trust, the heritage areas of Port Adelaide and other nearby areas. I was extremely pleased to see the minutes of the coastal section of the coastal area, and I believe that this is a project on which they are now embarking. If I could help them I should be pleased to do so.

There is also much for this body to consider, including the better promotion of arts and crafts, the consideration by the local government authority to allow for greater freedom by small vendors, and the promotion of special interest holidays along the coast. I believe that local councils should consider sending their officers overseas to study the tourism industry. I hope that the review of the liquor laws will allow free distribution in respect of the tourist industry and I should like to see special interest markets developed in strategic areas along the coast. Tourism as part of the service industries is our great hope in the immediate foreseeable years for increasing job opportunities. I have no doubt that the State Government will continue to increase its investment in this area, and I look forward to seeing it do so.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles): I am pleased that time has been made available to the Parliament to debate the topic of tourism which, as the Minister has said, has no legislation and, therefore, is debated only in a peripheral manner in this House. However, I condemn in the strongest possible terms the way in which the Minister has manipulated the Parliament to bring on this motion in the manner in which it has been brought on with complete disregard for the normal conventions and complete lack of courtesy to the members at least of the Opposition if not the whole Parliament. We are debating a motion that arose out of a suggestion that I made in a speech following the debate on the technology strategy, copies of which were distributed to all members of Parliament well before the matter came before the House.

At that time the Minister for Technology gave ample advance notice of his intention to note and debate the strategy, and members were prepared for that debate. Of course, they had received a copy of the report. I followed up my suggestion with a question to the Minister, and at the South Australian Tourism Industry Conference I framed a resolution that was moved by the Chairman of SAARTO and seconded by the Chairman of the Tourism Industry Council that the Minister be requested to make Parliamentary time available to debate the Tourism Development Plan—not, I stress, to debate the Government's strategies and policies, but to debate the objectives of the plan. That debate, as I stressed to the Tourism Industry Conference, would have been a bipartisan debate because we would have been discussing the merits of a plan.

However, the Government has ruled out any chance of a bipartisan debate, as far as I am concerned, by its approach to the issue, on three grounds. First, the Government has had to suspend Standing Orders for this motion to be debated. No notice was given to the House in the normal manner in which it should have been given. The second ground for absolutely losing any chance of a bipartisan approach is the Minister's failure to distribute the plan to members of Parliament. He claimed in his speech that they got it yesterday. What we got yesterday was a copy of the proceedings of the South Australian Tourism Industry Conference. No member of the Opposition has ever been formally given a copy of the South Australian Tourism Development Plan, except for the copies of the plan that I distributed as Minister in August 1982.

I consider it a discourtesy of the grossest kind that no member of the Opposition has been given a copy of the plan and that, on the other hand, we are asked to debate the merits of the plan. Of course it is true that I have copies of the plan. In fact, I venture to say that I personally have distributed more copies of the plan throughout the industry in South Australia than has the Minister. I have done it because I discovered that the plan had been printed in the course of one of my regular visits to the research division of the Department to make sure that I am informed about

the latest developments. As a result of that, my Tourism Policy Committee has a copy of the plan. As far as I am aware, the majority of the delegates to the Tourism Industry Conference were never given the plan, and in that regard I believe that the Minister has completely betrayed any confidence that the industry and certainly this Parliament might be expected to have in him.

The third ground on which I believe that the Minister has abdicated any chance of having a bipartisan approach to this debate is the wording of the resolution. We are not noting the objectives of the plan. We are being asked to note the policies and strategies of the South Australian Government in implementing the Tourism Development Plan. I am very pleased to debate that topic because it is not precisely the plan. We are now putting the Government under the microscope and magnifying glass, and in the time available to me that is what I want to do. I can only ask, 'Why has this happened today of all days, two days before the Budget is to be brought down?' The only answer I can come up with is that tourism is being used as putty to fill in the cracks in the Government's legislative programme. Either it has no business to go on with or not enough to last until Thursday afternoon, or there is one other alternative: that the Minister of Tourism (who is also the Minister of Local Government) is reluctant to deal with a very tricky matter on the agenda that involves his other portfolio, namely, the Address to His Excellency the Governor concerning the boundaries of the town of Gawler.

One way or the other tourism is being used, and in my opinion it is being abused by the manipulation by the Minister on this matter. Had the matter proceeded as I invited and suggested in the first instance, there would have been a bipartisan approach. However, the Minister is now about to get what he and his Premier richly deserve, namely, an analysis of their performance. When considering the plan, we can look in broad terms at the role of Government in tourism.

Speaking broadly without reference precisely to the plan, that role could be described as a responsibility to create a climate for investment, a responsibility to restrain costs through the Government's economic, fiscal and industrial policies, the provision of infrastructure (roads, national parks, marinas, boat ramps and things of that nature), a responsibility for education and training, a responsibility on the part of the Minister and the Government for advocacy and leadership, and a responsibility on the part of the Department of Tourism for promotion and marketing of the State's tourism product, research and development in regard to the product, and a general interface between the industry and the Government.

In broad terms those are the Government's responsibilities. Because time does not permit me to go through each of the 14 objectives, the strategies, responsibilities and constraints on achieving the objectives, I will simply deal with those that I consider to be among the most important. Referring to the Government's responsibility to create a climate for investment, let us look at the record of this Government and what it has done to business since it came to office. It has transformed South Australia from the lowest taxed State in the Commonwealth to one of the highest taxed States. At the same time, it has ensured by regularly increasing charges that the costs which have to be borne by industry are becoming in some instances almost insupportable.

My Leader referred to the wine tax. It is one thing to hear politicians talk about taxes. I believe that it is more pertinent very often to speak and listen to those who are affected by those taxes. I refer to the *Hotel Gazette of South Australia* of September 1983 under the cover headline, 'Hotels demand action over the great Federal and State Government rip-offs'. We must bear in mind that hotels

are the backbone of the hospitality industry and the foundation of the tourism industry in this or any other State. On page 3 of that edition, the AHA South Australian President, Mr Peter Whallin, said that his council would extend its protests at Federal and State levels. This was following the Hawke Government's decision to index liquor taxes and the South Australian Government's decision to increase liquor taxes by 33½ per cent. Mr Whallin further stated:

The authorities must realise the enormous harm they are doing to the hotel, hospitality and liquor industries—and, because of this, the tourism industry. We as a council are very angry. Our membership has had enough. Governments cannot be allowed to escape with continual persecution of sound businesses, pleasure and what is an integral part of the Australian way of life.

In response to a campaign mounted by the Opposition and the AHA, the Government backtracked to the extent of 1 per cent. However, the Minister of Tourism, who, prior to any of these taxation announcements said that he would consult with the industry before any proposed taxes were imposed, let that go through Cabinet and come into the House.

It involved a 33½ per cent increase in liquor tax, which would have hit an industry which was already operating on extremely fine margins and which had to engage in discounting in order to obtain enough cash flow. That straw came very close to becoming an insupportable burden. In fact, it was more than a straw: it was a devastating impost for the hotel industry. That was not the only thing. What about electricity charges? Most of the hospitality industry and a large part of the tourism industry, in terms of tourist operators, are very large users of power and fuel. A 25 per cent increase in electricity charges has meant that a suburban hotel in Adelaide—which is by no means an isolated case—now has an annual electricity bill of \$40 000, an increase over the past 12 months of \$10 000 on what it was paying under the previous Government. That is the kind of economic and fiscal policy that affects tourism, but the Minister appears not to appreciate that. He seems to think that just what happens in his Department is what affects tourism.

Mr Speaker, I assure you that what happens in the Treasury affects tourism for good or ill, probably more and with a greater impact than anything that occurs in any other department. In relation to water rates and land tax, hotels are protesting about the huge imposts that they have to pay. This applies not only to hotels but also to other tourist operators, who are also protesting. I wonder whether Government members have forgotten some of the other taxes: the tax on petrol and diesel fuel that will hit the touring motorist; the general insurance levy that has affected the entire hospitality, accommodation, transport and attraction sector; the financial institutions duty which is creaming off far more than the Government ever dared hope for. And that is money which would otherwise have been in the pockets of the tourism industry and which would have enabled the industry to have more confidence in investment. It would have given it a greater cash flow. Also, it would have reduced costs and, therefore, increased the possibility of employment. However, those sorts of things are not happening, and they are not happening because the Bannon Government is a high taxing Government, and high taxation and tourism development are incompatible.

I now turn to the development plan and objective 1, which is to identify or devise a common identity for South Australia as a year round visitor destination with strong, tangible, appealing and positive images for each of the following markets: intrastate, interstate and overseas. I can agree with the Minister, and commend the 'Enjoy' campaign, which was initiated under the previous Government as a brilliant concept formulated by the advertising agency Cle-menger in conjunction with the Marketing Director of the

South Australian Department of Tourism. That 'Enjoy' campaign commenced in 1982 and has since expanded. I am pleased to reaffirm my congratulations to all concerned for the Pacific Area Travellers Association award which has been given to it, and I wish the campaign well.

Regarding objective 1, I would commend the Government for continuing the policies and the campaign of the previous Government. There are various strategies, which have to be, according to the plan, undertaken in terms of that objective, and I question—although I do not pause to question at great length now—whether those strategies have been undertaken and whether those who are responsible for undertaking them have fulfilled that responsibility.

Objective 2 is to achieve a greater awareness of what South Australia has to offer to the target markets through effective marketing. Here, I would commend the Department's relationship with the Australian Tourist Commission but suggest that much more attention needs to be paid to the enormous market—our biggest market, almost on our doorstep—in South-East Asia.

I also refer to strategy number 21 on page 16 of the plan, which seeks to ensure co-ordination, co-operation, and communication between the Government and the tourism industry in relation to marketing. An excellent concept of co-operative advertising was developed by the Department last year. Unfortunately, that co-operative advertising campaign did not go near to fulfilling its potential, simply because of the way in which the industry was approached. Operators were approached at the busiest time of the year, in the month of December, when many of them never even looked at the papers on their desks because they were simply too busy looking after guests. It meant that the number of advertisements and the nature of advertisements that should have appeared simply did not appear.

One can hardly say that that represented co-operation and communication between the Government and the tourism industry, because it represented exactly the opposite. It represented a great big muddle which was condemned by SAARTO. I do not make these comments without substantiation, so I refer honourable members to the minutes of a SAARTO meeting held on 22 May in the conference room of the State ADP Centre, Victoria Square, which recorded one delegate as saying that he was very disenchanted with the campaign and that no editorial was being included with the published advertisements, contrary to promises that had been given. I will not pursue that matter; I simply say that someone slipped up, and I believe I know the reason why.

At another meeting held on 20 February, the timing was strongly criticised but not the content of the campaign. That meeting forcefully suggested that a personal approach should be used in an effort to regain lost ground. At another SAARTO meeting the statement was made that excessive shortage of staff was contributing to impossible pressure in this area. I believe that the Minister can no longer expect the staff of the Department of Tourism to perform miracles if he does not give them the resources with which to perform those miracles. On page 17 of the plan, still under the objective of achieving a greater awareness of what South Australia has to offer, we are urged to:

Adopt a more vigorous and aggressive approach with the Commonwealth Government, the Australian Tourist Commission, and inbound tour operators to maximise promotional opportunities, particularly joint venture opportunities.

I have not seen anything either vigorous or aggressive about the approach of this Government to the Hawke Government in any area whatsoever. In no area has there been what any disinterested observer could regard as an aggressive approach. In fact, the Government has been virtually invisible in terms of its advocacy of South Australia to the Hawke Government.

There is a whole string of issues which affect us adversely, which were outlined by my Leader and which bear testimony to that fact. I refer to objective number 3: 'Improve visitor access to the South Australian holiday experience'. One of the strategies is to identify all key tourism airports and roads and seek a firm commitment by all levels of government to give priority to improving and maintaining such airports and roads. We had a fine speech by the Minister of Tourism in Mount Gambier about a year ago in relation to upgrading that airport. I have not heard a word since and I do not believe that anything has been done in terms of the Mount Gambier Airport. Words, words, words, but not the actions to support those words. As for the roads, one only has to visit the regions, as the Liberal Tourism Policy Committee and I have been doing over the past 18 months to two years, to find that road funding is a very hot issue in most regions. As we know, South Australia's road funding has steadily diminished as a proportion of the national total over the past decade.

The question of access also involves the Adelaide International Airport, about which some members of the Government back-bench were extremely vocal during the last State and Federal election campaigns. I wish that they would be as vocal with the Prime Minister now. Three days ago I got a letter from the South Australian Tourism Industry Council pleading with me to support them in their efforts to get the State Government to do something to make the Federal Government upgrade the services and facilities at the Adelaide International Airport. Again, because of lack of time, I will not read chapter and verse into *Hansard*. This is not my statement, but a South Australian tourism industry statement, that nothing has been done effectively to improve that terminal despite the fact that this Government has had two years in which to make recommendations. Let us look at page 23, objective 4:

Encourage an environment conducive to tourism investment and the development of high quality tourism products.

One of the strategies designed to help achieve that goal is strategy 4.2 (and it is a pity that the Minister for Environment and Planning is not here to listen to this), which states:

The State Government adopt a policy which will permit public access, education and appreciation of environmentally sensitive areas of tourism significance; for example, the Coorong and the Flinders Ranges through the identification and designation of defined high impact areas or development nodes which can be carefully managed.

When my committee and I visited the Flinders Ranges and met with delegates from that region at Hawker we were informed that the national parks plan for the Flinders Ranges, which was couched in arrogant terms in respect of the tourism operators who were pioneers in that area, recommends that there be no powered sites in caravan parks in national parks. In other words, let the bastards freeze in the dark; let the visitors go without; if they want to come and see national parks let them be cold and without light! That is a lovely way to extend hospitality.

The other aspect of that plan which the tourist association resents and rejects is a proposal that there should be no upgrading of roads in national parks. Here we have a strategy for tourism which aims to permit public access, education and appreciation of environmentally sensitive areas, yet we have a Government that is trying to keep people out of parks, or at least break the axles on their vehicles by not improving roads in such areas. I have never heard of a more conflicting set of objectives than those held by the Department of Tourism and the industry on the one hand and the Department for the Environment on the other. In relation to legislation, strategy 4.4, also at page 23, states:

To ensure that existing and proposed State and local government legislation and its administration assists and is consistent with promoting desirable tourism development.

I have referred to the fiscal policies of this Government, which are designed to knock profitability on the head.

I turn now to the industrial policies of this Government. The Bill to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act was brought into this House with nil consideration for the tourism industry: in fact, I would say that there was very little consideration given to private enterprise at all. Fortunately, some of its more odious characteristics were removed by the other place but the fact remains that this Government, or this Minister of Tourism, has not ensured that existing and proposed State legislation assists and is consistent with promoting desirable tourism development.

The Hotels Association was certainly not pleased with the implications of that Bill to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act and the costs, both human and economic, that it would have imposed on the industry. The fifth objective is identified at page 25 and states:

To encourage tourism development which is in harmony with and preserves and enhances the State's environment and lifestyle. The constraints on achieving that objective are identified as negative and inflexible controls resulting in mediocre development. What have we had since then? More negative and inflexible controls introduced by this Government. We have also, I am pleased to say, had the release of the Liberal Party's planning policy, which is designed to relieve some of those constraints and to lead to greater flexibility and a higher speed of approvals for planning proposals. Objective 6 calls on the Government and other bodies to identify key development projects and encourage their establishment. Naturally, the Opposition was delighted to see the Porter Bay project, the early negotiations for which were conducted by my colleague the member for Torrens as Minister of Marine, and the ASER project come to fruition because we worked very hard to get both those projects off the ground.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Especially the Convention Centre.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Especially the Convention Centre. We have, however, grave reservations about the way in which the Government is handling the ASER project, and we certainly seek a great deal of information about what that project will cost the South Australian taxpayer in the years or the decades ahead.

Objective 8, which appears on page 32 of the plan, is to improve product quality and develop a professional approach within the industry. One of the strategies towards achieving that objective is to undertake an examination of training needs and of the capabilities of existing training facilities within the industry and, if necessary, restructure and improve existing training resources. Here, I am very pleased to pay tribute to the South Australian Tourism and Hospitality Industry Training Committee and to successive Federal Governments, which have ensured additional funds for that committee to fulfil its responsibilities.

That strategy was in train when the State Liberal Government was in office and, in fact, it was under our administration that the analysis of the training needs of the commercial cookery sector of the industry was undertaken. As a result of that analysis, the then Federal Government, under the ministry of Mr Ian McPhee, provided \$250 000 for special training courses in that regard. Since then, an additional \$250 000 has been provided by the present Federal Government. In addition to that, additional funds have been made available through craft subsidy schemes to provide training incentives to encourage women to enter trade areas outside of hairdressing. That area of education and training is paramount, and I am pleased to note that Governments of both persuasions also recognise it and have taken action on it, which shows great confidence in the ability and capacity of the Tourism and Hospitality Industry Training Committee to give good advice.

The voluntary tourism regions of South Australia have also been active in ensuring that a lack of knowledge of the availability of training, especially in South Australia's country areas, is overcome by promotion of the training courses on the part of the region. I commend particularly the Riverland Regional Tourist Association, the Flinders Ranges Regional Tourist Association, Eyre Peninsula, the South-East, and Fleurieu, all of which have worked very hard to promote these courses in order to upgrade standards of service and training within their areas.

Another area in which the regions have been active and have worked very hard to implement objective 8 relates to the strategy of establishing an award system within the various segments of the industry as an incentive to encourage excellence. The Harry Dowling Awards, which were established by SAARTO, are gaining in authority and prestige every year—and I am sure the Minister will agree with me on this issue—and are an incentive to excellence.

Objective 11 is to establish an awareness among politicians, unions, the community, business, industry, all levels of government, and the media that tourism is an industry of expanding and economic importance. What grand irony that the members of this Parliament had not even been provided with a copy of the updated plan. I can think of no greater indictment of the Minister in fulfilling his responsibilities (not the Department's, not the industry council's, not SAARTO's but his responsibilities) to the Parliament and to the State politicians and the Federal politicians than to fail to provide them with an updated copy of the plan, preferably at the beginning of this year when it was released but certainly in ample time to ensure its effective debate in the House today. I think very little more needs to be said because that to me is a real indictment and it just beggars imagination how such a thing could have been allowed to happen.

A constraint that is identified in that objective is the lack of appreciation of the effect of certain legislation on tourism. I would say that judging by this Government's legislative record (I am not talking about other matters, I am just talking about legislative record) there is a distinct lack of appreciation in Cabinet and in Caucus about the impact of legislation on tourism, and I have already outlined some of the legislation that has been allowed to be introduced without any consideration of its impact on tourism.

Objective 12 on page 42 seeks to attain a strong Government commitment to the tourist industry at local, State, and Federal levels. One of the constraints upon that is identified as being the fragmentation of responsibility for tourism matters among different Ministerial portfolios. The Leader has already indicated that under the next Liberal Government there will be a Minister of Tourism who will hold that single portfolio and no other, and she will go about the State as an advocate for the industry. There will not be just films of the Minister as a talking head sent out to people. There will be the presence of the Minister all over the State and wherever else is necessary to ensure the greater awareness of the importance of tourism.

What we have had was one of the fastest back tracks one has ever seen: this Premier was scarcely out of the Leader of the Opposition's chair and in the Premier's chair when he broke a promise by giving his Minister of Tourism (who incidentally had not been originally lined up for the job; the industry rejected the previous shadow Minister as being absolutely unacceptable) a very demanding human services portfolio, namely, that of Chief Secretary. The Premier realised his mistake eventually, and on 9 February he announced the reshuffle, and it is worth looking back to that report. The then Chief Secretary and Minister of Tourism was given Local Government and Tourism. He said that he would have been happy to retain the position of

Chief Secretary and to lose tourism, but he was equally happy with his new role; he could take it or leave it. I do not know how the industry felt when they read that, but I thought, 'My goodness. Does he want the job or does he not!' I can only assume that he was accurately reported. I will give him the benefit of the doubt.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: If he was not accurately reported, it should go on the record.

Mr Gunn: I don't think he will ever forget the incident.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: No, I do not think he will ever forget it. Under objective 12 the responsibility for helping to achieve a more equitable balance between State Government expenditure on tourism and the existing and potential economic benefits of tourism to the State is given to the Tourist Development Board, the South Australian Tourism Industry Council, the South Australian Association of Regional Tourist Organisations, and individual industry associations and it is stated that they should lobby the State Government. I hope they have, and I hope that in two days time we will see the evidence of that.

Referring to what the Minister said about regional associations, I point out that this Government expects far too much of the volunteers in the regions. The Minister probably realises this. Those volunteers have been given an almost impossible burden to bear. They are doing work that would normally be done by paid people. Volunteers are doing it. I know that South Australia has a fine tradition of honorary service in a whole range of fields, but these people, who are trying to run businesses on narrow margins in difficult circumstances, are giving untold hours to meetings, promotions, development and all kinds of issues. The burden is becoming insupportable, and I plead with the Minister to recognise the value of the regions and their role in the development and the promotion of the State tourism product and give them the material resources that they need to do that job.

I do not want to take the time of others who want to speak in this debate. I conclude by referring to objective 14: to establish a means of maintaining forward planning and monitoring growth. One of the strategies for that is stated as being that the South Australian Tourism Industry Council should annually review progress and recommend corrective action or further strategies in order to facilitate continuity of the original planning process. Now, there was not a word of that at the last tourism industry conference. The plan did not appear on anyone's agenda or in anyone's handbag: no-one saw it; it was not addressed. That was a source of great disappointment, as indeed was the conference itself to some people. Those are not my words but those of a SAARTO subcommittee:

The 1984 conference was not administered on the basis of feasibility, viability and sound management principles.

The report concludes:

We wish to emphasise most strongly that funds spent on a mediocre conference are money wasted.

I think that the Minister has taken that on board, and I hope and believe that next year's conference will be different and much more like the 1983 conference which was held under his administration and for which I commend the Government.

The Tourism Development Plan is one of the most important documents to be prepared jointly by any department of this State and the community or industry generally. It contains key issues facing the Government. Since the Government has worded this motion in the terms in which it has, I feel bound to say that in many areas it has fallen short on strategies, and I do not believe that the Government could withstand too close a scrutiny of its own monitoring of the plan and its own adherence to the time table. That

will be put to the test in due course as a result of a series of questions. The Opposition does not oppose the motion. We note what the Government has done and what it has failed to do. It is on the record, and the Government will be judged by that record.

Ms LENEHAN (Mawson): I support the motion and congratulate the Minister of Tourism and the Government on the excellent progress that has been made in implementing the South Australian Tourism Development Plan. Before talking on certain issues in the short time at my disposal, I wish to put the record straight regarding the availability of the South Australian Tourism Development Plan. I understand that earlier this year 200 copies of the plan were issued in the State.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Not to the Opposition.

Ms LENEHAN: It was the Minister's understanding that every member of this Parliament had received one of those copies. I do not suggest that that happened, but that was the Minister's understanding of what happened. Regarding recent events, because the Minister felt that some members might well have misplaced their copies he decided to make available to members who were speaking in this debate, namely, the Opposition spokesperson on tourism—

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: I am just explaining. If I could be given the courtesy of explaining the situation, the Minister was under the impression that the Opposition shadow Minister of Tourism—

Mr Ingerson: Why don't you tell the truth?

Ms LENEHAN: I find that comment personally offensive. I am telling the truth.

The Hon. H. Allison: We get accused by the Minister.

Ms LENEHAN: This is very interesting. I am now to be subjected to a personal attack by members of the Opposition and not allowed to have my 15 minutes as previous speakers have had. The only members on this side of the House who received copies of the plan were the three back-bench members who were to speak in the debate. Quite obviously some sort of misunderstanding has occurred either in the department or on the part of the Minister's staff. It is very regrettable that some members who were to speak in the debate did not receive a further copy of the report. There was no deliberate intention to somehow deny members of the Opposition copies of the report. I think any rational person would agree with that. In the short time that I have available to me I wish to refer to three matters contained in the South Australian Tourism Development Plan. I do not intend to try to rush through the plan with a frenetic speech endeavouring to cover every aspect of it.

First, I turn to the matter of international visitors, and I refer to page 3 of the plan which outlines the current situation and states that the fastest growth market is that in relation to the international visitor. That point is further picked up subsequently in the summary of objectives. The first objective is to 'identify or devise a common identity for South Australia as a year round visitor destination with strong, tangible, appealing and positive images for the intrastate, interstate and overseas market'.

I wish to concentrate particularly on the overseas market, because I believe that it is an extremely important market. It is a new and wealthy market; the people have money to spend and their involvement will provide a boost to the industry that we in South Australia want to see. Statistics that have been released recently by the Australian Bureau of Statistics indicate that, between the years ended December 1982 and December 1983, 10 800 fewer short-term overseas visitors entered Australia. However, let us look at two of the areas at which South Australia in particular has targeted its marketing. In regard to the Japanese market, the statistics

show that from the end of December 1982 to the end of December 1983 there was an increase from 60 400 to 71 800 short-term visitors arriving in Australia. That represents an increase of some 19 per cent. In regard to the other market that we are aiming to capture a segment of, that is, the United States market, it can be seen that visitor arrivals have increased from 126 000 to 140 000—an increase of 11 per cent.

Whilst those two markets represent a remarkable turnabout in comparison with the overall situation, over that period the greatest increase in arrivals occurred in relation to those from Singapore, which increased by about 21.7 per cent, and in relation to those from Malaysia, which increased by 21 per cent. One does not have to be a great analyst of statistics to work out that quite obviously the greatest increase of tourists arriving in this country has occurred in relation to those coming from South-East Asia. I now refer to statistics provided by the International Visitor Survey (IVS), a survey undertaken by the Australian Tourism Commission. Unfortunately, the IVS did not undertake a statistical analysis in 1982, and so a comparison can be made only between 1981 and 1983. For the year ended December 1981 there were 4 754 Japanese visitors to South Australia, while for the year ended December 1983 there were 9 210—a remarkable increase of 93.7 per cent.

Let us also look at the other market I have used in my Australian comparison, that is, the United States market. In that same period from December 1981 to December 1983 the increase in visitor arrivals went from 10 834 to 17 180, an increase of 58.6 per cent—a remarkable increase for South Australia. It sets the scene for what I now want to say—that South Australia is benefiting very dramatically from an increase in overseas visitors particularly from the United States and South-East Asian countries such as Japan.

While many things are being carried out regarding the South Australian Tourism Development Plan to promote South Australia overseas, we need to concentrate and focus our attention on the quality of our product and the kinds of facilities that we provide for overseas tourists. One of the things that strike every South Australian who has ventured away from the shores of this country to a non-English speaking country is, when they return, the complete lack of multi-lingual facilities for overseas visitors in the form of comprehensive interpreter services, tape recorders and a range of multi-lingual brochures and pamphlets. I believe that this is one area where we must improve the facilities that we are providing.

There are a range of other areas that we can improve by looking at the things that overseas tourists and visitors wish to find when they come here. I do not believe that it is acceptable to hide our heads in the sand and say, 'This is the way we have always done it' and 'This is the sort of thing we want to provide and they can take it or leave it.' What I am suggesting and have suggested to both the Minister and the Premier is that, in conjunction with other segments of the industry—the Government, the international airline (Qantas), the domestic airlines and individual promoters in the State—we should sponsor or provide incentives (not pay the whole fare) for tourist operators to visit selected and targeted overseas markets and establish facilities and attractions overseas visitors wish to see when they come here.

To that end I have recently suggested—some of the media has picked this up—things like developing our native fauna, for example, and promoting our unique Australian animals and birds and not have them sitting unpromoted in a conservation park. I want to put on record, as there has been some misunderstanding, that when I suggested we should offer a prize in a quiz programme I was not suggesting that we should sponsor every honeymoon couple from Japan to

visit South Australia. Rather, I was suggesting in peak viewing time in countries like Japan, which has an enormous television viewing audience, we should sponsor a prize which would be a visit to South Australia, particularly Adelaide. I believe that that is one way in which we can get extremely good value for our promotional dollar.

In the time I have left I would like to turn to two other areas. The South Australian Tourism Development Plan under the heading 'Trends internal to the industry' states that the tourism industry needs to be aware of trends within it that may assist or hinder its ability to adapt to a changing world. The report goes on to list some of these trends, one being that the existing formal Government responsibilities are too scattered, diverse and unco-ordinated between the various departments and authorities and that this creates difficulties for relationships between the private and public tourism sectors.

My understanding of a solution to that problem would be, as the Minister has recently canvassed publicly, the establishment of a South Australian Tourism Commission. I wholeheartedly support the establishment of such a Commission, because I believe that a South Australian Tourism Commission, given powers and responsibilities similar to those of, for example, the Victorian Tourism Commission, would be able to address the very things in this report which highlight some of the problems facing tourism in this State. It is essential that such a Commission be given wide powers and responsibilities, be given the responsibility and, indeed, the ability to control funds to adopt a more entrepreneurial role and, in fact, be a leader in the tourism industry development of the product and of the promotion of our tourist product.

That leads me to the last section about which I would like to talk. It is covered on page 8, under the heading, 'A lack of major man-made attractions', which some people have suggested should read 'A lack of artificially constructed attractions'. Everyone in this State would agree that we have a lack of these attractions. I had a recent experience in my electorate where a group of people got together and proposed that they develop a Miniature City Community Project. This Miniature City Community Project envisaged an area of five acres in the Onkaparinga Estuary where they would develop a miniature city scale model of Adelaide or parts of the Adelaide environs. In their work to try to promote this development they have been approached by a gentleman from the Netherlands who wished to join with them in establishing a miniature Europe in Australia and to settle in South Australia. This gentleman, whose name is Mr Butijn, has 200 models and is arriving in Adelaide towards the end of September. It would seem that my constituents (and the idea came from Mr Noorda) have not had success in selling their idea to leaders in the community, to the local council, the Jubilee 150 Committee or other people that they have approached.

This is one of the areas in which I believe an effective Tourism Commission could play an entrepreneurial role. I wish to elaborate on that point. If we are to implement this Tourism Development Plan, move forward and see tourism as a means of economic development, then in this State we have to strike a very fine balance between the entrepreneurial creative people who are working to improve tourism, and who have a sense of vision and direction, and the people who have the economic skills and expertise and who are prepared to work with such people to develop plans which can mean that such programmes as the Miniature City Community Project can be implemented. Unless we strike this fine balance between creative entrepreneurship and economic reality and viability, we will find that those people with this kind of vision for tourism development will take their projects elsewhere and those people who seem to be

winning the day (certainly in relation to this project) will be left with also-ran tourist development.

In conclusion, in the short time I have had in this debate I have tried to draw together the threads of international visitors, the idea of establishing a viable South Australian Tourism Commission and the idea of using that Commission to promote and enable such exciting projects as this Miniature City Community Project to go ahead. I congratulate the Minister and the Government on the implementation, so far, of the South Australian Tourism Development Plan.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I shall refer first to the miniature city community project. I smiled towards the end of the previous member's contribution at her enthusiasm for the project and the implied goodwill that exists between herself and the Minister, and between the Minister and the miniature city community project. That goodwill certainly is not shared by the organisers of the community city project. One extract alone from a letter I have here—

Ms Lenehan interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: The lady is upset. Maybe she might just simmer down and I can tell honourable members about the difficulties that exist between the project and the Government. The letter states:

Although we have impressed upon several authorities that we had made contact with a person in the Netherlands who wished to establish a miniature Europe in Australia and settle in South Australia, our information was ignored.

That is a nice attitude for the Minister of Tourism! The letter continues:

The business community cannot be blamed for the lack of interest shown by the Department of Tourism.

I put it to you, Mr Speaker: what relationship does exist between the Government and this miniature city community project? I would put to the House that it certainly is not a good relationship. The motion notes the policies and strategies of the Government, but all we have heard this afternoon is considerable self praise and even adulation from the Minister and his back-bench, praising himself basically, I suspect, for the increase in tourism traffic in South Australia and making sure to get as much as possible on the record about what he believes has been his contribution to the tourist industry in this State since his Party came to office. However, from time to time we have had to read press releases on this subject, and it is interesting that they have come entirely from the Minister and the Director-General. Very seldom do we see anyone else publishing these figures in the press, and that is all part of his promotional plan.

I pose three questions to the House. First, how much of this increase has been brought about, first, by the marketing and promotion of private entrepreneurs and individuals on their own initiative? Secondly, how much was brought about by programmes initiated by the previous Liberal Government and only continued by the present Government? Thirdly, how much can be chalked up on the board as specific achievements by this Government brought about by specific programmes originated and initiated by it? Very little can fall into the last category. I noticed in the press last night an article which was printed originally in the *Sunday Mail* on 27 May or August (the date is immaterial) under the headline '\$137 million spent on tourists', and which states:

South Australia has more than \$137 million worth of tourist resorts and projects under construction or in final planning. The Tourism Minister, Mr Keneally, said yesterday the list of new developments included 14 hotels or motels, three major resorts, and 18 'attractions' such as the Port River cruise ship, *Matthew Flinders*. 'While these developments should not constitute the extent of South Australia's advance, it is a good start,' he said.

My comment is that the Minister has been happy to take the praise, but how many of these projects have got a cent of Government money in them? I would submit that there

are none. It is a private enterprise promotion. However, certainly Government receipts (and this is the important thing) will be up, because the Government will move in in its typical fashion to tax these new businesses at the full rates. Then the Commonwealth will move in to get its fair share of company tax and personal tax. But where has this Government given any assistance to businesses other than to use those businesses as a source of tax revenue once they have been established?

Mr Lewis: Never once.

Mr OSWALD: That is the trouble: it does not. The Government is very happy to see businesses set up, but as soon as that is done it moves in to use them as a source of State revenue, without returning anything to the business. This leads me into the subject of how the Government uses the tourist industry as a fertile source of revenue, and I hope to demonstrate to the House the need to return more of this revenue to the industry. It comes under that heading of tax reform—something that the Labor Government will not discuss and something foreign to it. However, it is a very important subject to anyone in the hospitality or tourist industry and to any entrepreneur in this State.

Tourists spend some \$720 million a year in South Australia, and the tourist industry employs some 27 000 South Australians. Although tourism is expected to be the world's biggest industry by the turn of the century, this Government is showing scant recognition of this in its policies. On 4 June, Graham Inns, the Director-General of the Department of Tourism, told the Tourism Industry Council that the South Australian tourism industry could create 1 200 jobs next financial year. It sounded good and looked good in print. Mr Inns said:

This would come about if the tourism industry repeated its growth rate for the current year.

Once again, that is very plausible. He continued:

All available economic indicators show 1983-84 has been a year of strong growth for the tourism industry. This was a welcome turnaround from the previous year, which was the trough of the economic recession. Mr Inns said travel within South Australia by South Australians is up 4 per cent in the first six months of the financial year. The number of visitors from other States rose by 5.2 per cent.

The key word in Mr Inns's forecast is 'if'—if the growth trend continues. Of course, the Opposition hopes that the trend will continue—let there be no mistake about that. We are awaiting this year's Budget with great interest, and this is where the interest lies. Will this growth continue?

I recall last year when the State Government brought down its Budget, which included new taxes and charges that destroyed many of the incentives in the tourist industry. This Government knows that is so. The Opposition knows it, and entrepreneurs know it. The Government's Budget prevented those industries from expanding. The Government sent many marginal tourist operators to the wall. It cannot deny that it did so through its increased taxes and charges. The Government would like to erase the memory of the 33.5 per cent increase in liquor licence fees from the mind of the hospitality industry, but of course that memory will not go away. That increase was equated to \$8 million directly being withdrawn from the hotel industry. It resulted in lower profits and a further disincentive to employ. That must be borne in mind strongly. If there is a disincentive to employ, there will be fewer full-time jobs in the industry. This is basically what most people are aiming at, that is, to secure for themselves a full-time job in any industry.

What about the tax that the Government imposed on petrol and diesel fuel? At first glance one might say, 'So what; how does that affect the hospitality industry?' But, it hits the motoring public first, so there is the disincentive to travel. It hits the hotel/motel operator in the cooking area and in the provision of heating fuels in country areas.

It increases transport costs in bringing supplies and fuel out to country hotels. There is also an extra cost in running the plant out in remote areas.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Especially for caravan parks.

Mr OSWALD: As the member for Coles says, it creates extra costs in caravan parks. This Government is not fair dinkum about helping the tourist industry in South Australia. It pays lip service to the industry but is not fair dinkum in helping it. The Government is happy to see good figures coming out in the press but it does nothing to help operators with some sort of relief.

What about the general insurance levy that affects the entire hospitality industry and, in particular, accommodation and transport? What about the FID impost of which we are all aware? I will not labour that point because we all know the implications of FID. I put it to the House that the Government is not fair dinkum. The House will recall—as just another small item in passing, but nevertheless a real one—how houseboat operators were hit with a fee increase. Riverland houseboat operators were hit with an increase. That small group of entrepreneurs, which was trying to make its presence felt, was suddenly hit with this increase.

Members interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: They were in the country quietly going about their business. I will read, to honourable members, a report as follows:

Riverland houseboat operators are up in arms over increases in marine survey charges. They claim the higher fees will cost them thousands of dollars and reduce the number of boats on the Murray River. The inspection fee for a 20 metre boat has been increased from \$45 to \$180. Renmark operator Liba Liba estimates that the higher charges will cost an extra \$6 000 a year.

The Government does not care about that. With one hand in Treasury, it loads up taxes and then expects entrepreneurs who have to meet expenses on a week by week basis over 12 months a year to pick up the gap and somehow make ends meet. If one cannot make ends meet, one quietly slides into oblivion and the Government writes it off as another statistic.

Mr Lewis: It's an unjust slug! They never look at the boats: they never inspect them that often in salt water.

Mr OSWALD: That is quite right. I take the interjection, which is quite right. The Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act Amendment Bill that came before the Parliament once again belted the tourist industry, regardless of its handling in the Legislative Council or elsewhere. The philosophy behind it was that subcontract labour should be regulated and receive benefits such as workers compensation, sick leave and holiday pay. No consideration was given to the fact that hotels and motels employ significant numbers of subcontract labour, particularly in the areas of painting and decorating, extensions and renovations (which run to about \$30 million annually), and entertainment, where hotels spend about \$1 million annually. To my knowledge, there are about 50 hotels in Adelaide paying \$1 500 per week for entertainment. The end result is more cost to the entrepreneur, and honourable members would not be familiar with the motivation behind those people.

The industry and indeed this side of the House were pleased to see that the Government spent \$525 000 promoting South Australia on local television in Sydney and Melbourne. We applaud that: it is obviously a step in the right direction. I acknowledge that the money spent is reflected in part in some of the increase in tourist numbers that have been noted in South Australia. Frankly, spending money on interstate television campaigns is only a very small part of the Government's obligation in creating a strong viable tourist industry in South Australia. It is no good spending money on the one hand and then being content with that by saying to the industry, 'We have done

a good job, you can see there is an increase in tourists.' As soon as that happens, the entrepreneurs set up shop; and then, the Government races in with the typical socialist slugs of taxation that have been seen in South Australia in the past 18 months, belting the industry for a six and then having industries going to the wall again. It is just not on! It proves that the Government is totally out of kilter with the reality of the hospitality and tourist industry in South Australia.

I wish now to turn to the South Australian Tourist Development Plan, although I have not had a chance to study it because the Minister did not give it to us to look at in any great depth. The first objective refers to the common identity of South Australia. I will not repeat the section concerning promotion of the State. I applaud that just as I applaud the way in which the Government has continued the 'Enjoy' campaign. However, it must have one or two more 'Enjoy' campaigns in the can ready to go.

The second objective refers to effective marketing. I put to the Minister that individual operators need guidance. Many individual operators do not have the capital to go it alone and need more joint marketing schemes organised in conjunction with the Department of Tourism. I want to place that aspect on record.

More money needs to be allocated back to the tourist industry. As I said earlier, it is a major contributor of taxation and one of our largest growth industries. If the Government is to take these great slices from the industry, it is not too much to ask that it returns some back to the industry. I noticed that I am supported in this by the member for Unley, Kym Mayes, who, in the local press in February 1984, called on the Government and the Minister to increase the amount of money being allocated to the Adelaide region. The Adelaide region misses out to a large degree on a lot of the money allocated in ratio to the population base.

In closing, I repeat a statement I made last month, when referring to entrepreneurs. I said that entrepreneurs are like lovers—all they need is a little encouragement. All operators in the tourist and hospitality industry are, without exception, entrepreneurs. I refer to the *Sunday Mail* of 20 November and the banner headline, 'Think again Mr Bannon say the publicans'. Mr Bannon featured strongly in that article. The things mentioned in the article will undermine the whole of the tourism industry in South Australia. As soon as we get something up and going the Government moves in. If the Minister of Tourism hopes to ever honour the objectives of the tourist development plan there will have to be a rapid change in Party philosophy towards State taxes and charges. Unfortunately, I cannot see that happening in South Australia.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): In speaking in support of this motion, I am disappointed that the Opposition has chosen to take this opportunity to act in a partisan way. Clearly, the member for Coles has used this opportunity to try to bucket the Government. I have no doubt whatsoever that the member for Coles delivered her speech in an attempt to gain some cheap political capital. That is how bipartisan the member for Coles is! Later, I will demonstrate how clear my thoughts are in relation to the member for Coles and the Opposition.

The former Minister of Tourism admitted that she had obtained a copy of the tourist development plan, but she had to make some cheap political comment on it. However, the member for Coles failed to acknowledge the positive achievements of the present Government since taking office. The former Minister of Tourism expressed concern about the viability of a number of businesses affected by the imposts of this Government. However, she failed to mention

the positive directions taken by the Government but, given time, I will relate them. Let us not forget the massive deficit inherited by the Government as a legacy of the former Government. Let us not forget that.

Members interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Members opposite do not like to hear that and they try to talk over the top of me, but they do not have a snowball's chance in hell of doing that.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Ferguson): Order! I ask honourable members of the Opposition to show the same courtesy to the member for Albert Park as has been shown to them.

Mr HAMILTON: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker, I need your protection from the barking dogs opposite. As I have said, let us not forget the massive deficit inherited from the former Government. Naturally, that affects the deliberations of the Treasury and the Government. I will pick up some of the points made by the member for Coles and other members opposite. They spoke about the Adelaide International Airport. What a debacle and what a joke!

Mr Oswald: It's been built.

Mr HAMILTON: Indeed. I can recall that the former Government wanted the international airport not necessarily for the benefit of South Australians—as I will demonstrate in a moment—but to make cheap political capital on the eve of a State election. I remind the House that on occasions that I travelled overseas adverse comments were directed to me by members of the public—

Mr LEWIS: Mr Acting Speaker, this is a very important point, so I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr HAMILTON: I am glad that many of the Opposition members are here to listen to my great contribution. The Adelaide International Airport was not designed to show our international tourists how great South Australia is. I heard comments, as I said, about the airport having no currency exchange facilities, no carpet and that it was incomplete. Numerous other things were said, too, but all the previous Government wanted to do, in cahoots with its Federal colleagues, was try to return to office. It did not succeed. People in South Australia rightly saw through that plan; they tossed the Government out of office.

The member for Coles said how concerned she was about tourism, but what did the previous Government do for the north-western suburbs? I suggest that it was almost zilch until 1982 when the gentleman who is now the member for Bragg stood against me and tried to defeat me. Nothing was said about tourism before then. Opposition members were looking for some cheap political point to try to turf me out of office, because I was sitting on a margin of 4 per cent. I might add, for the edification of members opposite, that it was a remarkable turn of events when I picked up a massive 13.1 per cent swing in the Albert Park District. Even the member for Bragg now admits that he was ill-advised to try to defeat me at that time.

I was surprised to hear the member for Coles's intemperate language—'let the bastards freeze'! That was a nice statement! I have a little more respect than that for the member for Coles and was surprised by that remark. She raised the matter of the Mount Gambier Airport. I recall that in 1982 I raised the matter of upgrading that airport. As the former Minister of Tourism, the member for Coles should recall my raising this matter, as a former Mount Gambier resident. But, obviously she does not. As I said, I was most concerned about the state of the airport but what did we get under eight years of the Fraser Government—absolutely nothing! From that Fraser-Tonkin affiliation we did not receive one red cent to upgrade the Mount Gambier Airport.

Yet the member for Coles was hypocritical enough today to stand in this place and talk about upgrading that airport. For her edification, I point out that at least the present Minister of Tourism has done something towards forming a local action group and has made representations to our Federal colleagues about upgrading the airport. But, no, the honourable member is not prepared to acknowledge what this Government is doing in that respect. She should remember what her Federal colleagues were prepared to do in relation to that airport.

I do not know whether her memory is failing her or not, but she said that the State tourism development plan was not discussed at the South Australian Tourism Conference. I do not know where she was, but I was certainly there and I also know from reading the minutes that the matter was discussed point by point, as is clearly demonstrated in the booklet, *Tomorrow's Tourism*. At page 11 the speaker (Mrs Wendy Chapman) referred to this subject. It was also recorded at pages 12, 13, 14, 15 and even at page 16. It was summed up at page 17 in this way in the last paragraph:

Both the council and the Department have continued their role of monitoring the progress of the plan and from this conference your very valued input will be used to further evaluate that progress. Tourism is not just a 1980s buzz word; it is a viable, exciting industry which if fostered professionally can supply this State of South Australia with a reliable growth industry. You, your business and the people you employ are essential ingredients for that cake. I urge you all to be positive,—

I hope that the Opposition takes note of that—

professional and enjoy your industry, and in turn your visitors and tourists will automatically enjoy you and what you have to offer them.

Clearly, the Opposition today has been hell bent on trying to make some cheap political points. Its members talk about their concern about the industry, but when people from other parts of the world and, indeed, from the other parts of Australia, read some of the adverse comments that have been made by the Opposition (and I imagine that some of them will be reported in the press) that will do wonders for tourism, like hell! Not a bit!

Returning to what I was saying about tourism, since I have been the member for Albert Park, I have promoted the tourism potential of my district to the best of my ability.

The Hon. Michael Wilson interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Yes, I know that I have done very well. My constituents agree with that, too, as was clearly demonstrated at the last election. However, I cannot recall—and I do not have a bad memory—a representative of the previous Government ever coming to me and speaking about or taking up any of the points that I have raised; I stand corrected if that has taken place, but I cannot remember it.

The former Minister, the member for Coles, as I said before, in 1982, on the eve of an election, was down there with the present member for Bragg trying to whip up some support. I also suggest that the former Minister had some inkling about a development that was perhaps to take place; I hope that I am not doing her discredit. I have been around the traps long enough to understand those sorts of tactics. It was not sincerity; it was a cheap political ploy to try to get another of their colleagues into office, but it certainly did not come off.

All members would know in the past month or so (and you, Mr Acting Speaker, would recall) the time and effort that I have put in to trying to promote the north-western suburbs, particularly within my electorate of Albert Park. The *South Australian Tourism Development Plan* at page 2 states:

In a local context then, tourism may provide employment and incomes in regions where alternative forms of employment are difficult to generate. Furthermore, tourism supports a wide range of community facilities, including shops, restaurants, sporting and

other leisure and cultural facilities which in many local areas may not otherwise exist. Tourism can also provide for the maintenance of parks and gardens, historic buildings, beach front areas, and other attractions, thus helping to preserve the environmental and historical character of towns throughout the State.

One could almost suggest that that document is talking about the electorate of Albert Park and the north-western suburbs, particularly where it states, 'supports a wide range of community facilities'. As member for Albert Park, I got very little assistance from the previous Government when trying to get a community centre going at Hawkesbury Reserve. I had to battle it almost alone when I supported local residents trying to resolve the problem (which it was) relating to Football Park. I stood on my dig from 1979 until now to ensure that local residents were protected.

I would like to say a lot more about the promotion of West Lakes, Tennyson and the Fort Glanville area, and about tourism right throughout the area, but unfortunately I am getting the wind-up from my Whip. When I listened to the hypocrisy of members opposite here today I realised that they are not here to promote this industry but to try to pull it down in the hope that they will be able to get back into Government. Members opposite do not want the Government to succeed. They are not interested in positive policies: it is doom and gloom—a resurrection of the attitude evident in the lead up to the 1979 State election. We are all well aware of that, but it simply will not work, because the popularity of the Opposition in the South Australian community is at its lowest ebb.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I thank the previous speaker for the tremendous assistance that he personally is giving us to get back into Government. It is a pleasure to speak on this important subject of the tourist industry in South Australia. However, it is something of a farce, an insult to the Opposition, to be asked to note a Government strategy, policy and plan having had no copy of the plan handed to it—literally no plan at all has been handed to the Opposition, despite the pretty excuses which have been made by back-benchers opposite. Under those circumstances, it is a gross insult to expect members of the Opposition to stand on such an important issue and debate competently on how it sees Government achievements.

In the past 18 months of the Government's term of office we have seen little that was not set in train by the previous Minister, who has already established a wonderful reputation in the tourist industry, despite the comments that have been bandied around by members of the present Government. At the next State election they will find out in what light the former Minister is seen, and I can assure members opposite that they are in for a rude awakening. At worst, if I were to take a very cynical view, I would say that the absence of any documentation at all is simply a straight out admission by the Government that it does not have a strategy, plan or policy. At best, I would say that it is a darn funny way to conduct Government business, that is, keeping the Opposition in the dark and treating it like a mushroom society. That will not work, either.

I think it is far more appropriate for me to note the excellent work which has been achieved and will continue to be achieved in the future by the people in my electorate (I refer to the South-East Regional Tourist Authority presently under the chairmanship of Ken Whitehead, and the secretaryship of Sheena McGuire). I also want to mention the excellent work that has been tackled following the inaugural meeting convened by the Green Triangle Committee, which very recently met for the first time. I am quite sure that they will take advantage of all that South Australia, and in particular the South-East, has to offer. The South-East is one of the most magnificent parts of South Australia.

When I come back to South Australia I always have to say that Adelaide and Mount Gambier are two of the cleanest, prettiest, neatest and tidiest cities that one could find anywhere on the face of this world. I am particularly proud of Mount Gambier, that jewel of the South-East, which has been my home for the past 30 years—and the tourists like it, too.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: And that part of the State will again be well represented after the next election.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The District of Adelaide will be, too. Yes, I agree, there will be no problem at all. Figures indicate that a total of 35 000 nights have been spent in the South-East by 8 850 international visitors, each tourist having averaged a four night stay in the South-East. A total of 153 000 interstate visitors (16.2 per cent of visitors to South Australia) have been registered, giving 502 000 bed occupancies in the South-East. On average, each visitor spent 3½ nights in the South-East. Figures indicate that 16.2 per cent of all visitors travelling from interstate come through Mount Gambier, which indicates that many visitors are travelling around the coast heading towards Adelaide, which is the main recipient of visits by tourists to South Australia.

The South-East Regional Tourist Association, although it collected \$25 000 from the State Government, is one of the most competent and efficient organisations in South Australia, if not the most efficient. It has about a \$4 000 membership subscription of its own. I refer to the excellent work undertaken by officers of the South Australian Travel Centre, at least two of whom on the senior staff began their interesting work in tourism at Mount Gambier in the South-East. I applaud the work of Government officers who are obviously propping up the Minister in excellent fashion—and how he needs it! Obviously time is very constrained, so I will have to continue my remarks in the grievance debate this evening and I will do so with great pleasure.

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

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I note with considerable concern that, while a private enterprise caravan park and convention centre in the South-East was recently sold under a mortgagee sale, the Government made available \$180 000 to a union organisation at Policeman's Point for the massive upgrading of another caravan park. I am told that the development at Policeman's Point upgraded that caravan park quite considerably, well beyond the ability of private enterprise parks in the area to compete. I also understand that the grant was made in advance of other applications for funding.

So, what exactly is the Government's regional strategy? When one sees decisions like this implemented it is rather like an accident waiting to happen and certainly leads to disgruntlement in the tourist community, particularly in the South-East. All would agree that a plan is needed.

Before the Opposition can compliment the committee on its achievement and the South Australian Department of Tourism on its work, we would like to see the report and the Government's strategies. As I said earlier, the Opposition was not shown the courtesy of being given a copy of the report before this debate began. As far as we can see, the Government's implementation of its policies is as slow as its making available the documentation.

The report of the committee refers to a number of constraints, which I do not propose to itemise. Obviously, those constraints mean that the Government has a tremendous amount of work to do before it can get tourism well and truly under way in South Australia. There are a number of transport problems, including train services throughout rural South Australia which are diminishing very quickly as Australian National Railways scales down its services. Each year either different services are phased out or carriage capacity is reduced. Concerning air services—

The **SPEAKER**: Order! The time allotted for this debate has expired.

Motion carried.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

LIBRARIES ACT AMENDT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 14 August. Page 234.)

The **Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light)**: It is the intention of the Opposition to support this Bill to the second reading stage, when some variation to the Government's amendment contained in this measure will be undertaken. I do not elaborate on that issue at the moment, other than to say that the principle enunciated here has the full support of the Opposition. As to the variation in the Bill as presented by the Government, I believe that it would be totally wrong to completely write out of the legislation the involvement of a practising member of local government, whether that practising member be an elected member or an officer of local government. I am appreciative of the fact, attention having been drawn to that matter in preliminary discussions and briefings on this issue, that the validity of the argument has been accepted not only by the Minister and his Department but also by the Local Government Association itself.

It is important that those practising in local government always have some direct channel to matters of this nature because they are being called upon to participate more and more. The amount of money involved is greater and, therefore, whilst they would be the first to acknowledge the value of people who have had experience in local government in putting a viewpoint on behalf of local government, it is not the same as local government itself putting that viewpoint. That is a variation which is highly desirable in the changes which have been proposed.

It is a rather strange set of circumstances which have led to this Bill coming before the House on this occasion. There was a reorganisation in 1982, appointments were made and, purely by chance, the three persons who have occupied these positions are either out of or about to leave local government. The Opposition recognises the work that has been undertaken over a long period, not only since the existence of this Act, by Mr Jim Crawford, a former Mayor of Brighton, a former Junior Vice-President of the Local Government Association and a person who has shown a great deal of interest in libraries for the community.

Members right across the political spectrum will have noted the presence of Mr Jim Crawford at many openings that have taken place in the past three to four years. There has been a distinct programme of upgrading libraries, and the Board has played a very vital role in that. Most certainly Mr Crawford, as the leader or chairman of the group, has been out in the forefront of those programmes. Mrs Meredith Crome, the former President of the Local Government Association, has left her direct involvement with local government in the Corporation of Gawler. Still lecturing in that subject at the open college, she is still recognised as the immediate past President of the Local Government Association but has forsaken the direct role of a participating member of local government. I am led to believe that Mr Alex McClure, Town Clerk of the City of Marion, is about to retire, being the third of the three people no longer

available unless these changes are undertaken to the Libraries Act.

Recognising the importance of a continuity of effort (and we have previously debated argument as to whether it should be all in or all out with local government), it is interesting to note that the Minister on this occasion has lauded the value of an element of continuity, and by supporting the measures which are before the House it will be possible, in the case of one or two people, to retain that continuity. I would like to think that, all other things being equal, Mr Crawford will maintain his involvement as the leader of the Libraries Board. That is not a matter for me to direct: it is an admission of the appreciation of the effort he has made in this most vital community area.

With the changing circumstances of communication, more particularly, the orbiting stations, it is conceivable that in the not too distant future the library services in this State can be upgraded by linking the libraries into the satellite facilities that will be available. Certainly, I would expect from its previous history the Libraries Board to be considering all those new initiatives and seeking to bring forward for the benefit of the total community whatever service will benefit the community. However, one would have to close on a slightly sour note—and it is not meant to be sour, but it is purely and simply an expression of reality—that the cost of developing these libraries is getting greater. The cost of maintaining them and providing the book stock is getting greater. Further, the cost of the employment associated with them is getting greater and there is a limitation to how great can be the development without a continuing fusion of funds either from the Commonwealth or the State, along with whatever local government can provide.

Members on this side recognise that a good library system leads to an informed community, and an informed or educated community can achieve a lot more than can a community which is held in ignorance of available facts. That being recognised, the Opposition would say that there is this need to look very critically at the sum of money made available from whatever source for the continuance of a library service and, where necessary, to integrate library services as has so often occurred in the past into community libraries and tying them in, for example, with school libraries.

It is foolish to the extreme to have competition within the one community, with the same type of shelves in two localities and the same type of books being duplicated. There is this need for co-operation and I am sure that the Minister of Education has already shown on previous occasions his concurrence with that theme. It is one that members on this side are interested to put before the House as of some importance.

The **Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Local Government)**: I want to thank the shadow Minister of Local Government (speaking on behalf of the Opposition, of course) for his and the Opposition's support of this piece of legislation. I would like to respond to one or two interesting comments that the honourable member has made. First, I acknowledge that there needs to be a rationalisation of library services to ensure that the community is provided with the best possible service. I think that we all agree, because both Governments have made a commitment to this, that South Australia fairly generally has been underserved by libraries and that matter needs to be redressed. It was redressed largely by the Libraries Board under the Chairmanship of Mr Crawford.

The honourable member was quite right in paying a tribute to Mr Crawford and the members of the Board, who are caught in a sense by this piece of legislation. I refer to Mr Crawford, Mrs Crome and Mr McClure, to whom I would certainly like to pay a tribute for the work they have

done. I do not know what the membership of the Board will be as a result of the legislation, except that I can advise the honourable member and the House that it is certainly my intention to appoint Mr Crawford as Chairman of the Board resulting from the legislation. He is already the Chairman, so it is merely a continuation of that position. Whom the Local Government Association wishes to nominate will be a matter for it, the Department (I guess) and the Minister, of course, in due course.

I would like to thank the honourable member for the very sound advice he gave me during the briefing discussions on the Bill. I believe it is good that we keep a position on the Board available to a practising member of local government, whether that member be an elected councillor or an officer of local government. I accept the truth of the proposition that, if all members of the Board are past members of local government, it is not always certain that current thinking can be represented on the Board. One would assume that that would be so, but having a current practitioner on the Board by right, is an improvement on the original intention behind this amending Bill.

I thank the honourable member for his suggestion and, as always, if the Government receives sensible suggestions from the Opposition it is pleased to accept them and include them in the legislation. There seems to be no difference of opinion as to the importance of the Library Service, as to the importance of a viable Board and as to the importance of local government representation on the Board. In Committee I will say a little more about the amendments, to which I am not allowed to refer in the second reading stage. I thank the honourable member for his comments.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Membership of the Board.'

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I move:

Page 1, lines 16 to 18—Leave out all words on these lines and substitute the following proposed subsection:

(2) The membership of the Board must include—

- (a) one member who is a member or officer of a council, nominated by the Local Government Association of South Australia;
- (b) one member with experience in local government (who may, but need not, be a member or officer of a council) nominated by the Local Government Association of South Australia;
- (c) one other member with experience in local government (who may, but need not, be a member or officer of a council).

It was to this amendment that I referred earlier. The amendment has been suggested by the member for Light and is an appropriate amendment. The Government's original provision sought to ensure that people who had wide experience in local government could be appointed to the Board, whereas the legislation provided that they had to be practising members of local government. That provision put the Government into the position of requiring the resignation of three valuable Board members. It was never the intention of the original legislation that that should occur, as it would have deprived the Government of valuable expertise. The Government's amendment sought to ensure that persons of wide experience should be available for appointment to the Board.

The member for Light pointed out to me that the original amendment in a sense took away from practising members of local government a right that they currently have of being appointed to the Board. He believed that it was essential that practising members should have a contribution to make because obviously there can occur a difference in thinking between current practitioners of the art and those who were practitioners some time ago. The Government accepted the honourable member's suggestion as a wise amendment, and I am pleased to be able to move the amendment accordingly.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The amendment proposed by the Minister provides for the benefit which has been discussed: in fact, it goes a little wider. It creates a situation where as many as all three of the people concerned could be practitioners of local government, and that is wise. It gives a greater degree of flexibility. I had indicated a preference for at least two practising members or most certainly one. The amendment is broad enough to allow all three to be practising members and whilst I do not want that to occur on this occasion, because we have already referred to Mr Crawford, who will occupy one of the positions, the flexibility will exist for the future, and that is wise. The Opposition supports the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 3—'Terms and conditions of memberships.'

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I move:

Page 1, line 20—After the passage 'of subsection (3)' insert the passage 'and substituting the following paragraph:

- (d) being a member nominated under section 9 (2) (a), he ceases to be a member or officer of a council;'

This is consequential on the amendment just agreed to.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read and third time and passed.

DOG FENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 14 August. Page 234.)

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): The Opposition supports this measure. It is one in which we have had a great deal of interest and in which I had a particular interest, because I was Minister of Lands when the subject was first raised. As the Minister has indicated, it was raised in a letter from the Hon. Arthur Whyte highlighting the problem of the cattle industry to the north of the main, and the sheep industry to the south of the dog fence.

The Minister would be aware of the endeavours made in the early 1980s to arrive at a method of raising funds to adequately maintain and significantly upgrade the dog fence by way of a levy on the whole of the industry on a per kilogram basis. However, legally that was not possible, although the whole of the wool industry was in favour of it being done, whereby with a small levy the dog fence could be upgraded to an adequate standard to totally protect the sheep industry on the southern side of the fence. Unfortunately, because of our Constitution, this was not possible. The wool industry, no matter where the woolgrower was located in South Australia, was prepared to support that approach because it recognised that the financial burden on sheep farmers properties which were rated, as far as the fence is concerned, was unjust, and if it was not for the fence then the dog menace would continue to move south through the sheep country.

This is a glorious example of the co-operation that can exist between various sectors of the agricultural or pastoral interests. The cattle producers have recognised the burden confronting the sheep producer in the costs incurred in maintaining the sheep fence. Agreement has been reached between the two sections of the pastoral industry, and the cattle producers have agreed to contribute at the rate of \$37.50 per kilometre for the next five years. In fact, it will commence in November of this year. As I have said, this is a good example of the co-operation that can exist. It has been applauded by the United Farmers and Stockowners Association. As I said earlier, I am more than happy to support the legislation.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I will make two brief comments in relation to this matter. I am pleased that the Government has brought it forward. I support the comments of my colleague, the member for Chaffey. Like other members, I hope, I am aware of the importance of the dog fence to the pastoral industry in South Australia. One of the problems faced by the Dog Fence Board in recent years has been the lack of funds available to keep the dog fence in adequate repair. Unfortunately, a proposal put forward by the member for Chaffey as Minister of Lands could not be carried into legislation, even though it was supported by the pastoral industry and the wool industry as a whole.

For some time I have been concerned that adequate funds have not been available to carry out the maintenance, and in some cases the realignment, of the dog fence. However, I am pleased that the industry has agreed to this measure, which will bring in some extra revenue each year, even though it will not go a great deal further in providing adequate maintenance. The dog fence is unique to Australia. Whilst overseas recently I had an opportunity to discuss at some length the innovation of an electric section of the dog fence in my district. In Colorado a great deal of interest was shown in relation to this innovation. I am pleased to support this measure.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister for Environment and Planning): I thank members opposite for their contributions to this debate. I agree with the member for Eyre that there has been a lack of adequate funds in recent years. I think he may have forgotten the amending legislation which we put through only about 12 months ago and which had the effect of increasing the amount of funds available to the Board. Nonetheless, there were some problems in particular with flooding, only a few months ago in the North-West. That created some strains on the capacity to keep the fence in good repair. As the member for Chaffey has said, the legislation is the fruit of a good deal of amicable discussion leading to what I think has been a very successful outcome.

I take this opportunity to place on record my appreciation to the members of the Dog Fence Board. Mr Everett, an extremely experienced public servant who is extremely well liked and respected throughout the pastoral areas of the State, continues to run what is a tight and effective ship to the benefit of the industry, the people in the North and, therefore, all of the people of this State. I commend the measure to the House.

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

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 23 August. Page 516.)

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles): The Opposition does not oppose this measure although, on the other hand, I cannot say that we would have introduced it ourselves, not seeing the necessity for it. The Bill provides for the repeal of section 53 of the Prices Act which, in turn, provides that the powers of the Minister to fix and declare minimum prices for wine grapes and the orders made in pursuance of them shall expire on 31 December 1984. In his second reading explanation, the Minister said:

It is significant to note that at no time during the 34 years since the Act was passed has Parliament rejected a proposal for extending the operation of these powers.

On that basis, we would expect that the powers could continue to be exercised without opposition. On the other hand,

as a Party that supports the insertion of sunset clauses to ensure that Parliament examines on a regular basis provisions such as these, the Opposition sees no reason why the Act needs to be amended in this way. However, as the provisions have been supported and as it is unlikely that they would in future be opposed, the Opposition simply makes the observation that on the one hand the Government talks about the need for sunset legislation and, on the other hand, it is in effect on this occasion repealing an existing piece of sunset legislation that has served the Parliament and the community well for some considerable time. With those brief comments, the Opposition supports the measure.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare): I thank the Opposition for its support of this measure, which I trust will bring a great deal more certainty into the operations of the Prices Section of the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs in this State.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARIES OF TOWN OF GAWLER

Consideration of the Legislative Council's resolution in which it requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

That the Joint Address to His Excellency the Governor, as recommended by the Select Committee on Local Government Boundaries of Town of Gawler in its report, and laid upon the table of the Council on 16 August 1984, be agreed to.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Local Government): I move:

That the Address be agreed to.

On 2 June 1983, the Legislative Council appointed a Select Committee to inquire into the Local Government Boundaries of the Town of Gawler. The Committee has now presented its report to Parliament. The terms of reference of the Committee allowed an examination of any benefits or disadvantages to the Corporation of the Town of Gawler and adjacent council areas by a change of boundaries to encompass urban growth areas. The committee had a very wide investigative brief and was to take into account the influence of Gawler on its region and the likely impact of any boundary change on adjacent council areas. The Committee was to take into account any operational, financing, staffing and management issues that would result from any possible changes.

The report of the Committee condenses a great many pages of evidence and a great amount of deliberation. I am aware that the Committee has approached its task with diligence and with a forethought which has transcended short-term interests. In forming its opinion, the Committee met on a great many occasions in its 12 months of operation. It took its hearings to the people of Gawler and surrounding districts, and ample opportunity was given for the voicing of opinion. In its treatment of individual opinion the Committee has obviously listened and paid heed, but has also been prepared to take some hard decisions for the common good of the residents. I put on record, as Minister of Local Government, my appreciation of the work undertaken by the members of the Committee.

The Select Committee proposes to expand the boundaries of the Corporation of the Town of Gawler by adding areas in Gawler West, Willaston and the Cockshell Estate. These areas are currently within the District Councils of Light and Barossa. The Committee, in making this decision, has been cognisant of the fact that these areas have pronounced suburban subdivision characteristics and that this develop-

ment and the zoning of land for this type of use has occurred because of the proximity of Gawler's commercial and community facilities and services. Thus, Gawler is seen as being able to provide the sorts of activities expected by the residents of these areas, but at present cannot obtain their full participation through representation and financial support. It is intended that the proposed change of boundaries will remedy this situation.

The situation is similar when we look to the south of Gawler, where Gawler has a common boundary with the District Council of Munno Para. There has been considerable residential development in the Evanston, Evanston Park and Evanston Gardens areas. These suburbs are largely within the District Council of Munno Para, a large council area, which, unlike the other two councils of Light and Barossa, is within the Adelaide metropolitan area and, therefore, as it develops will have an emphasis on urban rather than rural content. The Committee considered that the existing residential areas close to the boundary with Gawler have a close affinity to its community facilities and service provisions. There has been local support for the unification of these areas with Gawler. The Select Committee found no major opposition from residents to this type of proposal, and therefore includes these areas within an expanded Gawler council.

It is important to note that the Select Committee has included within the proposed boundary a significant area of land that at present does not contain development but, because it is zoned for residential use, is obviously going to contain a residential population. In addition, the Committee considered that there should be a rural buffer between the suburban expansion from the south and those areas close to Gawler. The Committee has therefore chosen to place land, which is at present zoned rural B, and therefore meant only for limited urban activity on an extended time scale, within the Gawler boundary.

These boundary changes as proposed by the Committee will affect all of the councils but to a differing degree. In all cases the Committee has attempted to ascertain the net effect on the councils in regard to not only the loss of rates but also the consequent transfer of loan liabilities and assets. Thus, the report of the Committee indicates that although the District Council of Light will lose a likely total of \$65 000 in rates, the net effect could be reduced significantly by the transfer of certain assets, a significant loan liability and possibly an officer of the council to Gawler. The Committee has indicated that the revenue loss to the District Council of Barossa may comprise only approximately 5 per cent of the rate base.

As expected, there will be a significant impact on the District Council of Munno Para in rate revenue loss, with 14 per cent of that council's rate base being transferred to Gawler. However, this loss must be viewed in terms of the net effect and, given that a large number of loans also will be transferred, this figure will be reduced significantly. Far more importantly, the change in revenue will have an impact on the staff positions in the District Council of Munno Para, and I am pleased to note that the Select Committee is aware of this situation. The District Council of Munno Para mentioned in evidence that the loss of Evanston Ward could result in the transfer of five of six employees to Gawler.

I am aware of the worry that can be caused to any workers who are involved in a change of employment. However, I point out that every precaution is being taken to ensure that where any employee of the councils of Light, Barossa or Munno Para, by reason of the change in boundaries, becomes an employee of Gawler, there is no prejudice to his conditions of employment by reason of that change. This assurance is a part of the Joint Address; its intention will be a part of

any proclamation and, indeed, it will be a part of the negotiations which will be undertaken between the Department of Local Government, the councils and the unions that will settle the changes caused by the boundary alterations.

I am aware that union representatives have expressed some disquiet about the possible changes. However, I believe that it is possible to resolve the staff issues in a way which is suitable to all parties. The committee has indicated that the changes will greatly influence the Corporation of the Town of Gawler. It is obvious that the committee's recommendations will significantly increase the population and rate revenue of that council and will cause dramatic effects in its representation. The membership of the council, which could be vastly different after the May elections next year, will be faced with a significant challenge which must bring about important changes.

I firmly support the Select Committee in urging any new council to get on and do the job and to push the area forward with significant improvements to accommodation and conditions for employers of the council and the residents of Gawler. The intention of the Select Committee report offers this opportunity. I have carefully noted the recommendations made by the Select Committee in its report, and have given considerable thought to their ramifications. I support the proposals and recommend the report to this House.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): The whole issue of the Select Committee on the Gawler boundaries has unfortunately created some heat. This began at the outset because of the way in which the Select Committee was put together. I am not reflecting on the members who comprised the Select Committee. When the operation of such Select Committees was considered in this House it was intended that the Minister of Local Government would participate on those Committees. However, overnight, with the stroke of a pen, circumstances changed and no longer were the Minister of Local Government (at that time Terry Hemmings) and other members of this House involved. I can understand that perhaps part of the reason for that was that the Minister had precipitated action ahead of any real discussion on the issue. Also, there was a problem because much of the area under discussion was in the electorate represented by that Minister. Further, the shadow Minister of Local Government is also very much involved in a great deal of the area associated with the project.

However, the first indication of this activity was an announcement in the other place. It was a move that caused some concern in local government circles, and it helped to get this issue off on the wrong foot. Notwithstanding that, the diligence and activity of members of the Select Committee are to be commended. There was no rush and ample opportunity was given, to those who wanted to put forward a point of view, to contribute. The problem always exists of people, having put forward a point of view, believing that it must be heeded. However, we all know that hearing out an argument does not necessarily mean that one agrees with it, and that eventually an independent body must make a decision in relation to submissions made. In this instance members of the other place have deliberated on this matter and have seen fit to alter the boundaries of Gawler and to involve the District Councils of Light, Barossa and Munno Para.

Each of those three district councils has an axe to grind and a comment to make about the intrusion into its areas. Being the House of Assembly elected representative for all those three councils, it is incumbent on me to put their points of view. The District Council of Light is concerned about the loss of some of its territory as it voluntarily

headed the warnings of the former Minister of Local Government (Hon. Mr Virgo) and took note of the decisions of the Royal Commission conducted by Judge Ward when suggestions of major changes to local government boundaries were made. I suggest that the Hon. Mr Virgo would accept that proposition at this stage.

Whilst the decisions of Judge Ward (the Royal Commissioner) were unacceptable on first appearance to a vast majority of people in local government, the statement by the Minister immediately after that 'thou shalt' follow the decisions, was the worst thing that he could have said and destroyed the initial work of the Royal Commission. The local government community will not be told 'thou shalt'. If the report of the Commission had been placed on the table, as was the case in similar circumstances in New South Wales, and the local government community had been advised that the changes contained in it were, in the opinion of the Royal Commissioner, in the best long-term interests of local government, I suggest that many of those changes would have been effected some years ago.

As it is, some of the changes have voluntarily taken place. The District Council of Mudla Wirra and the District Council of Freeling amalgamated of their own volition to form the District Council of Light approximately six years ago. Certainly, those district councils were not the only ones to amalgamate. I represent the District Council of Kapunda which, with the Corporation of Kapunda, voluntarily amalgamated in 1963 or 1964—long before the Royal Commission—after recognising the importance of giving a better and more economic service to the community—one might term that the vanguard of the new era amalgamation process.

Having made the decision of its own volition to amalgamate for the benefit of the community it represented, the District Council of Light suddenly found that it had lost its growth area, which was close to Gawler. This particular area had recently cost that council heavily in development charges. If some 250 to 300 Housing Trust homes are put into an area, as occurred west of the railway line at Gawler, a council is then in a short time called on to provide, first, the infra-structure of the road system, the drainage, kerbs and water table (with some assistance from the Housing Trust in performing those operations), and then to satisfy the needs of the community for a playing area, playground equipment, a turf surface, and so on. The District Council of Light certainly found itself in that position recently.

I do not at this moment wish to refer to a proposition which was made available in the not so distant past to offset the inevitable loss to the District Council of Light because of the decision made at the time we were looking at the District Councils of Owen, Port Wakefield and Balaklava. Certainly, it was consistent with the longer-term view. I held the view then, and still hold the view, that, with the public appeal for the area around Hamley Bridge to be aligned with the District Council of Light, the offset, although not exactly the same, was fairly close to the same and there would have been a great deal of harmony had that action been taken. The District Council of Light would not now be in the position of saying, 'You have taken our rate base from us and you have given us nothing in return.' That is water under the bridge, regrettably, but perhaps in some other adjustments, which may take place a little later on, it may still not be too late to assist the District Council of Light in respect to that matter.

It is very cold comfort for the District Council of Light to say, 'In this amalgamation process you have picked up two areas from the Corporation of Gawler to add to your district.' In total, the two parcels of land it has picked up would be less than 1 acre in extent—they are just aberrations on the edge of a development. In fact, the creation of the Gawler by-pass in about 1961 was responsible for those two

small parcels of land being on the wrong side of the by-pass. They have now been made over to the District Council of Light, and that form of adjustment is correct.

I would hope (and I express a forward-looking viewpoint) that, when aberrations of that nature occur anywhere in the system, common sense will prevail and that that small area of territory will be given up and an adjustment made to give a cleaner boundary between one council and another. The matter has been corrected and the area has been made over to the District Council of Light. Some conjecture exists about the boundary of the District Council of Light and the new proposed boundary for Gawler being along the projected or expected line of the new Gawler duplicated by-pass. It may well be, in the final design currently being considered, that we might have one or two very small areas of Light in Gawler or of Gawler in Light. I would hope that, if that comes to pass, some positive action will be taken to tidy up any irregularities or small areas of that sort that might occur at the time.

The District Council of Light has expressed concern that its development area has gone and that a proposed development area on the north-eastern corner of the town of Gawler, on the inside of the by-pass and in close vicinity to the Gawler cemetery, will be lost to it because it is a new development area which, I am led to believe, will provide for some 80 to 90 homes. That sort of development in the District Council of Light would benefit its rate base.

Moving on to the District Council of Barossa, we find a relatively complex situation in the sense that a clear indication was given by the persons who live on Cockshell Estate that they do not want to move into the new Gawler Corporation. These people had their views canvassed and Mr Terry Bellchambers, a resident of the area, played a major part in obtaining those views. In a letter delivered to most members of the House as recently as yesterday, the residents of the Cockshell Estate had this to say:

To members of the House of Assembly.

Your attention is drawn to the fact in a vote taken by the people living in the Cockshell Estate 98 per cent voted against the move to force the area into an urban council. The report by the Select Committee:

1. Contains contradictory statements.
2. Has failed to acknowledge an important principle of democracy.
3. Has little regard for the capacity of the Corporation to cope . . . particularly with the planned sudden expansion.
4. Has totally ignored the real threat of industrial action and the blemish it will leave on the State's record.
5. Expresses doubt that the area known as Cockshell Estate should be incorporated in the city of Gawler.

It should be made known to every member of the Lower House that if it rubber stamps the action of the Upper House it must accept the consequences for failing to properly assess the report and to amending it so that its implementation does not become a greater fiasco than the Meadows affair. If the Assembly, knowing that the Select Committee in its recommendation has breached a basic principle of democracy—that of not having proper regard to the almost unanimous voice of a minority group—it too will have breached that principle.

If the Assembly, knowing that there is a real threat that black bans will be placed on the areas to be severed, proceeds to endorse the Select Committee's report, then it must have little regard for the welfare of the people or the unions involved. It would be the wish of the people of this area to sever from the City of Gawler if the Assembly fails to recognise the majority view of the residents and endorses the highly undemocratic recommendation made by the Select Committee as to the future of this part of the State.

The letter concludes 'Yours faithfully' and is signed by a number of signatories of the Cockshell Estate area. Unfortunately, what is not known by the residents of the Cockshell Estate area is that there is no provision for the direct canvassing of a community either during or after a decision has been taken by the Select Committee. It is most unfortunate that the community at large still does not understand the consequences of a Select Committee approach to bound-

ary redress or boundary redrawing. I believe, having the hindsight of the Kadina, Wallaroo and Moonta, of Meadows, of Owen, Balaklava and Port Wakefield, and certainly the Port Pirie and Port Lincoln exercises (being the most recent), that it is important that when announcing a Select Committee to a community it be clearly indicated that there is no opportunity for the community to demand or be involved in a poll before a final decision is taken.

I make these statements a little behind the scene because there has been a change in the Local Government Act and the circumstances of amalgamation will be somewhat different to what they have been in the past as a result of those changes. Nonetheless, a Select Committee proposition exists. I believe that a community should, at the time that any future Select Committee is set up, be clearly advised, if necessary by advertisement and most certainly by editorial comment, that it will not enjoy an opportunity to vote on the issue involved and that when the Government (that is the Parliament acting on the initiative of the Government) agrees to the setting up of a Select Committee, whether it be in the Upper House or the Lower House, the decision of that Select Committee is virtually final in so far as its effect on the community is concerned.

That is one point that needs to be related in respect of this very understandable and obviously concerned view that has been expressed by members of the Cockshell Estate community. Also, I note that in this area the extension is to take in some areas that have been mined for sand in recent years, and it is conceivable that the Waste Management Commission will be looking at one or other of those mined areas as the site for the northern deposit, not just for the new town of Gawler but the Munno Para, Barossa, Tanunda, and even Angaston areas. There are provisions for that sort of extension.

I now refer to the third part of the external equation, which relates to the Munno Para District Council. That council has been harassed over a period, and the concern that it has expressed on that matter of harassment was heard by the Government and accepted by Parliament in the rewrite Bill when we included a provision involving an area that had been approached in connection with compulsory amalgamation, and once a decision had been taken against any such amalgamation there would be a period of amnesty regarding that council. It is only a two-year period, which the people of Munno Para would say is not nearly enough after their experience, but at least it is a start and shows that in reality this type of action is really contrary to the best interests of the community that a district council serves. So many of its resources—not just financial resources but also manpower resources—are turned towards defending a position about which the people concerned have firm beliefs. In respect of the proposals associated with the Munno Para District Council, much heat has been generated and some fairly vicious statements have been made by concerned members of staff and their representatives.

Since the announcement was made—it has had front page billing in the local newspaper for over 10 days—I have had one resident in the area proposed to be annexed to Gawler complaining about having to move. That is one case out of a large number in the area. Certainly, I have received much representation by staff or persons on behalf of staff, and I draw that distinction because I recognise the concern of staff who ask how a local governing body with a large staff of over 100 employees can be told by a committee that it will reduce 14 per cent of its rate base but transfer almost \$200 000 of serviced debt so that—and the Minister can do the sum—it is probably about 8 per cent of the rate base that is to be shifted rather than the 14 per cent mentioned.

In those circumstances the staff ask how it is possible to seek to transfer only five or six staff members. That conun-

drum has not been adequately explained to me, yet it must cause concern to those people who are obviously interested in their future employment. A number of the people who are employed by the council and whose jobs are in question are actually residents of the Corporation of the Town of Gawler, and they have been for years or, if they do not live within the corporation area, at least one or two have lived in the District Council of Light or in close proximity to Gawler in Evanston, Evanston Gardens or the Evanston Park area of Munno Para, which is to be annexed to Gawler. In essence, they would be travelling a lot less distance to work in Gawler than they would if they continued to work for Munno Para. There is a great deal of importance in job satisfaction and if one is satisfied with one's employer, obviously there is a loyalty to that employer.

However, with the other changes that have been made within the local government area for continued employment and transference, not only of service but also of superannuation, long service leave and all other factors, and with the stipulations that have been made by this Parliament in respect of amalgamation procedures—that no member of staff may be put off or be required to accept employment at a lesser rate or benefit than that which he enjoyed with his initial employer—those difficulties are catered for.

Granted, there is a severance of the comradeship which might exist between Joe and Bill or Susie and Sally in the single work place, but that is happening on a daily basis right around the world. In having put these viewpoints I do not want to be thought to be unsympathetic to the views expressed by these employers. Indeed, I want to refer to a document delivered to all members yesterday and explain my attitude to some parts of the statements made in it. Under the heading 'Munno Para Anti-Takeover Group, c/o Post Office, Smithfield Plains', dated 22 August 1984, addressed to all members of both Houses of the State Parliament, the letter states

Re Gawler and Elizabeth Takeover Bids

This is to advise you of the following resolutions which were passed unanimously at a meeting of members of the Australian Workers Union and the Municipal Officers Association of the staff of the District Council of Munno Para this morning:

1. The Report of the Select Committee of the Legislative Council on Local Government Boundaries of the Town of Gawler gives no logical reasons for the recommendations, is not in the best interests of the residents of Munno Para or Gawler, and should be dismissed out of hand.

2. After four unsuccessful attempts by Elizabeth to take over Munno Para, which attempts were opposed by a strong majority of Munno Para residents, the Parliament should immediately pass an amendment to the Local Government Act declaring a 10-year moratorium on all severance and takeover bids against Munno Para.

I have alluded to the fact that in the rewrite that moratorium is for two years, and the nub of their argument has been accepted by the Parliament. In the best interests of a community, a period of 10 years would be too long for positive consideration. The letter continues:

3. Munno Para should be retained in its existing form.

That is a view that has been expressed over a long period. However, it is interesting, from evidence and public statements made, that Munno Para has not been averse to joining completely with the corporate town of Gawler to form an amalgam of Gawler and Munno Para. Therefore, there is some considerable question in my mind as to the validity of that third point. I say, 'Yes, stay in one piece if they cannot get what they want,' but at least they have shown interest in an amalgam.

More particularly, I suspect that that statement is more attributable to their attitude to the takeover bid from Elizabeth rather than it is to the decisions that are being canvassed in the noting of this report. The letter continues:

4. Successive State Governments have allowed this severance madness against Munno Para (12 severance bids over the past 10 years) to go on far too long and the staff is totally dissatisfied over the waste of resource and unrest which this has caused.

The community is unhappy at the loss of resources and the loss of effort. I am not critical of the people at the centre of the action in making that statement. In my view it is most unfortunate that a series of events have led to this constant defence having to be mounted by the District Council of Munno Para. However, that is another story, and there are many twists in that whole sorry saga. The letter continues:

5. Therefore, if the recommendations of the Report of the Select Committee on Local Government Boundaries of the Town of Gawler are approved, in order to protest and draw the public's attention to the serious injustice in this matter, the following industrial action will be taken immediately—

- 5.1 A black ban will be placed on all council works and services in the portion of Munno Para to be transferred to Gawler (that is, no garbage will be collected, buildings approved, rates collected, dogs registered, roads maintained, reserves maintained, mobile library services provided, etc.)
As we do not wish to disadvantage children, the immunisation service will be provided, if Gawler council indicate that they are unable to provide this service.

Of course, we are looking at a transfer of responsibility—not now, not before Christmas, but in May next year unless there is an earlier development by mutual agreement between the two councils. From the point of view of the administration, and from the point of view of the determination of the council to be responsible for this new area, the date is the normal council election in May 1985. The letter continues:

- 5.2 A black ban will be placed on all work associated with the splitting up of assets and liabilities as between Gawler and Munno Para and all matters associated with the transfer.

- 5.3 No Munno Para staff will agree to be transferred to Gawler.

I can understand why those attitudes have been brought forward. It is only right that the group should feel indignant. I hope that they will reassess their position and the community that they represent and that they will rethink those decisions taken at the meeting of 22 August.

As I have pointed out, the community at large is not in favour of the group's stance. The community at large is not voicing the same concern being expressed by the workers. In a fairly recent poll conducted by Munno Para in defence of the attack upon it by the Elizabeth council, the people in the Evanston Ward showed that they wanted to stay with Munno Para. The question asked was not, 'Do you want to stay with Munno Para or go to Gawler?': it was an entirely different question, 'Do you want to stay with Munno Para or be amalgamated with Elizabeth?' That is another question altogether and one to which I will allude later in my remarks. The letter continues:

6. The decisions taken at this meeting be conveyed to all members of both Houses of the South Australian Parliament and to the staffs of the District Councils of Barossa and Light.

7. This whole problem be drawn to the attention of the full memberships of the Australian Workers Union and the Municipal Officers Association in South Australia with a demand for their support.

8. We will mount a strong campaign in Munno Para, Elizabeth and Gawler at the next State elections against any political Party not supporting the retention of Munno Para, by explaining to people the disastrous effects that this could have on the community, such campaign to include door knocking, letter box drops and possibly putting up candidates.

That is quite a demand upon a sitting member. I hope that they are really referring there to the members for Napier and Elizabeth in respect of any continuing argument they may have as between Munno Para and Elizabeth, because I can see some justification for concern in that regard; it was the member for Napier who got them into the position in which they are at the moment (as the Minister who made

the decision to set up this Select Committee), but I do not want to wish that necessarily on to a Parliamentary colleague.

It is rather brash of an organisation or a group of people to seek to intimidate a member of Parliament in this way. I hope that they do not seek to put that particular practice into effect, because that is the sort of blackmail tactic that is not well accepted by the Australian public and would be very quickly identified and understood by the public. The letter continues:

We have had enough of takeover bids and strongly believe that the recommendations of the Select Committee of the Legislative Council on the Boundaries of the Town of Gawler, if approved, will have dire results for the residents of the areas concerned and local government in general. We urge you to support the retention of Munno Para by rejecting the Select Committee's recommendations on Gawler and giving Munno Para a 10-year moratorium on all severance and takeover bids.

The letter is signed for and on behalf of the members of the Australian Workers Union and the Municipal Officers Association of the staff of the District Council of Munno Para. I read that in its entirety because I believe that this group of people, who are obviously concerned, should have their views put before this forum. This does not prevent any member here from pointing up deficiencies or concerns that he or she may see in regard to the statements that that group has made.

I turn now to the second aspect of the problem that they identified—the argument between Munno Para and Elizabeth or the attack upon the balance of Munno Para by Elizabeth. It is not a matter that can be discussed at any great length in our consideration of the Select Committee report, although in the Minister's response tonight he refers to the terms of reference of the Committee. He points out that they were 'to take into account the influence of Gawler on its region and the likely impact of any boundary change on adjacent council areas'. I made the following point when we discussed the Owen/Balaklava/Port Wakefield amalgamation: the reference to 'adjacent' has been taken too narrowly—to mean that council which is immediately adjacent to the area that one is discussing. In fact, by the domino theory an action taken in one place can have quite dire consequences for a district council two or three removed.

That is the real problem which has been created by this Select Committee's deliberations at a time before there had been a thorough discussion in a broad area of the local government community of the likely consequences. I openly say that I do not believe that the residue of Munno Para, which I indicated is 92 per cent of its total rate revenue, is in any way adversely affected by the decision that has been taken by this Select Committee.

It is not directly affected in the sense of taking away that 8 per cent of its rate base, causing it be placed into a very awkward financial position and therefore likely to be taken over or to be an easy target for subsequent or other amalgamations. I am not addressing, nor do I want to address, the areas of approach that have been made to Munno Para and the manner in which some other persons or groups would see the spoils divided. Suffice it to say that one of the actions that it is contemplated would be taken—that, for example, of putting Virginia with Mallala—is not viable because the Mallala council has said very clearly that it would have no part of such an amalgamation. There may well be some other configuration, but I do not want to get into that area other than to say that I do not believe that the viability or the vitality of the District Council of Munno Para is adversely affected by the decision taken by this Select Committee.

I will talk briefly about the boundaries that have been created, against a history that what is to take place as a result of this decision is not something that has happened overnight or has been contemplated only overnight. In the

1950s the Greater Gawler Committee was formed and was active in promoting the view that the area adjacent to the boundaries of Gawler should at that time be amalgamated with Gawler because it was already obvious that the Gawler community would enlarge. There was a fear at that time that the Gawler community would be the northern extension of the Adelaide metropolitan area, that Elizabeth and Smithfield would grow to Gawler and that it would be just one long urban development.

I acknowledge the response that I was able to obtain in this House from the former Minister of Planning and Minister of Development, the Hon. Hugh Hudson, when it became apparent that there was an abhorrence at the thought that there should be an amalgam of development all the way to Gawler, that the extension of Elizabeth and Smithfield was a natural consequence, and that Gawler would be submerged by that form of development.

Some seven or eight years ago, not in a final and total manner but certainly in an implied manner, the Hon. Hugh Hudson, as Minister of Planning, acknowledged that there ought to be a green belt between the developments of Elizabeth-Smithfield and Gawler. At that stage the emphasis started to change and there was to be a growth of Gawler towards Adelaide, rather than a growth of Adelaide towards Gawler. The area adjacent to the suggested southern boundary in the Dalkeith area was to be the commencement of that green belt. The South Australian Housing Trust decided that there would be no northern development beyond that which exists in the township area of Munno Para at present, that the area between the northernmost house in Munno Para and Dalkeith Road would be a belt of trees and remain open ground, and that north of Dalkeith Road, which is the southernmost boundary now associated with the suggestion before the House, would be the commencement of a green belt maintaining the rural character.

If we go back a little further, the land on the eastern side of Main North Road, the extension of Dalkeith Road, which is Smith Road, was purchased some years ago for the development of the third university, back in the days when Mr Jack Clark was member for Gawler. He continued the operation as the member for Elizabeth when he and I were members for adjacent districts. Developments were taking place that procured an area of land there for the development of a third university.

The necessity for that has changed over time. It is rather interesting to note that the combined northern districts cemetery is now to utilise paddocks that were to have been used for that university. I do not know whether there is any relationship there but the decision made by the Select Committee means that part, if not all, of the cemetery area will be in the newly defined Gawler region.

I have dealt at some length with that area, because the natural barrier between the Munno Para and Gawler areas will be clearly identifiable. That area of land is well depicted on the plan that the Minister for Environment and Planning (Don Hopgood) released recently, at which time he talked of the second generation parklands. That barrier will be there and will encompass the southern boundary that has been designated. In regard to the eastern boundary, I question the fact that there will be no true physical division between the balance of what will be the Munno Para area and the new Gawler area.

The Select Committee decided to use as a boundary the hills face zone. However, as honourable members would appreciate, that boundary is not necessarily straight; it does not follow a physical entity. It follows contours, and it will be found, for example, that parts of paddocks on one side of the road will be in the Gawler area while others will be in the Munno Para area. Recently the Electoral Commission decided on a much more positive boundary, that is, the

Barossa pipeline, which supplies Elizabeth and which is in close proximity to the hills face zone. That will now be the boundary of the electorates of Kavel and Light. Within that district there will be the hills face zone as well as a little more area. The pipeline is a physical entity that can be clearly seen.

On the northern and western side, as far as the Gawler River, the committee has decided to use as a boundary the new dual by-pass, and that, again, is a positive boundary. A matter of concern as to clear definition is where the area cuts across on the eastern side of Gawler into an area which is to be picked up, known as Cockshell Estate. I regret that some more positive definition of those boundaries has not been made. The variation in the area of land to be acquired would have been very small. People are better able to understand a boundary if it coincides with a physical feature of the area.

In accepting the decision of the Select Committee (with some reservations because of the minor concerns which I have and which I have expressed), I know that there will be people who will remain aggrieved—the Cockshell Estate people, those in the District Council of Light, and certainly, the staff of the District Council of Munno Para. However, the clear acceptance of the change by the vast majority of the population I believe augurs well for the new area.

The new council of Gawler will have to become an entirely different structure than what presently exists. It has had an urban identity for some time, albeit small pockets of agricultural undertakings with some intensive farming in its boundaries. It did not have to deal with country roads and rural areas that have now been granted south and south-east of Gawler bounded by Dalkeith Road and Wingate Road. Some would question that as Wingate Road crosses the Gawler River and is frequently used through a ford the extension of the boundary should have occurred along the whole length of Wingate Road.

That would have taken from the District Council of Light the glider field, the Gawler trotting track, an area of horse training country and vegetable market gardening land. At the moment I cannot see that any harm is done by leaving those people where they are. For the District Council of Light it has made a bitter pill somewhat easier to swallow because it retains that important rate base.

Before any other considerations are undertaken by this Government in relation to council boundaries, it is important that terms of reference are drawn up so that the domino effect on councils that are not immediately adjacent, but adjacent in the sense of being in the same general region, will be considered by the committee. I believe that this decision will have repercussions, which are already being felt concerning the way in which the Munno Para people see their vulnerability to the Elizabeth Council. That vulnerability I do not necessarily share but, obviously, it has caused concern.

Other amalgamations are contemplated across a broad area of South Australia. They need to be looked at in the longer term rather than what has applied to this point. I support the recognition of the decision and, in so doing, trust that all who are called on to make an input to overcome the administrative difficulties that must be sorted out between now and May next year apply themselves diligently to that important activity. It is extremely important that that should occur. Finally, I am reminded of the adage that 'things turn out best for the people who make the best of the way things turn out.'

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I will make some brief comments in noting this Select Committee report. One area in disagreement with the report that falls within my electorate is the Cockshell Estate, which will be passing

to the District Council of Light, although at present it is in the District of Kavel. These residents having contacted me, it is only proper that I express to this House some of their concerns. I had intended to read into the record the correspondence that all members received from those residents, but the member for Light tells me that he has already read it, so I will not repeat that exercise. I was not here when he dealt with that matter. I understand perfectly the fears of those residents. I was placed in a reverse situation in the middle of the 1970s—I forget the precise year.

The Hills ward of the Tea Tree Gully council was part of what was originally a largely rural council. The City of Tea Tree Gully has grown up over the period of time that I have been a resident of the Adelaide Hills—over 30 years. When I first went to live in Paracombe Road, Houghton, there was no development much at all out from Gepps Cross through the north-eastern suburbs. Tea Tree Gully was a sleepy one-horse town, without being rude about it: it was a nice little rural community, and the Hills ward of that council was the area in which I was a ratepayer. However, the growth of the city over the years meant that Tea Tree Gully became a major city, although the Hills ward did not change much. Although it is only about 12 miles from the centre of the city, it is in one of the city's water shed areas which meant that building was strictly controlled and the pursuits remained rural.

However, over the years the small land holdings have become harder to maintain because the profitability of farming, particularly in some pursuits in that area, has decreased over the past 30 years. It seemed to us that the present masters of the Tea Tree Gully City Council did not have the faintest idea of what life was all about in the Hills ward of the Tea Tree Gully council. I recall that in one year my council rates increased 10-fold. I even went to the lengths of hiring a lawyer. I do not like lawyers and try to keep away from them because I believe that, when one gets near a lawyer, one is likely to lose money fast—in terms of fees, if nothing else. However, I was so uptight or incensed at this increase in council rates that I hired a lawyer, and fronted up to the council subcommittee to prove that I was a rural producer and that the new 10-fold increase in rates was entirely unjustified. Fortunately, the lawyer earned his keep, I won the case and got some reprieve.

That situation was not typical of the experience of people in the Hills ward of the Tea Tree Gully council. It was with some degree of effort that we managed to secede from the Tea Tree Gully council and become the Glen Ewin ward of the Gumeracha council. That was an entirely successful move, because the Gumeracha council understood what we were all about, that we could not subdivide the land and that, therefore, we should not be rated as though we could. That is what was happening; we were being rated at sub-divisional rates whilst being precluded by law from subdividing. I go into this lengthy story because that is the feeling of the people of the Cockshell Estate, as I understand it—only in the reverse. They are in a semi-rural or entirely rural existence, enjoying a rate regime and way of life that they find agreeable, and are suddenly to be annexed in the reverse to the City of Gawler. These people are fearful of the situation which developed in the case which I have outlined.

I can only trust that the assurances that have been given to those people by the authorities concerned do, in fact, lead to an understanding of their viewpoint. If the missive that we all have is correct, something like 98 per cent of these people are against the current proposal. It is an eleventh hour bid by these people to have alterations made to the Select Committee report, and I think it is quite obvious that the horse has bolted and that there is no way in which

the Government would be pressing on as it is if it intended to make any alterations to the Select Committee's finding.

However, I simply put on record my understanding of the problem and the thinking of the people there. Gawler has been so associated with rural pursuits over many years that I do not believe that the situation I have previously described is likely to occur. I would not equate the situation of the town of Gawler with that of Tea Tree Gully, where I believe that there was no understanding at all by the emergent council of the nature and problems of people in the rural and hills wards. I do not believe that a similar situation will occur in relation to Gawler and I certainly hope that the assurance given to these people affected will be honoured. As I said, I can entirely understand their point of view and, in these circumstances, I think that it is appropriate that I point this out to the House.

The change is not wanted by 98 per cent of the people in the affected area. They are entirely satisfied with the current arrangements, and this submission indicates that there could be some harmful activity as a result of this decision. I say no more than that, except that I trust that their fears are groundless and that they do not go through the experience that we in the hills ward of the former Tea Tree Gully council went through. It was with some degree of relief that we were finally able to be severed from the Tea Tree Gully council and annexed to a rural council. Although rates have had to climb in relation to inflation (the rates which we all complain about—I think that all ratepayers complain about their rates), the rates that I personally pay are not nearly as high now as the Tea Tree Gully council was demanding 10 or 12 years ago.

Therefore, that was certainly a welcome move in our case, where we have a council that understands the problems of the people in that area. I say no more, except that the horse has bolted. This motion will pass this House. I certainly trust that the people of Cockshell Estate will not have to put up with the sort of situation which is obviously in their minds at the moment. I simply wish to get that on record so that the people who will in the future be responsible for local government in this area are well and truly cognisant of the problems which can arise and the ill feeling and hurt which can accrue to people such as these.

Motion carried.

COMMISSIONER FOR THE AGEING BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 15 August. Page 293.)

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): Since the Second World War the Federal Government has taken a considerably increasing interest in the affairs of the aged. The standard of living has improved steadily as a result of quite widespread involvement also by State and local governments, voluntary and charitable organisations, and private and medical nursing home centres. The Federal Government's responsibilities have largely been in the field of pension increases; rent and board supplements; medical, hospital and pharmaceutical benefits (generally means tested to some extent); repatriation benefits; subsidising approved accommodation; nursing home care; home help; senior citizens' centres; Meals on Wheels; some tax relief; and telephone concessions.

As far as the States and the private sector have been concerned, voluntary and charitable organisations, together with the State and private sector, have provided most of the direct services to the aged. The State has been responsible directly for hospitals and health, public housing, public aged institutions, welfare services, and volunteers have run our

aged homes, Meals on Wheels and home nursing. The private sector has been responsible for primary medical care and nursing homes.

From that brief summary one can see that services to the aged have been and still are scattered and fragmented. Legislation across the Federal and State fields has been steadily rising year by year and obviously there has been an increasing need for co-ordination in a wide area of services to the aged. The median age of Australians has been increasing steadily, with the South Australian median age of 31.1 years of age. It is now eight years since Marie Coleman delivered her 1975 statement 'Care of the Aged' to the then Federal Government. She referred to a number of other publications as being relevant to services necessary for the aged community in Australia. I do not intend to cite them now; suffice to say that since 1975 in addition to that wealth of information a veritable plethora of research material has become available. Obviously, any Commissioner on the Ageing appointed in South Australia will not go into that office empty handed. A tremendous amount of research has been done nationally to which the Commissioner can readily turn his or her hand.

In 1971, the Australian Bureau of Census and Statistics showed that 77 per cent of the Australian population lived in New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland. It said that 79.7 per cent of Australia's aged lived in those States. It also claimed that the aged throughout Australia were distributed in a fairly uniform fashion.

Australia then and now was and is a relatively young nation in comparison with Western world standards, where problems associated with the aged have reached really massive proportions. A reference to the United Kingdom alone would be sufficient to draw one's attention to the great problems that are being experienced. However, in Australia—and particularly South Australia—pensioner groups are not necessarily accepting the widespread fragmentation of services and are themselves becoming increasingly united in some attempt to bring rationalisation to the way in which their lifestyle is administered.

For me it has been a pleasure over recent months to meet with different groups of aged people and confer with them on their needs. I refer especially to the South Australian Council of the Ageing, the umbrella organisation which keeps a watchful eye on the affairs of the aged and which in its own way attempts some co-ordination of the efforts of 17 or 18 different groups in South Australia. Also, much more recently established was the South Australian Consultative Council of Pensioner and Retired Organisations under the presidency of Jack Neil, who is also President of the RSL. This group, which will work within the South Australian Council of the Ageing, claims to have the representation of about 115 000 aged people within the South Australian community.

The Liberal Party is fully committed to care of the aged and supports this legislation. It would be common knowledge that in the 1982 election policies of both the Liberal and Labor Parties in South Australia there were firm commitments to establish some sort of office of the aged. The Liberal Party undertook to do this within the Department of Community Welfare as an office of the aged. On the other hand, the Labor Party committed itself to appoint a Commissioner for the Ageing and I believe that both policies were acceptable to the many organisations claiming responsibility for the aged in our community.

The Government is now moving to fulfil its promise, and this appears to have met with widespread approval from all groups within the ambit of the South Australian Council on the Ageing Incorporated. While we believe that our submission would have met the task equally well, if not better, we propose to support the present legislation. As

recently as last Thursday week, I met with the South Australian Council on the Ageing Executive Director, Mr Frank Schaper, and with the Chairman of the newly established South Australian Consultative Council of Pensioner and Retired Persons Association, Jack Neil, and I was a little surprised it was only at that rather belated stage that a submission had been prepared and was ready for presentation to the present Minister of Community Welfare. The submission was presented on that day or the day after: I received my submission the following day.

When tabling the present Bill the Minister expressed the hope that individuals, organisations and others interested in the Bill would take the opportunity to make comments to him regarding the legislation. He claims that a very large number of submissions had been received before the Bill was compiled. I note that there is no substantial change to the legislation which was introduced into the House during the last session of Parliament, although the Minister does propose to introduce a couple of relatively minor amendments to the Bill during the Committee stages. He has, however, paid us the courtesy of tabling those amendments.

The Minister has a considerable advantage over all of us because although he has said that, in preparation of the Bill, there were extremely widespread consultations with the public, he has not released the results of those consultations. He commented that in compiling the report upon which the legislation was finally drafted 1 250 copies of an ideas paper were distributed, international opinions were sought and that his Department received 135 submissions from organisations and individuals in South Australia. The Minister has claimed widespread support for the proposal and for the consultative process and says that the legislation was, in fact, strongly influenced by the comments and recommendations that he received. It is quite probable that his comments are accurate because we have detected very little opposition to the legislation in principle, although the South Australian Council on the Ageing's submission, which I propose to refer to a little later, did express some concerns.

From a number of alternatives the Government decided that it would be best to legislate for the office of the Commissioner to be established in order to give that position the status which the ageing in our community properly deserve. The title 'Commissioner for the Ageing' is simple and concise, but to define the ageing as a group is open to a number of interpretations. I believe that the member for Mitcham is currently toying with the semantics of the word 'ageing' in an attempt to come up with a word that is more appropriate to the aims of the Bill. He maintains, and it is perfectly obvious, that from birth all of us are ageing, but though at what precise age or physical condition one is deemed to be among the aged or close to being aged is hard to say.

Suffice to say that we are all ageing in some way and that we would hope to benefit from the provisions of this Bill should its aims and objectives be both realised and realisable. The aims and objectives of the Bill are laudible, but whether the Commissioner and his staff can realise them will depend on a number of factors that can only be the subject of pure speculation, even after a careful perusal of the legislation because the Minister has omitted a considerable amount of fine print. At the same time, he has built into the legislation a number of ostensibly innocent phrases which nevertheless ensure that the Government is in no real danger of being pressed unwillingly into taking action to carry out any of the recommendations which ultimately emanate from the Commissioner and his staff.

We notice that the main responsibility of the Commissioner will be to provide informed advice and comments to Ministers, departments and other instrumentalities upon programmes and services affecting the ageing, and that the

Commissioner will aim at including rather than excluding the aged from what we term to be normal society. Given access to Ministers and Government departments, the Commissioner should have considerable assistance in obtaining information. Indeed, the Commissioner's consultative role can be and probably will be extremely wide.

I am interested to note that the Commissioner will promote research into the ageing and services for them, and that he will compile data and ensure its dissemination throughout the community. That factor alone, coupled with the need to consult on an extremely wide basis with individuals and organisations about the issues and needs of the ageing, indicates to me that the Commissioner's office will need a very substantial amount of funding. I say that because one only has to look at the cost of conducting one public opinion poll, with opinions from a very limited and random selection of persons, to realise that with the tremendously wide number of problems confronting the aged the Commissioner will be almost incessantly engaged in one inquiry or another.

I believe that it was only a few months ago that we had examples in this House and in another place of figures for one public opinion poll that varied from 15 000 on the one hand to 30 000 on the other. If the Commissioner is expected to engage in that sort of research, as I have said before, it could prove to be an extremely expensive exercise. Not only that, the Commissioner will need skilled interpretative staff to make the most effective use of information and to give meaning to the statistics. One cannot expect ordinary untrained office staff to get a great deal of relevance from the breadth of statistics which are already available. There are a wide number of interpretations. The instruction to disseminate information throughout the community implies quite massive printing and circulation bills.

One suggestion that I make to the Minister is that the Commissioner might well be able to utilise more effectively the services of the Commonwealth-established Office of the Ageing, which is the subject of contemporary Federal legislation. Rather than duplicate an expensive service, our Commissioner might be subsidised at Federal level to make full use of the very efficient expertise and equipment held by the Australian Bureau of Statistics. I regard that Bureau as one of the most sophisticated gatherers and assessors of information in Australia.

I am pleased that the Commissioner will be charged with consulting the aged and the ageing themselves rather than simply with making paternal judgments upon their needs. I do not think that any of us really needs to be told that the elderly in our midst, with the already considerable encouragement to retire as early as age 55 (and with all women retiring at 60 and almost all men no later than 65) coupled with increased life expectancy, provide a great pool of highly intelligent people who are most capable of leading productive lives outside the workforce.

Indeed, until the past two or three decades it was traditional to look upon the elders of our society for those special skills which we associated with the wisdom of the ageing. Our own Aboriginal society still traditionally and quite properly retains respect for the elders of the tribes. Rapid technological advancements seem to have altered our own perspective, perhaps a little too quickly and too much, with one of the results being that almost all too frequently one finds relatively young people in executive power in Government and private enterprise. Meanwhile, many of our elderly men and women can continue long beyond retirement to give us guidance and advice of which we simply would be very wise to take advantage.

Meanwhile, the Commissioner is instructed to support organisations to facilitate co-ordination, but there is little indication that the advice he gives to various organisations and individuals, including the Government, will be accepted

or implemented, nor is there any indication as to the time it will take for the Commissioner to collate the great amount of information already available, to which I will refer in passing, about the aged and then to make it readily available to the elderly. His clearing house for information may be some considerable way down the track.

I referred a little earlier to the Minister's defence clauses. The Minister himself quite clearly stated in his second reading explanation that it is not the Government's intention that the Commissioner should be responsible for the administration of services to the ageing. He says that as far as possible there is a wealth of meaning in that the Government will provide policies and services for all people, with the aged included. This is very similar to the role that the present Minister of Community Welfare placed with regard to the Aboriginal communities in South Australia of an ostensibly co-ordinating role, but with the real power vested with individual Ministries.

Therefore, he is providing services for all people, including the aged, and the Commissioner will seek to ensure that all policies and services are sensitive to the needs and actions of our elderly people. The Commissioner will identify gaps in services. The Minister also said that he does not intend the Commissioner to have any regulatory function, so that, while personal complaints will be received, the Commissioner will use them on an informative basis, but that the Minister will remain in sole control as far as any decisions are concerned.

The danger to which the Minister refers of the Commissioner duplicating existing avenues of investigation and providing a conflict of roles also begs the question whether the appointment of a Commissioner is not, in itself, a duplication of services already available through the South Australian Council for the Ageing and other bodies which are essentially voluntary in nature. These are some comments I make about the Minister's second reading explanation.

I will now give a little consideration to some of the aspects of the Bill itself. We see that the Commissioner will be appointed for a term of office not exceeding five years, but that there is no specified minimum period, and that the conditions under which he is employed shall be fixed by the Governor upon recommendation of the Public Service Board. For example, the Board will recommend the Commissioner's salary. That may well be one of the key factors in determining the calibre of the person to be appointed to the task. I think that the Commissioner will achieve mightily if he or she fulfils all the aims and objectives set for him or her in the legislation.

Do they include proper integration of the ageing to give the community full benefit of the skills and experience of the aged (a test for Methuselah himself with his special skills, not the least of which is age itself), the creation of social structures to help the ageing realise their full potential as individuals within the community, the creation of a social ethos so that the general public views the aged with dignity and appreciates all they stand for rather than rejecting them and the achievement of a proper understanding of the problems of the ageing so that there is favourable public reaction towards the elderly?

We have already mentioned that the functions of the Commissioner will be essentially advisory to a whole range of Government and other organisations, but that he will lack any statutory power of enforcement. But the Minister wants the Commissioner to ensure as far as practicable—that is another defence clause—that the interests of the aged are considered when programmes affecting them are being considered; in other words, there is some implied policy input but no real power for the Commissioner—probably more hope than anticipation.

This may mean a considerably increased cost factor (for example, to the South Australian Housing Trust) if the Commissioner recommends that it change its design and construction of homes for the aged and infirm instead of letting everyone have the standard South Australian Housing Trust design. I understand that there is already input into the Trust with that in mind.

The Commissioner will also consider the needs of other groups, such as the rapidly emerging migrant aged, Aborigines, the physically and mentally disabled aged, and the impoverished. He has the power to establish committees to advise him. He can also delegate his responsibilities, while the Governor may in his turn appoint Public Service staff to assist the Commissioner. Alternatively, the Commissioner can utilise the services of departmental staff at the discretion of the respective Minister.

It is appropriate that the Commissioner is required to report not later than 30 September following the end of the financial year to the Minister, and subsequently through the Minister to the House. The questions that have to be asked are: first, what will be the initial and long-term expenses of establishing the office of the Commissioner? How far down the track is the Minister in that regard? Also, will the Government use the politics of delay by deferring action to remedy those problems of the aged that are already known to us, by waiting until such time as an understaffed Commissioner's office reports to the Government on those urgent needs?

Another question is whether this work might not be just as well accomplished by transferring equivalent funds to already existing agencies, such as those within the umbrella of SACOTA (the South Australian Council on the Ageing). One thing is certain, and that is that South Australia will continue for a long time to lead the rest of Australia in the proportion of over-65s in the population. In his second reading explanation the Minister referred to 4 000 people every year reaching the age of 65. In the Government's own economic report of March 1984 the prediction was made that within a very few years 13 000 or 14 000 will turn 65 in each year and, following that, over the next 15 years the number of over-65-year-olds could reach 14.4 per cent of the South Australian population against an Australian average of 11.9 per cent. In another 20 years from then the figure could reach over 20 per cent of over-65s against a national average of 15.8 per cent.

So one can see that those 1971 census statistics that I quoted at the outset, which indicated that Australia's ageing population was fairly equitably distributed, will be well and truly out of kilter as far as South Australia is concerned. We will for the next three or four decades lead the rest of Australia as far as the proportion of aged (that is, over-65s) in our population is concerned.

When one also considers that 65 is the current age under consideration for male retirement and pensions, the earlier retirement age, which is becoming increasingly popular in Europe or Britain, of 55-plus, could create even more massive problems with the potential aged in that group reaching 30 per cent and 35 per cent or more.

It could be a very massive proportion of the South Australian population who have to be supported by a relatively small workforce. When one considers the problems that young people are already having thrust upon them—with the unemployment rate being the highest of all in the under-25 age group—one can imagine the additional burdens that they will be faced with when they start working, possibly aged 25 years and over, with this massive umbrella of aged people in the community to look after. It is a frightening prospect. I wonder what sort of recommendation the Commissioner will come up with, when one considers that there are already very serious actuarial problems associated

throughout Australia (not the least being in South Australia) with the provision of pensions of all kinds in a number of Government funded employment areas. That is quite apart from social service pensions provided through the Federal Government. Public Service schemes and tertiary education pension schemes are already tens of millions of dollars in the red and are annually subsidised from taxes with no special provision made on a recurring basis.

Currently, only 45 per cent of the retired workforce is superannuated; the rest of our retirees are supported from social security funds. Will the Commissioner be able to propose a more equitable scheme for consideration by Governments when at the moment a diminishing work force can only look forward to supporting an ever increasing aged population? Meanwhile, pensioners remain extremely vulnerable to cost escalation, as social welfare pensioners remain dependent on the goodwill of Governments to index their payments. The small increase of \$4.50 provided in the recent Federal Budget has already been largely absorbed by the South Australian Housing Trust rental increases which materialised two or three weeks before that Budget was handed down.

Privately superannuated pensioners often suffer from declining purchasing power simply because they are on a fixed income. Other Public Service superannuants frequently benefit from the fact that their pensions are increased in accordance with the consumer price index. However, problems occur when Government charges rise at a rate far outstripping normal price indexation. One has only to consider the 9 or 10 per cent increase in public transport charges (as referred to by the Minister, although the shadow Minister of Transport claims that they will be higher than that) and the substantial increase in electricity charges, which over the past two increases have risen by 20-odd per cent, as well as the increase in charges for water and for gas, on which the Government itself has placed a levy, all of which are passed on to the consumer. What sort of weight will the Commissioner's advice carry in such circumstances? I wonder whether the Commissioner will be able to influence Governments, as those petitions that I have been presenting almost on a daily basis over the past couple of weeks seek to do in requesting that the Government look gently on the aged and impoverished in our society.

One can be lonely in a crowd and, apart from the obvious worry of impoverishment, infirmity, lack of friends or relatives, the need to be active, wanted, and physically and intellectually stimulated, the aged also have special health requirements, including the provision of teeth, spectacles and hearing aids. In rural areas these problems are often far more acute than they are in cities where people can visit major institutions. Often country people are faced with the problem of transport, which is expensive and often tedious, and sometimes dangerous for an elderly, frail person. Also there can be accommodation problems; rarely does one visit to an institution for medical care, dental, optical or hearing treatment suffice and it is often necessary to make another visit involving possibly another long trip and further accommodation expenses.

These problems constantly face the elderly but more so in isolated rural communities. Will the Commissioner be able to remove the discriminations involved in isolation and ensure the equitable provision of services? I know from personal experience that people using the Isolated Patients Travel Assistance Scheme are often met with refusal on application. My office has initiated a considerable number of appeals at the request of elderly people.

Will the Commissioner be able to soften those attitudes at both the State and Federal levels by collaboration with his Federal counterpart? One would hope so. Will the Commissioner be able to ensure that recreation facilities for the

ageing match those for the young? Can he do this in the face of ever increasing competition for funds? Will he join in the quest for additional funds with those 4 000 voluntary agencies in South Australia which traditionally include service to the aged and which are even now seeking substantial additional funding from the Government?

I can see the Minister wishing, if the Commissioner meets all these expectations, aims and objectives placed before him in the legislation, that he had never conceived the Bill. If some co-ordination can be achieved in the provision of health services, the ageing will be well served. The Commissioner's task is both daunting and challenging. There are many paths to pursue. The Minister has provided in the Bill a vehicle for change and improvement to the well being of our ageing—a change which has been quite steady and which many claim has not been sufficiently rapid since the Second World War.

I again point out that any forward movement will not be at the discretion of the Commissioner: it will be at the discretion of the Government—the Minister of the day who is in charge of the Commissioner for the Ageing Office. In the absence of regulatory and administrative powers for the Commissioner, I reserve judgment as to the ultimate achievement of those aims.

The real measure of success will depend on how important the Government views the Commissioner's recommendations. The aims and objectives are good but the powers of the Commissioner are very limited. The sincerity of the Government will become clearer in a couple of days when we see what funds are allocated in the Budget for the establishment of this office, when we later see who is appointed to this extremely challenging task and when we see what resources and staff are provided to assist the Commissioner.

The real acid test will be somewhat later, when the Government begins to accept or reject the Commissioner's recommendations. Concerning the aged themselves, this legislation is a beginning and not necessarily an end in itself. I had the pleasure of conferring with the South Australian Council for the Ageing, the Executive Director and others, when invited to address a conference held in Gateway House two or three months ago. I enjoyed the submissions made by a number of other contributors, including Professor Tony Radford from the Flinders University and the Commissioner for the Ageing from New South Wales.

That conference, with following workshops, was very constructive and worth while. The South Australian Council of the Ageing submission to the Government finally emerged the day after the legislation was reintroduced in the House of Assembly. Concerning the submission that SACOTA presented to the Minister, apart from restating the main thrust of its original submission—one of those 135 that the Minister received—it said that it also considered that the Commissioner for the Ageing should be responsible to the Premier and that the Office for the Ageing should be situated in the Premier's Department.

That is significant, because the ageing in our community had the same attitude as did the Aboriginal people in our community when the Aborigines conferred with me in 1979 and said that they were pleased that responsibility for their affairs had been placed under the portfolio of the Minister of Education rather than under Community Welfare. Of course, the responsibility is now back in Community Welfare and we have two communities in South Australia that believe some stigma is attached to being with the Department for Community Welfare. It is unfortunate that some sort of hand-out connotation is attached to the Department for Community Welfare and, whatever the stigma, I hope that we are able to remove it one way or the other.

I did report to the group with whom I met that I felt that the Premier's Department may well be a sort of 'frying pan into the fire' business because so many different organisations believe they should be directly represented by the Premier that the Premier is obviously unable to meet all the requirements or demands placed on him. We had evidence of that only recently when he assumed responsibility for childhood services. On this side of the House we quite properly addressed a series of questions to the Premier on childhood services, only to find him extremely nonplussed, unable to answer the majority of questions adequately, and with the Minister of Education complaining quite bitterly that he should have been asked the questions although the Premier had decided that the Minister was not the one who would be responsible and should have only an advisory role. I do not know whether there would be any great joy in placing another commission within the ambit of the Premier's office.

I do not know what comment the Minister will make in responding, but I will ask questions in the Committee stage. South Australia recognises that the Commissioner should have no regulatory powers, but access to Ministers and departments is seen as being of critical importance. SACOTA addresses the question of adequate staffing and resourcing of the unit. We will no doubt be watching with great interest what Budget funding it will receive. It believes that effective functioning will be directly related to appropriate staffing levels. It strongly favours the establishment of consultative committees to aid the Commissioner and sees the notion of task orientated committees able to express the needs of special groups within the ageing community as being a very good idea.

SACOTA also urges the Government to include in the Bill reference to the policy development function. I believe that some veiled reference to that is contained within the existing legislation. It also recognises the many successful programmes and services (and I think that this is extremely important) provided by a range of voluntary organisations, and believes that the Commissioner, through the Minister and the Government, should support and assist the co-ordination of these endeavours. I state unequivocally that Liberal Party policy would have been to continue strongly with support of the voluntary agencies in South Australia.

I do not propose to read the main submission which SACOTA submitted to the Minister. I have given a brief summary. Suffice to say that, in principle, the submission is largely supportive of the legislation but, like myself, the SACOTA people and most other people associated with care of the ageing are expressing some reservation as to the ultimate success of the Commission, largely because of the vastness of the aims and objectives, and also with some reserve because we do not know what funding will be produced in the Budget. That joy will be afforded us on Thursday. We support the legislation to the Committee stage.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare): I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles): Reading this Bill provides one with the opportunity and indeed the temptation to philosophise about the process of ageing. Indeed, upon reading it I could not help but reflect on the change in my attitude to this subject since my entry into Parliament. I entered Parliament seven years ago, when I was aged 39, and my purpose in embarking on a political career at that stage was really a determination to do something to contribute to the community in which my children would grow up and develop. In the ensuing seven years, and more

particularly in the past couple of years, I have now become increasingly concerned about the kind of community in which I will grow old, and I have developed a fairly strong sense of urgency about the action that needs to be taken now, by this generation of legislators and community leaders, to ensure that the rising generation of the ageing, which is our own generation and which will constitute the biggest group of aged ever to live in this country and in this State, has the freedom to choose the kind of life that it wants.

I suppose that we could say that that goal is really at the heart of this legislation. It is a Bill that has been a long time in the making. I recall that early in my term as Minister of Health in 1979 I was approached by a then Commissioner of the Health Commission, the Rev. Vernon Harrison, who was very strong in his desire to see a Commissioner for the Ageing established. That is now five years ago and here we have the Bill which, as my colleague the member for Mount Gambier has said, deals with an issue which was carefully considered by the former Government. The outcome under our policy would have been somewhat different in technical terms. It remains to be seen whether the outcome in practical terms meets the goals which I am sure are shared by both political Parties and the whole community of South Australia.

As has been mentioned, it is appropriate that we should be debating this Bill on a day when we have been reminded through the media that South Australia's population is the oldest in the nation. The growth of a very old population will require resources of the kind that Governments have never before been required to provide for this group of people. I doubt whether the whole community is fully aware of what extreme burdens will be placed on Governments, basically taxpayers and wage earners, in the next couple of decades unless we can find ways of maintaining the health and independence of the ageing.

If we cannot find ways of maintaining that independence a very heavy burden will fall on the remainder of the community. One of the factors that needs to be considered is, as I have said, the need for extra resources. The fact that many elderly women are widows (because women live longer than men, and because men usually marry women younger than themselves) means that we will have an even greater proportion of women on their own, as one might say, towards the end of their lives than we have ever had before. Ageing women will comprise an even more significant part of the community in future years than they do now.

We have to continually bear in mind that retirement from work is accompanied by a significant drop in income and that more and more people will come into that bracket in the future. We have to bear in mind the gradual diminution of physical strength and vigour among the ageing. This is not necessarily accompanied by a diminution in other faculties. It often is, but not necessarily. Indeed, I was most interested and encouraged to read in the *Australian* some months ago that the prospect of failing memory, which haunts so many people approaching old age, should be regarded in the context that failing memory is a deficiency shared by all aged groups—including the very young. We must put these things in perspective and approach them with equanimity and a fairly high degree of good humour.

Many of us probably know people whom we regard as being models of what we would like to be in our own old age. I certainly know many people who fall into that category and, although a debate on a Bill is not usually regarded as an opportunity for personal discussion in this House, I would like to take this opportunity to pay a tribute to my own mother, whom I regard as the perfect model for me and for others in terms of her approach to ageing. She is 86 and has borne six children of whom I was the fifth. I was born when she was 40. My mother has been widowed for 30 years and, although she is physically frail, she is

independent in the sense that she lives on her own and manages her own affairs entirely with some supportive help in a practical sense from those of her children who are living in Adelaide.

One of the principal reasons why my mother has been able to maintain this independence is her strong sense of purpose, her interest in life, her vitality, the fact that she is interested in family affairs, and that her influence on the family is still strong. She is interested in community affairs, State affairs, national affairs, and international affairs. Indeed, if I go home at the end of a day in this place and visit her, I am likely to be confronted with a barrage of intensive questioning as to what I think happened in the House today. Invariably I find that she knows more than I do because she has been listening intently to all the news services, whereas I might not necessarily have been concentrating on the matter at hand. There is an example that I must live up to, and it is certainly one that I hope that I can emulate.

I was amused to hear a story the other day of a woman visiting a hospital who found an elderly person apparently looking for someone. She inquired of this person whether she would like help. One would have guessed that this lady was in her late 80s. She said, 'I am looking for my mother, who is a patient in this hospital.' It turned out that the mother was 105 years and that her daughter, aged 83, was coming to look for her. It also turned out that the daughter's great ambition was to outlive her mother. So, we should not be daunted by the prospect of old age.

A look at the objectives of the Commissioner, which are outlined in clause 6, conveys some of the challenges confronting society as a whole in ensuring that the needs of the aged are met. Those objectives are to achieve proper integration of the ageing within the total community, thus ensuring that the skills and experience of the ageing are not lost to the community through social alienation. I feel strongly about this matter and have grave reservations about establishing residential accommodation for the aged that divorces them from other generations.

If one is to have a truly healthy community and the best kind of relationships between human beings, the three generations need to be able to mix naturally together, each helping the other in the way that they are able. To isolate the ageing in large retirement villages is to my mind not a good way of achieving that kind of integration. The next objective states:

to create social structures in which the ageing are able to realise their full potential as individuals and as members of the community.

If we are looking at ideal social structures, we have only to look at the original village or town structure where everyone knows everyone else and where people have grown up together and possibly grown old together; there is a network of natural inter-personal relationships which provide those social structures which are so necessary throughout all periods of our life. The next objective is:

to create a social ethos in which the ageing are accorded the dignity, appreciation and respect that properly belong to them.

I suggest that that will possibly be one of the most difficult challenges confronting the Commissioner, and it may well be that the Minister sees fit to send the Commissioner on a trip to those countries where the aged are accorded the respect and appreciation that properly belong to them, and that traditionally is in the countries of Asia. I mention that in a lighthearted way: I do not really imagine that the Commissioner will go tripping off, but there is a lot that we can learn from the Asians in that regard. The final objective is:

to achieve a proper understanding within the community of the problems of the ageing and to ameliorate those problems so

far as it is practicable to do so by modification of social structures and attitudes.

I take issue with the wording of that objective. In the first instance, would it not have been more appropriate to seek to achieve a proper understanding within the community of the issues confronting the ageing? It is not necessarily all problems with which we will be dealing. There are some superb opportunities, and we should not overlook them by focusing on the negative, difficult and problematical aspects. We overlook the huge and rich resource which is available to us and which will be neglected if we concentrate on problems rather than on opportunities. I would prefer to have seen the word 'issues' used in respect of that objective because that in itself would have been a healthy approach to the situation.

Looking at those objectives of the Commissioner and the functions that he or she will be given in order to help fulfil them, it is necessary to have an understanding of the needs of the aged. Just identifying a few of those needs, I would describe them as being in the first instance security (both financial and physical); independence (both personal and physical); proper housing; proper health care; access to leisure and recreation; and, as important as all the foregoing, a sense of purpose and a sense of worth.

That of course is related to how the ageing are perceived by others. If older people know that they are really needed by just one other person in this world, the reason for living is there and the reason for making the most of each day exists. The reason for wanting to live until tomorrow, the next day and the future, because one knows that one is needed, is an enormously strong motivating force that brings richness to life and, in its impact, enriches the community. In that regard the provisions of this Bill, the effectiveness of which really rests on the personal qualities and capacities of the Commissioner, are a positive step but one about which all of us must have some reservations because it depends so much on the capacities of the person appointed. I have no doubt that the Minister will appoint someone of considerable capacity, but it is hard to know how one person can fulfil all these roles.

I refer briefly to the health care of the ageing, because that was an area of responsibility for me in the previous Government, and because it has been an area of lifelong interest. On reflecting on health care for the aged, I cannot help but reflect on an overseas study tour which I made as Minister of Health in April 1982 in order to observe what was being done in other countries from which South Australia could benefit. I can say with pride that I returned to South Australia believing that our services were as good as any that I had seen in terms of health care, with one or two qualifications, which related to the extremely high standard of support services for the ageing in the United Kingdom.

I saw some interesting work being done in Holland, and I asked the Dutch authorities who in their opinion in Europe was providing the best services for the ageing. I was told that England does the best, Holland probably does the next best, and that France and Italy do not need to do anything at all because the ageing are looked after by their families. Again, that says something interesting about each of those nationalities.

I think the Liberal Party can look back with pride at what we did in Government in respect to health care for the ageing. I suggest to the Minister that some very good foundations were laid then which are probably still being built on and which I hope will be extended. I refer particularly to the establishment of geriatric assessment units in the major teaching hospitals to ensure that elderly patients who were admitted were assessed by a multi-disciplinary team and that their needs were most carefully analysed. I commend to anyone who is interested in this area of health care a

study of the outcome of the geriatric assessment units at both the Flinders Medical Centre and the Royal Adelaide Hospital and to note their quite outstanding results.

From recollection, those results related to the fact that most patients, following admission to the geriatric assessment unit, found that their drug dependency was very much reduced as a result of proper diagnosis and treatment and that their capacity to be 'independent' was greatly enhanced by a diagnosis of the kind of support services those people would need on discharge from a hospital either to return to their own home or to a nursing home. The establishment of the pensioner spectacle scheme, the pensioner denture scheme and the extension of nursing hours for domiciliary care through the Royal District Nursing Society all took place under our Government. Those services were very much needed and will need to be built on in future by this and other Governments.

In conclusion, I believe that this legislation should be carefully monitored and reviewed after five years to see whether this rather fragile framework, with absolutely no statutory powers given to the Commissioner, will be sufficient to meet the huge demands that will be placed on the Commissioner for the Ageing. I do not believe it is possible; I think it will be an insupportable burden. I would say that possibly even in less than five years this legislation will need to be reviewed and either strengthened or a fresh approach taken. In the meantime, I support the general concept of the Bill and hope that the Minister does indeed manage to find the miracle worker who will be required to fulfil the objectives of his legislation.

Mr BAKER (Mitcham): When the Minister first announced his Commissioner for the Ageing I had a wry smile about the proposition because I remembered that, when I worked in the Australian Bureau of Statistics during the 1970s, I identified a number of changes that had taken place in the population and, in fact, I wrote a number of papers on the subject. That was part of my job. One of the areas identified, which led to the demise of Monarto, was in relation to the growth of Adelaide. The other major discovery, which was not really a discovery, was that we had a population which would eventually become imbalanced in terms of its dependence. The older population influences demands for goods and services in the South Australian community. I thought that the Minister had identified a need that had been outstanding for some 10 years at least. The signs have always been there but they have never actually been brought to the public attention. So, I thought that this legislation was a beginning but I was somewhat fearful that it would be a political sop to the electorate.

I imagine that a number of members of the Minister's Cabinet astutely identified the fact that we have a growing number of people aged over 60 or 65 years in our population who will continue to have a political influence. Therefore, the answer is to demonstrate a recognition of the fact that these people exist by creating a Commissioner for the Ageing. That was my cynical approach to why the Minister intended to set up an office of the Commissioner for the Ageing. I applauded the measure, but I was a little worried about the background thinking related to it.

Of course, my fears were realised. A booklet was released by the Minister called, 'South Australia's Commissioner for Aged Care and Services—An Ideas Paper'. I now read a letter I wrote to the author of this nefarious document, because I think it encapsulates some of my feelings when I received it:

I cannot decide whether the document 'South Australia's Commissioner for Aged Care and Services—An Ideas Paper' is ingenious or whether it is . . .

I left the dots because I thought that any words inserted may not have been the best English. My letter continues:

The problem I experienced with the paper is that it is a collection of ideas without thematic formation or direction. It appears as if someone selected cuttings from the newspapers over the past 12 months and threw them together. Whilst I realise that the Minister may not wish to prejudge the future role of the Commissioner, it is a little disheartening to read a document which reveals so little of his general intent. Having said that, the response you elicit may well exceed all expectations. My misgivings about the approach you have adopted centre on your identification of the symptoms and types of disadvantage being experienced by our ageing population. Nowhere is there an understanding displayed of the impact of life cycle development and its relation to the living environment. As a demographer, an economist and a person previously involved in land use planning, I find the omissions glaring.

This is where it all begins. Ultimately, government must pay attention to causal relationships rather than spending massive sums of money attempting to cure the problems which have developed through inadequate planning. In addition, whilst reference is included to the process of self-determination and utilisation of skills which our older population possess, the paper does not pay due heed to the potential which exists. I trust that my observations are not viewed as totally critical, but constructive. If the Commissioner's role is to be one of vitality, I can only suggest that there needs to be a complete reorientation of thinking on the subject. Let us use a little more imagination.

That was the letter that I wrote to the author of this document. The reason that I wrote it was that I had nowhere seen displayed an understanding of what it is all about. Until one can understand what it is all about one cannot put into place legislation or provide a position to resolve some of the conflicts, problems and issues related to the needs of the aged. I want to make that point quite clear. As I said before, I had fears that it was there to wave a political flag, and nothing that I have seen since has shown or persuaded me differently.

I have some great difficulty with the term 'ageing'. It has been mentioned before that the ageing process starts at the year zero, as everyone is well aware. So, in this Bill we are saying that we will cater for everybody from the year zero until the time that they die, which could be at age 100, 110 or, if one is unlucky, at age one. Let us be quite clear: if the Minister cannot understand what area he is trying to concentrate on, how in the hell can the Commissioner? It is simply ludicrous that the Minister is not giving directions as to the clientele who will be researched.

The Commissioner will have some responsibility for looking in to the needs of the people who are getting up in years and their future well being; yet the Minister has not identified that group. In the process of non-identification we get into the mishmash of conflict between the various groups of people who are over 40 years of age. When I was discussing this matter with the person who wrote this document (I will call it 'the blue document') he said that he did not want to restrict the focus because many people are retiring at the age of 55. It is not those people that the Commissioner for the Aged has to concentrate on. They are normally of good health, with a network of friends, and support, either through their previous working experience or through their social contacts. They have all the facilities available to them and very rarely have problems with mobility; yet this is the sort of group that one person thought might well come into the focus of the Commissioner for the Ageing. If the Commissioner for the Ageing is to cater, for example, for all those people over 50 years of age, that person will never achieve anything.

We have no indication in this Bill as to who is the target group. There seems to be some confusion on the part of a number of people who are associated with it as to where the major impact will occur. As a demographer, I find this quite startling. I find it very disappointing that the people who are responsible for the orchestration or the architecture

of this Bill do not understand where the prime needs are occurring, do not understand the life cycle process and do not understand that the planning for this must occur earlier in age but that the primary focus must be on the people who cannot enjoy the mobility and the advantages of living that we do.

I shall quickly canvass some issues. When someone asked me how long I intended to speak on this Bill I said that I might be able to break John Mathwin's three-hour record, although I now find that I am constrained to a time limit of about 15 minutes. I shall refer to certain matters and perhaps the Minister can think about directions that should be taken. Perhaps when he takes this document, which he calls a Bill, to the Commissioner he may be able to assist the Commissioner to interpret the document in a way that will lead to a fruitful result, with attention being directed to areas of need.

I refer to the increasing dependency relationship in the Australian population, and in particular the South Australian population. My colleague the shadow Minister of Community Welfare has already mentioned the ageing of the population. It is no secret; the tendency has been evident for many years, but now people are paying attention to it. However, 10 years ago, for example, it was expected that a person's working life would range from 15 years to 65 years—a total of 50 years. But now, because of people spending longer in the secondary and tertiary education systems and early retirement schemes the age range of the labour force is between 20 and 55 years—a total of 35 years. Further, life expectancy is increasing, and the life expectancy of an average male person could reach 85 years, for example, by the year 2 010. That is not inconceivable having regard to the increase in life expectancy that has occurred over the past decade.

If age 55 becomes the normally accepted age for retirement that will mean that, having regard to increased life expectancy, people could be in the post-retirement category for a period of 30 years. It has suddenly been discovered in America that there are all these people with an enormous amount of talent who either have been forced out of the traditional areas of the work force or have chosen to work fewer hours and have more leisure. In Australia we have gone in the opposite direction: we have decreased the interaction of retired persons with the labour force, and we know that that is causing an enormous strain on those people who either have been forced out of the work force or have voluntarily left it without having other areas of interest.

The two speakers who preceded me canvassed the problem of the increasing social welfare bill for pensions. This problem is serious and must be grappled with. It must be understood that we will probably spend 50 per cent more time in a dependency relationship with taxpayers than we will spend in the work force and that we will spend almost as long a time out of the work force as we will spend in it. That provides specific challenges for people dealing with the issues and challenges that face the retired population who previously have been excluded from further participation. Some very healthy developments in America are providing such people with an adequate outlet. The best guide for legislators in relation to this matter is for them to look at the experiences of others in the community. I do not presume that what is occurring at my office is atypical in any way. I know that, for example, in the District of Mitcham 18 per cent of the population is over the age of 65 years.

Of the traffic and contacts that comes through my office, 40 per cent involves the same age group. Why do they come to my office? Perhaps some come for company or to discuss matters that concern them; others come because they are worried about the assets test, changes in pensions or the inability to pay the gas bill. All members know that older people come to our offices for a variety of reasons, often

for contact. Members also know of some of the major problems facing the aged in the community. When I go door-knocking in the afternoons, I know that after 5.30 I can rarely make contact with a person over 65 years of age—they are afraid to go outside their houses or open their doors.

This is an enormous challenge that does not necessarily relate to the Commissioner for the Ageing. It concerns the realisation that the safety we enjoyed 20 years ago is no longer there. In the Mitcham area, I am trying to promote—as I am sure other members are trying to promote elsewhere—an outlet for these older people so that they are not restricted to their houses after 5.30 at night.

Special reference is made in the Bill to the problems of the ethnic communities. People from non-English speaking backgrounds have been served very poorly in the past. A significant group of these people are part of the retired age group. Many of them have never been taught English or had interaction outside their community. This problem will now be very expensive to address. Many years ago this difficulty should have been recognised.

When the social infra-structure breaks down it has to be picked up again and Governments will have to foot these very expensive bills. Not much has been done to the present time, but the matter will have to be addressed soon. The Commissioner might focus on the older population, but that person has also to realise that the problems are a part of the life cycle development. While the primary focus should be on those people in the older age group who no longer have the network backing them or the support of those in the younger age group, the Commissioner will need a perspective of where people have come from and how we are to make their lives worth while.

I had a long list of matters to speak about tonight but will restrict my remarks to discussing my amendment, which I understand unfortunately will not enjoy the Government's support. I wish to insert in the Bill 'to ensure that physical resources are effectively developed and provided by Governments and private enterprise to meet the long-term needs of the ageing'. Nowhere in the Bill do we see anything about planning or infra-structure. One of the greatest efficiencies in assistance to the aged is the way in which we plan. For example, the net effect of the retirement village at Pasadena and the shopping centre across the very busy road is that traffic lights now have to be installed so that these people can go to the shopping centre. The Minister of Transport recently had a set of lights installed at Kingswood, as some residents of Sunset Lodge have been killed or injured crossing the very busy Belair Road.

I am not saying in any sense that these things could necessarily have been totally avoided, but I know that with better planning and understanding (as people become older they become less mobile) some of the difficulties that these people may suffer could be planned for in a better way. Yet, the Bill makes no reference to the planning process, and I find that a startling omission. There are a vast number of other examples where good planning will provide a better result. We know, for example, that in the southern and northern areas there are people who will go through this life cycle stage, and we are going to have to make a determination about how many resources we have to put into these communities to support them, rather than merely understanding that those things are going to take place and providing them with options.

I will not talk tonight about the different options available, but we have to think about what we are doing when we provide space for housing and provide facilities, the use of which will change over time. If we build a hospital we know that the immediate demand for it may warrant it but that in 20 years time it may be under-utilised, whilst there may

be an increased demand in 50 years time when the people who have settled in the area require more hospitalisation. There has been a massive change in attitude to retirement villages, nursing homes and care in the home, yet we have no reference to it here.

I support the Bill, as it is a start. I do not believe that it is a very auspicious start, but at least there is statutory recognition of a community of people out there who for various reasons are removed from the mainstream of life. We all want them to enjoy the best of health and social outlets and to be able to do simple things like shopping and walking as everyone else is able to do. When I was trying to think of a name for the Bill other than 'Commissioner for the Ageing,' I spent some hours poring through *Roget's Thesaurus* and a number of dictionaries, but could not come up with an alternative term. The term 'ageing' offends me. Tonight I came up with alternative terminology, although I realise it is too late for an amendment. I believe the Commissioner should be called 'the Commissioner for the Elder Community'.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare): I thank all members who have contributed to the debate and thank the Opposition for its support of the measure. The comments that have been made are helpful and generally outline the very need for this legislation and, indeed, the office that will follow. In his introductory remarks the last speaker did outline a very strong case for some substantial work to be done, maybe not by the Commissioner or the Commissioner's office, but by some people in the community. It may be that the Commissioner is the person who encourages that very planning and demographic study to which the honourable member referred. We do not have a focal point of this nature in Government and we need one so that information can be received, assessed, processed and distributed not only to those in the Government but also to those in the community who are providing important services to this important section of our community.

The member for Mount Gambier referred to the seminar that SACOTA (the South Australian Council on the Ageing) conducted some months ago. He also referred to other representations he had received. Other speakers have referred to the substantial community discussions that have taken place on this legislation.

That process was certainly not a cynical process. It was an important process that had to be undertaken so that this legislation was meaningful, relevant and very thoroughly considered by those groups which I very much want to be involved in the work of this office and in the delivery of services most certainly at the State level and hopefully at other Government levels. I have received correspondence from SACOTA and the South Australian Consultative Council for Pensioner and Retired Persons Associations. That is a further umbrella organisation recently formed in this State to speak on behalf of the ageing. Both those organisations have expressed their support for this measure.

Certainly, specific matters have been raised that do not refer directly to the legislation but to its administration. The point that has been made with respect to the necessity to appoint a most competent person in this area is certainly received by me and the Government, and a lot of work undoubtedly will be put into choosing the most suitable person to fulfil this office. It is not an easy task. Very high expectations will be placed on that person and the work of the office, so it will be necessary for that person to receive all the support that can be given, particularly in the early years of that office.

Much has been made of the financial provision for the office. There will be provision in the Budget for the establishment of the office. It is hoped that the appointment of

a Commissioner can be made this year and that the person can commence duties. However, it is not envisaged that an office full of people, siting an office and the like will be undertaken by the Government but more appropriately by the Commissioner, who will be the person who establishes the siting of the office in due course and the selection of staff. It is in that way that the office will become relevant and will be able to do much of the work that we are asking of it, rather than the Government predetermining that.

So, it will take some little time for the establishment of the office, but I am sure that honourable members and indeed the public will accept the wisdom of that approach, rather than decisions—and indeed very lasting decisions, particularly with respect to staffing—taken by the Government. The points that have been made by several people who have commented on the legislation (and, indeed, the member for Mount Gambier also reflected on this) about the Ministerial responsibility for this piece of legislation are matters that the Government has also considered. Originally, this was the subject of the platform of the health portfolio of the Labor Party.

As a result of discussions in the early stages of this Government, it was suggested that the area of community welfare would be a more appropriate home for this function and some people have suggested that they would prefer to see this as an adjunct of the Premier's Department. I think that the points that the member for Mount Gambier made about the access to Ministers, Cabinet and indeed Government are very relevant here, and this is very much a practical consideration. It is not a part of the Department for Community Welfare and I think that the analogy that was drawn by the honourable member with the office of Aboriginal Affairs is indeed very pertinent because that office has direct access to the Minister. Whilst for administrative purposes it is part of the Department for Community Welfare, certainly in its policy communication it is directly associated with the Minister.

Here we have an independent statutory structure, and the Commissioner would have as a right direct access to the Minister to whom responsibility for this legislation is committed. Many of the fears that have been raised will be allayed as time goes on. Obviously, this is not a measure relating only to community welfare—it relates to many portfolios. The Cabinet of this Government has a number of subcommittees, one of which is related to the delivery of human services. Naturally, the Commissioner would report from time to time to that subcommittee where it would be possible for him to meet with the group of Ministers most relevant to this legislation. The Commissioner would have access to those Ministers and from them to Cabinet and the Government. The Commissioner would work both through my Ministry and through the Cabinet subcommittee.

The member for Coles referred to a number of people who have influenced her personally and her thinking when she was Minister of Health. I also pay a tribute to the many people in South Australia who have taken a special interest in this legislation and have shown their concern for the wellbeing of the aged and about some of the barriers placed in the way of organisations and individuals who are working in this area. Indeed, an interesting seminar was held in this Chamber organised by the Australian Council for Intergovernmental Relations to discuss that council's working paper on the aged. It brought together probably for the first time in this State representatives of the three tiers of government and community organisations. That sort of thing must occur more often.

The Reverend George Martin, who is undoubtedly an authority in this area, raised at that meeting some of the practical problems that organisations providing housing for the aged face in working their way through regulations. He

referred to the humbug and costs associated with that humbug placed in the way of charitable organisations providing important services in that area. Detailed regulations apply at local government, State Government and Commonwealth Government level. That illustrates vividly in my mind the need for the Commissioner to be telling government of the need to minimise its regulations in some of these areas, to consolidate and update regulations, and to ensure that they do what they are intended to do rather than continuing to proliferate and to create barriers against those organisations providing important services.

The point made in this legislation and by many speakers is the involvement of the aged themselves in the delivery of services and the formulation of policy through consultative committees or through other structures or organisations to which they belong. I referred to that in the second reading explanation. As a result of the representations that the Government has received I will be seeking to amend one of the clauses explaining the functions of the Commissioner, to strengthen that function to ensure that the organisations providing services are encouraged to see that the aged are involved wherever possible in the delivery of those services, and that their views are sought in that process.

I also accept the submissions that have been made to the Government, particularly on behalf of ethnic and Aboriginal communities, that there should be within the objectives of the Commissioner a clause that expresses the multi-cultural nature of the community. I have circulated an amendment to ensure that that is clearly expressed in this legislation. It requires a consequential amendment and that is similarly covered.

This is the first piece of legislation of its type introduced in any Australian Parliament, and it is my prediction that other Parliaments will follow suit. They no doubt will want to watch what happens in South Australia but it is also my prediction that the Commonwealth Government will act in this area in the near future, as well. Obviously, there will be some considerable interest in the evolution of this office and what it can achieve for the aged in South Australia.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—'The Commissioner.'

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Can the Minister say how long he anticipates it will be before a Commissioner is appointed?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: This depends somewhat on the Bill's passage through Parliament and its proclamation, but I would hope that advertisements could appear soon after the legislation passes through the Parliament. There will be some period needed for assessment of those applications but I would like to see the Commissioner in place by the latter part of this year.

Clause passed.

Clause 5 passed.

Clause 6—'Objectives of the Commissioner.'

Mr BAKER: I move:

Page 2, after line 19—Insert new paragraph as follows:

(aa) to ensure that physical resources are effectively developed and provided by Governments and private enterprise to meet the long-term needs of the ageing;

I explained in my second reading speech that nowhere in the Bill is there any reference to a planning process. It is one of the greatest deficiencies that we are facing today, and it will be a very costly mechanism to pick up some of the pieces which we may have been able to overcome if the problem had been thought about 10 years ago. I believe it is essential that this Bill has an objective which pays heed to the planning of physical resources in order to overcome many of the deficiencies that we see today.

I believe it is essential that this Bill has an objective which pays heed to the planning of physical resources in order to overcome many of the deficiencies that we see today. **The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** The Government does not accept the amendment. I can see the point made by the honourable member. I think that he is trying to place the Commissioner in a most difficult position indeed. I will analyse the honourable member's amendment to illustrate that point, without leading into a philosophical argument which I think is probably the end result of the amendment. First, the early part of the honourable member's amendment seeks 'to ensure'. To use that term would require some consideration of sanctions, because if we place that onus upon the Commissioner it is of little effect indeed unless it is backed up with some sanction.

The whole thrust of the legislation is not to involve the Commissioner in a confrontation situation by making demands on Government or non-government organisations. By contrast, it is very much one of helping those organisations to discover other ways in which they can meet needs that are evidenced among the aged in the community. Secondly, the honourable member referred to physical resources only. Many of the submissions given to the Government, indeed, even in the speeches this evening, have related to non-physical resources. I think that is something that we have tried to come to grips with as well.

The points that I made in my concluding remarks related to many of the human resources available amongst the aged in our community and how they can be best utilised in this area. The honourable member also referred to both Government and private enterprise. I hearken back to the use of the word 'ensure'. I think we would have to rewrite the legislation if we were to place obligations on private enterprise to perform in a particular way. I would have thought that such intervention in the non-government sector was contrary to the honourable member's Party's stated philosophies.

Thirdly, the honourable member referred in his amendment to meeting the long term needs of the ageing. I suggest that once again we need to look as well at needs other than long term needs. I can see the point that the honourable member is striving to achieve, but I think that there are those deficiencies in his amendment. They are fundamentally different from the whole philosophy and thrust of the legislation as it is written, as it has been the subject of very wide consultation and has received the support, as honourable members have said, of organisations and individuals who have a special interest and concern for the aged in the community.

Mr BAKER: I think it is worth responding to the comments made by the Minister. I have jotted down the four points made by the Minister. The original wording of my amendment included the words 'to promote', but that does not fit in with the objectives, and it was a matter of debate as to whether I put in some reference to the objectives or to the functions of the Commissioner.

If the Minister wants to argue that point, he has an amendment to ensure that the multi-cultural nature of the community is reflected in the planning and implementation of programmes and services for the ageing or affecting the ageing. He must be consistent in his approach to the matter. I ask that he withdraws his amendment and rewrites it. As far as physical outcomes are concerned, of course, everything we are talking about relates to social objectives which result from social infrastructures, but we are missing the physical environment. That is not recognised. Possibly, we could find a wording that would fit in precisely with what we are trying to do in this instance. But let us be quite clear: these are all social outcomes, but the physical outcome is just as

important. The two come together. It is deficient without that objective.

Secondly, we have the problem of ensuring that private enterprise plays a part in this matter. We should try to find words that will fit in with our objectives. I am talking now about the promotional aspect. However, it is difficult in the time available to find an alternative wording. Private enterprise will pick up the population's needs far faster than Government ever will. Private enterprise is doing much by way of, for instance, building physical structures such as houses or providing outlets for physical education or some other activity. I assure the Minister that private enterprise will be involved because people will see a demand for the services that it can better provide.

We must realise that private enterprise has a real role to play in this matter. That is the intention of my amendment. We are aiming to satisfy the long term needs of the ageing. If we look only at the short-term needs we get into the reactionary situation that we are in today of putting forward a Bill that does not contain what I believe to be some of the essential elements required. I defend my amendment despite the fact that one or two words in it will cause difficulty as they relate to the Bill itself. The Minister should be well aware that I believe something should be incorporated in the legislation that refers to the physical environment.

Amendment negated.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I move:

Page 2, after line 24—Insert new paragraph as follows:

(ca) to ensure that the multi-cultural nature of the community is reflected in the planning and implementation of programmes and services for the ageing or affecting the ageing.

I explained a moment ago to the Committee the thinking behind this alteration to the wording of the Bill. Previously in the functions of the Commissioner there was a requirement to keep under review special sub-groups. I accept the representations that have been made to the Government that it is more appropriate that we give credence in the objective section to the multi-cultural nature of the community. I suppose that the debate that is ensuing at the moment with respect to the multi-cultural nature of our society is support enough of the fact that we need to give some credence to this aspect of the matter.

I refer honourable members to the comments that I made in my second reading speech with respect to the particular problems which are already evident in the community and which will increase with respect to the provision of services to ageing ethnic communities in this State. Some quite dramatic figures are quoted there. I trust that this is a more appropriate placing of this concern and that it is embraced in a more comfortable way in this legislation.

Mr BAKER: I know that I am being a little pedantic at 11.5 p.m. in mentioning the Minister's objection in respect of the wording of my amendment, which is the same objection that he must raise against his own amendment. I wonder whether he will bring sanction against those people providing services for the aged from the private sector because he has not mentioned Government or private enterprise. Obviously, Government and private enterprise and charitable organisations and a whole lot of other people provide services that are used by the aged. He has to ensure that it is in keeping with the flavour of the other provisions, and I ask that he go back to the drawing boards and rewrite it.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: If I can also be pedantic, there is a difference between ensuring that the multi-cultural nature of society is reflected in a planning process and placing that obligation on the Commissioner, and ensuring, as the honourable member wants to, that physical resources are effectively developed and then placing obligations on

Governments and private enterprise to use those physical resources in a very specific way. So, under this heading of objectives that point must be obvious to the honourable member.

Mr BAKER: Because the Minister took me to task, I will really say, and I will say it only once, that he has 'and services for the ageing or affecting the ageing'. That takes in the whole spectrum of activity that provides for people in the old age group. If the Minister would ensure that they are implemented—and that really takes in some of the things to which I was trying to allude—I would not have raised an objection. However, he raised an objection to the amendment that I put forward; it is totally inconsistent of the Minister to do so.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: If the honourable member thinks that way, obviously he will support this amendment. Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 7—'Functions of the Commissioner.'

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I move:

Page 2, line 31—Leave out 'encourage' and insert 'actively foster and seek'.

I also took a little time previously to explain the difference in emphasis here. It is perhaps, the member for Mitcham might say, pedantic, but it does give a different—perhaps a stronger—emphasis. As the result of the many people who really want to ensure that every effort is made to develop an inclusionist philosophy to which I referred in the second reading explanation, I quote from the second reading explanation:

Many policies and services separate old people from others in our society. This is not the philosophy of this Government, nor the intention of this legislation—nobody should be subject to society's intended or unintended rejection. The Commissioner will try to identify and promulgate inclusionist rather than exclusionist practices at all times.

A number of honourable members in their speeches tonight have referred in one way or another to this aim; so it is in that spirit that this additional emphasis has been placed on this function of the Commissioner.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I move:

Page 3, line 9—Leave out 'those of immigrant or Aboriginal background.'

This further amendment is consequential on the amendment that was passed to clause 6. The concerns and needs of those of immigrant or Aboriginal background are expressed in the objectives of the Commissioner and in the broad thrust of that provision.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (8 to 11) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.11 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 29 August at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 28 August 1984

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

PORT GAWLER CONSERVATION PARK

18. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning:

1. What stage has been reached in having the draft management plan for the Port Gawler Conservation Park approved?

2. Have submissions been received from local residents concerned about the removal of free access to the beach area from the north and that access to the south is too far away for horse trainers (trotting) who have traditionally used the area and, if so, what action is the Department of Environment and Planning taking to overcome this problem?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. Public comments have closed—the plan is now with the Reserves Advisory Committee for comment.

2. Yes. There is no proposal to close Shellgrit Road.

LIQUOR LICENCES

31. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Attorney-General: When does the Minister intend to adopt the recommendations of the review of the South Australian Liquor Licensing Laws concerning streamlining of liquor licences?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Those recommendations, arising from the Review of South Australian Liquor Licensing Laws, which the Government decides to adopt, will be incorporated into draft legislation which the Government hopes to introduce during the current session.

SUNDAY LIQUOR TRADING

32. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Attorney-General: When will legislation be introduced into the Parliament to allow Sunday liquor trading in all hotels?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Optional Sunday trading is only one of the recommendations arising from the review of the South Australian Liquor Licensing Laws. The report of the review was released for public comment on 20 July 1984. The Government proposes to introduce legislation during the current session based upon the recommendations arising from the review and on the assessment of public response to the report.

FORTIFIED WINE TAX

34. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Agriculture: What was the estimated loss of production of fortified wines experienced during 1983-84 as a result of the imposition of the fortified wine tax by the Federal Government and what impact did this have in terms of employment within the wine grapegrowing and wine production industries?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: At this point in time it is difficult to estimate the loss of production of fortified wines experienced during 1983-84 as a result of the imposition of the fortified wine tax. No reliable wine production statistics are yet available for that period.

SACOSS REPORT

36. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare: Has the Minister undertaken a review of the SACOSS Report which identified South Australia as having the highest proportion of welfare recipients and in the greatest need of welfare assistance and, if so, was the report accurate?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The SACOSS Report has been reviewed. The argument that South Australia has the highest proportion of welfare recipients is supported by data from the Commonwealth Department of Social Security. The statistics quoted in the report indicate that the State has the greatest need for welfare assistance; however, a number of recommendations are not accompanied by statistical evidence.

COURT SENTENCES

41. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Attorney-General: Does the Minister intend to introduce during this session changes in legislation which will enable lower court sentences to be imposed as an incentive for guilty pleas, in response to the suggestion made by the Chief Justice, Mr Justice King?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The Government does not intend to introduce legislation during this session to enable lower court sentences to be imposed as an incentive for guilty pleas. Whilst it may be said that providing encouragement to an accused person to plead guilty would save the costs of unnecessary preparations for trial it is also important to recognise that the desirability for administrative efficiency must not oust the basic principle that an accused is entitled to require the Crown to prove the case against him.

It should be noted that the Full Supreme Court of this State in the case *R. v Shannon* (1979) 21 SASR 442 considered and discussed the weight to be attached to a plea of guilty. The court laid down that a plea of guilty may be taken into account in mitigation of sentence:

- (a) where it results from genuine remorse, repentance or contrition; or
- (b) where it results from a willingness to co-operate in the administration of justice by saving the expense and inconvenience of a trial, or the necessity of witnesses giving evidence, or results from some other consideration which is in the public interest, notwithstanding that the motive, or one of the motives, for such co-operation may be a desire to earn leniency,

and where to allow the plea a mitigatory effect would be conducive to the public purposes which the sentencing judge is seeking to achieve. (see pp. 459, 460, judgment of King C.J.)

It would be difficult to take the effect of a plea of guilty much further than it has already been taken by the Supreme Court in *R. v Shannon*.

WIND ENERGY

43. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy: What stage has been reached on the proposal by Professor Peter Schwerdtfeger concerning the installation of wind generators for the provision of electricity in outlying areas?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The Government is not specifically acting on a proposal of Professor Schwerdtfeger but rather has announced its own programme on wind energy. While the programme will cover all of the State some aspects will relate directly to the more outlying areas to which the honourable member refers. Details of the programme are as follows:

In December 1983, the South Australian Department of Mines and Energy began initial work on a longer term programme to assess the potential for medium-size to large wind farms and wind generators in South Australia. To allow the programme to proceed into the operational stage the State Energy Research Advisory Committee provided a \$32 000 grant that covered both the purchase of monitoring units (five sites) and the external costs associated with their commissioning.

Following the release of the Stewart committee findings on Future Electricity Generation Options for South Australia in June 1984 I announced the Government's commitment to an extended wind energy programme involving further funding (about \$83 000 capital expenditure in 1984-85) by the State Energy Research Advisory Committee and the Electricity Trust of South Australia. This programme includes:

a co-ordinated State-wide wind monitoring programme aimed at establishing the necessary wind data base at high wind potential sites, sites adjacent to the existing ETSA grid and at settlements remote from that grid; closely monitoring technological developments and operational results of wind turbines, particularly overseas, with a detailed evaluation being completed by mid 1985; undertaking a detailed costing study in 1985 on a wind powered generation system of up to 500 kW installed capacity, to be connected directly to the ETSA grid as a demonstration/evaluation facility, with a possible target date of 1986.

A co-ordination group of officers from the Department of Mines and Energy, ETSA and the Bureau of Meteorology was established to monitor the programme. Under guidance from this committee and management by the Energy Division of the Department of Mines and Energy, work is now proceeding on the development of site selection techniques and the selection of possible monitoring sites on the Fleurieu Peninsula, south of Adelaide. At least five prime sites and a group of secondary sites will be selected initially. The wider second stage of the survey, covering the remainder of the State, will commence towards the end of this year. While coastal areas might be expected to offer more potential for wind power generation the study will monitor wind intensities at some more remote inland settlements.

It would be inappropriate to commission wind energy installations at specific locations without prior detailed monitoring of the wind characteristics of the sites and detailed evaluation of costing and operational performance of available reliable wind generators. Detailed planning can only be completed when the wind data bases for specific locations are established. The survey work already under way will provide this information.

CAR MANUFACTURING

49. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: Has an assessment been undertaken of the impact of the General Motors proposals to cease production of car engines on South Australian car manufacturing and, if so, what is the estimated job loss to the State?

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: No job loss is expected in South Australia.

NURRUNGAR SATELLITE STATION

50. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: What details, if any, have been provided by the Federal Government on the upgrading of the Nurrungar Satellite Ground Station in response to the Premier's call for information from the Minister for Defence?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: On 28 May 1984 I wrote to the Commonwealth Minister for Defence requesting a general briefing on any changes to the satellite ground station at Nurrungar which could effect South Australia's citizens. This approach followed reports in the *National Times* regarding the upgrading of Nurrungar. On 4 June 1984 the Hon. Gordon Scholes, MHR, Minister for Defence, advised that it was the policy of the Federal Government not to confirm or deny the authenticity of any such reports as those appearing in the *National Times*. He further advised that the Prime Minister would be making a general statement on joint defence facilities. This statement was subsequently made by the Prime Minister on 6 June 1984. The Minister also indicated that, in relation to new construction projects, it is normal practice of the Commonwealth to announce new works programmes at the time of calling for public tenders and that this practice will continue.

MARALINGA NUCLEAR TESTS

51. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: To what stage has the Federal Government's inquiry into nuclear tests at Maralinga advanced and when is it expected that a report will be laid before the South Australian Parliament?

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: Following representations from the South Australian Government and other interested parties the Commonwealth, on 5 July 1984, announced the establishment of a Royal Commission into various aspects of the British nuclear tests in Australia between 1952 and 1963. The Letters Patent appointing the Commissioners and the terms of reference for the inquiry were promulgated in the Commonwealth *Gazette* issued on 24 July 1984. The initial public hearing of the Royal Commission was held in Sydney on 22 August 1984. The Royal Commission is required to report no later than 30 June 1985.

PRIVATE DAMS

55. **The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: What authority is responsible for seeing that dams constructed by land holders are safe?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: There is no authority at present responsible for seeing that dams constructed by land holders are safe. The Engineering and Water Supply Department regularly carries out surveillance and monitoring programmes for safety purposes on its own dams, but has no authority to insist on its standards of safety being adhered to by private land holders. The Department of Agriculture publishes a bulletin titled 'Storing Water in Farm Dams' which gives farmers advice on how to construct small farm dams, but it is purely advisory and landowners are not obliged to adhere to the principles laid down.

The Government will shortly be considering a proposal for the preparation of a Bill for the establishment of a Dam Safety Act to be administered by a statutory authority. The Act will set down safety standards for large dams and dams which pose a danger to life. However, it is understood that only a small number of privately owned dams will fall into these categories.

HANDICAPPED PERSONS EQUAL OPPORTUNITY ACT

59. Mr BECKER (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Attorney-General:

1. Does the Government propose to amend the Handicapped Persons Equal Opportunity Act, 1981, to remove the discrimination against a person with an impairment to the intellect or a mental illness and, if not, why not?

2. Does the Government propose to repeal section 24 of the Act to remove its discriminatory nature and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The replies are as follows:

1. The Government does not propose the amendment to the Handicapped Persons Equal Opportunity Act, 1981, referred to by the honourable member. That Act deals with physical impairment. It is not considered an appropriate vehicle to deal with persons having intellectual impairments or mental illnesses.

2. No; as the Hon. K.T. Griffin observed during the Committee stage of the Bill for that Act:

'Suppose that a person in a wheelchair sought a job operating the blast furnace at the smelters. It may well be that that person would have to work on the floor near the blast furnace. However, that person may not be able to perform the task adequately and safely, and, if there was an emergency with spurting liquid metal involved, the person in the wheelchair may not be able to react with reasonable speed. It is that sort of situation that we are anxious to define clearly.'

A person with a disability should be considered in relation to whether the work can reasonably be undertaken without his injuring himself or other persons, and in relation to whether the disabled person could react adequately in emergency situations'.

REAL ESTATE COMPLAINT

62. Mr BECKER (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs: Was a Mr K. Conway called before the Land and Business Agents Board to give evidence following a complaint and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The person to whom the question refers had lodged a complaint with the Land and Business Agents Board against the actions of Southgate Realty, real estate agents, involving the sale of a property. I am informed that the Board, when assessing the merits of the complaint, had before it three letters written by Mr Conway and a statement made by the Manager of Southgate Realty. The Board also took into account the result of a civil action instituted by the purchaser of the property against Mr Conway. Damages amounting to \$25 000 were awarded against Mr Conway in respect to this action. The Board did not require Mr Conway's attendance before it because it considered that there was insufficient cause for disciplinary action to be taken against the agent.