

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 13 September 1984

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

PETITION: FIREARMS

A petition signed by 17 residents of South Australia praying that the House oppose legislation that further restricts the ownership and use of firearms but support the use of funds derived from gun licence fees for the promotion of sporting activities was presented by Mr Olsen.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

Petitions signed by 59 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to ensure that the course in early childhood education at Magill campus of the South Australian College of Advanced Education be retained in its present form were presented by the Hon. Michael Wilson and Mr Oswald.

Petitions received.

PETITIONS: KINDERGARTEN UNION

Petitions signed by 58 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 were presented by the Hon. Michael Wilson and Mr Oswald.

Petitions received.

QUESTION

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

Mr JAMES REID DICKSON

In reply to Mr **PETERSON** (16 August).

The **Hon. G.F. KENEALLY**: In order to be eligible for release on parole Mr Dickson must make application to the sentencing court to have a non-parole period set. So far he has declined to do so.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: CENTENNIAL PARK CEMETERY

The **Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Local Government)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. G.F. KENEALLY**: One brief remark I made yesterday in reply to a question from the member for Florey about the Centennial Park Cemetery is, I find, capable of misinterpretation. I said that I would be contacting the Centennial Park Trust and the two councils involved—Mitcham and Unley—to see what could be done about some changes proposed there. It is necessary for me to make clear publicly that, although the two councils named do appoint

representatives to that Trust, they are not themselves involved in the management. The Trust is completely autonomous.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: MEMBERS' SHAREHOLDINGS

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON**: On the Green Paper issued today, notice is given that I would be presenting a paper, giving notice of a motion or making a statement. In fact, I do intend, and I give notice to this House, to make a statement at the end of Question Time today concerning a matter that has been raised in this place and in another place on certain shareholdings of members of Parliament. The Attorney in another place will in fact be making a full statement in that Chamber, and I will be putting that before the House of Assembly at the end of Question Time.

QUESTION TIME

ADELAIDE RAILWAY STATION REDEVELOPMENT

Mr **OLSEN**: Can the Premier say whether an agreement finalised yesterday between unions and the major building contractor for the Adelaide Railway Station redevelopment project led to any further escalation in the cost of the project? Will the Government oppose claims for workers employed on this project to receive extra benefits through an employer funded superannuation scheme being sought by the building workers?

The cost of this project has already escalated by more than \$20 million in less than a year. The Government has a vital interest in limiting this escalation, as it must meet certain guarantees on the cost of the project and it will also be leasing the Convention Centre and the office space. Media reports yesterday stated that an agreement had been reached with unions to ensure industrial peace on the project. However, only this morning, the State Secretary of the Building and Construction Workers Federation, Mr Owens, said that, unless workers employed on the project are covered by the national employer funded superannuation scheme being sought by the union, industrial action will be taken to stop the project.

In view of this threat, made within less than 24 hours of an apparent agreement to secure industrial peace on the project, I seek information from the Government, because of its direct and vital interest in this matter, on the cost of the industrial peace agreement, in the first instance, and an assurance that it will strongly resist any further union claims which will increase the final cost of the project.

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON**: First, let me correct a statement made by the Leader. The cost has not escalated because of inflation: the cost increase in the overall project has (as has been explained often in the House) resulted from an increase in the size and scope of the Convention Centre and the improvement of the quality of finish and design in certain areas. The net result of that (that is, the extra \$20 million in the total cost of the project) will in fact yield better economic returns both to the Government as manager of the Convention Centre and the car park and to the overall project. So, I would make that clear. Secondly, the Leader of the Opposition refers to the industrial agreement that

has been mapped out for the project. I think that that should be hailed as a real example of the way in which things can be done in South Australia in respect of these major projects. Indeed, the success of making an agreement of this kind around a massive undertaking such as this will aid us in turn in the way in which we approach projects such as the submarine project, which the State Government and the South Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry and other interested parties are working hard to secure as well.

It is a credit and a tribute to the employers and the unions that got together and it is the sort of approach that the Deputy Premier has been encouraging in a whole series of such major projects. Indeed, it is a real key to South Australia's industrial relations successes. Therefore, I hope that the Leader of the Opposition will acknowledge that this method of approaching a major project is seen interstate, and indeed internationally, as being streets ahead of the anarchy that we have seen on some other projects in some other States. I sincerely hope that Opposition members do not try to undermine an agreement of this kind because, if they create agitation around such agreements, they will not only undermine the success of such projects but make it more difficult to secure such projects as a submarine base. They will also jeopardise the splendid industrial relations environment in South Australia.

I refer honourable members to the latest figures, which show that South Australia, in terms of the national proportion of industrial disputes, is way below the national average. In fact, we have a better industrial relations record at present than has Japanese industry, and I do not think that that is understood. Having put the agreement and the approach into its context, may I say that I have heard some of the statements attributed to Mr Owens concerning national claims and the national superannuation claim. Those matters will be dealt with as they always are, at the national level, but I am confident, as are the project managers and the unions, who have been involved at all stages, that we will see a major industrial success that will in turn ensure not only time tables but the quality. That is set in the context of the overall cost structures of South Australian industry. The key negotiators are in fact the lead contractors on dozens of projects around this city; so, it is nonsense to suggest that other than a perfectly appropriate agreement has been mapped out for what will be the most exciting project that we have seen in South Australia for many years.

TASMANIAN BUDGET

Mr TRAINER: Can the Premier, in his capacity as Treasurer, explain to the House whether the economic principles underlined in the budgetary measures announced in the Tasmanian Liberal Government's Budget are appropriate for tackling those economic problems which beset regional economies, such as those of Tasmania and South Australia? Yesterday the Hon. Robin Gray, Treasurer of the Tasmanian Liberal Government, presented his Budget speech to the House of Assembly. Tasmania's economy has suffered from regional problems, as has South Australia's economy, and I understand that Mr Gray's Budget tackled those problems, although his Budget details received very little coverage in the South Australian media.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is certainly true that Tasmania has had problems similar to those in South Australia of economic recession, and it is very interesting to see that the approach of the Tasmanian Liberal Government has been to try to reduce taxation in some areas and at the same time to institute some fairly drastic cuts in public sector employment. The net result of the general economic policies adopted by that Government sees it at present with

an unemployment rate of 11.2 per cent, which is well in excess of South Australia's unemployment rate and indeed is the highest in the country. I bring out that point only to emphasise an argument that I have consistently stressed that, particularly in the smaller regional economies, the role of the public sector is absolutely vital, particularly at a time of recession, to the general health of the economy.

If in fact one tries to run down the public sector, institutes major cut backs and allows the financial base to be eroded, then the effect on the private sector is very great indeed, bringing down the two. There is no coincidence that the depth of the recession in South Australia coincided with similar application of policies by the previous Liberal Government in this State. What is the consequence of that? Mr Gray, the Premier of Tasmania, has been in office a little longer than was the previous Liberal Government in this State and he is now in a position of having to face the consequences of those policies. Therefore, in the Budget that he brought down yesterday, faced with very difficult problems for which I fully sympathise with him—I know, as a State Treasurer, the real problem of the economic base and the problem of recession—he has had to bring in a Budget with a deficit in proportional terms nearly two times larger than the deficit of the South Australian Government, and at the same time he has accompanied that with a series of revenue raising measures.

For instance, he has raised driver's licence fees, incidentally, to a level above those in this State. He has raised motor vehicle registration, extended conveyance duty and stamp duties, and raised the business franchise on tobacco products to 35 per cent, which has been a very large hike indeed. So, he has taken those measures because he has seen the problem that his revenue base has got into. One of the most interesting aspects of this—

The Hon. D.C. Brown: He hasn't introduced FID.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No, he has not, and this is the point to which I am coming. He has introduced a cheque transaction tax, as I understand, not the same as FID, which will yield him some revenue. However, rather than see a broad based tax of the sort that the financial institutions duty is, he has chosen to raise revenue by putting a pay-roll tax surcharge of 1 per cent on employers whose individual group pay-roll exceeds \$5 million.

This is in the context of large scale unemployment, and I would draw the very clear distinction between what we did in this State and the application of the remedy there. Faced with the hard economic reality of the facts of life, we have ensured that our revenue raising measures to the smallest extent possible affected that direct employment factor and we have avoided the imposition of a pay-roll tax surcharge, recognising that it is regressive on employment.

On the contrary, we have consistently lifted the exemption level for pay-roll tax. There are a few lessons to be learnt, and I hope that Mr Gray sees that he must change policies in some respects if he is to survive in that context. However, it is a very important contrast that, faced with similar problems, the Tasmanian Government has a burgeoning deficit and has gone into a whole range of revenue raising measures, one of which includes doing something about pay-roll tax (putting a surcharge of 1 per cent on larger pay-rolls), and that can only work against employment. It is about time that Opposition members who support the political philosophies of the Premier of Tasmania understood that he was on the right track and started supporting what their State Government is doing.

UNDER TREASURER

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Premier tell the House on what date the Under Treasurer (Mr Barnes)

will officially retire and whether it is the Government's intention to appoint Mr Bruce Guerin, at present Director-General of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, to replace Mr Barnes?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Mr Barnes will be retiring in early November and steps are already under way to identify a successor.

CONTAINER DEPOSITS

Mr FERGUSON: Can the Minister for Environment and Planning inform the House whether his Department is contemplating any changes to the beer bottle return and collection system? I have received correspondence from the 1st Grange Scout group located in my electorate. The correspondence states that the scout group has been advised that the State Government intends to introduce legislation which will increase the deposit on all beer bottles. They believe that this deposit will be a minimum of 5 cents and perhaps as high as 20 cents. The collection of beer bottles is a valuable form of income for all scouting groups, and they have stated that the deposit suggested would be so high that it would cause a loss of revenue to the scouting organisations in general and to the 1st Grange Scout group in particular. The scouting group has suggested that there are few effective ways of fund raising, and they consider that the deposit on bottles should not be made so high as to jeopardise their present bottle collection.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I, too, have had my attention drawn to what seems to be a strong rumour floating around the place, and I think that the other component—

Mr Lewis: It's more than a rumour.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: If the honourable member would be patient, I think I can enlighten him. The other component of the concern of the scout group would be how the deposit would be redeemed because, if the deposit is to be redeemed at the point of sale, that is the point at which their capacity to pick up stray pieces of glass here and there so that the return goes to the scouts would be reduced, because people would be redeeming at the point of sale.

I can give an assurance to the honourable member, the scouts and to the House generally that it is not the Government's intention to increase deposits on pickaxe bottles to 5 cents, 20 cents or anything like that. I think I know how this story got around. Last week I wrote to the industry generally—at least I signed the letters early last week and I think they went in the post on Friday—in respect of the premium container. Some members, in fact practically all members, are more familiar with the contents of these things than am I, so I appreciate that I am an unsophisticate in the midst of those who are experts.

However, as I understand it, there is a distinction as to the contents in the container. There is what is called premier beer that is marketed in one trip bottles and then there is the normal sort of beer that is marketed in the 750 ml or echo pickaxe bottles. My letter did not in any way relate to the 750 ml or echo bottles: it related to the premium containers, and the letter made clear that where—

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Getting a bit touchy about that, are you?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I am answering the honourable member's question. Where a premium container is sold at a bottle outlet, it must be subject to a 5 cent deposit, redeemable at point of sale, and where retailers are selling these containers free of deposit they are technically breaching the Act. The letter was not canvassing a change to procedures but was simply making retailers aware of their responsibilities at this point. It would appear, from the information that is now available to me, that this practice has become relatively

widespread. There has been an increase in the sales of premium beers in recent times, particularly following the very successful launch of the South Australian Brewery's green bottle.

At one time it was mainly the imported beers that were packaged in this way. On bottles sold simply for consumption at the point of sale no deposit need apply, but when they are sold from bottle shops and the drive-in bottle departments of hotels, if no deposit applies technically there is a breach of the Act. Having had this matter drawn to my attention, I thought it was obvious that people should be made aware of their legal responsibilities.

Therefore, I have written to the industry and I have stipulated that the industry must get itself into gear by 1 November. In other words, no prosecutions for breaches of the Act will be made until that time. We expect the industry to alter its marketing procedures to ensure that from that date premium beers will be sold only for table consumption in restaurants or that such beer will be sold subject to a five cent deposit to be redeemable at the point of sale. As honourable members will have noted, none of that relates in any way to the normal pickaxe system.

LIQUOR LICENCE FEES

Mr INGERSON: Will the Premier give a commitment that any reduction in liquor licence fees to offset the impact of the Federal sales tax on wine will be applied to all liquor retailers and not just to those engaged in cellar door wine sales? In this House on 28 August the Leader of the Opposition suggested that there should be a small reduction in liquor licence fees because of the significant increase in revenue that will be obtained from the fees that will be generated by the introduction of the Federal sales tax on wine. In his response to those comments at that time and in statements reported in the *Advertiser* on 1 September, the Premier rejected that suggestion. However, a report in this morning's *Advertiser* indicates that the Premier may be having a change of mind. The report quotes the Premier as saying that the Government will consider lowering liquor licence fees in regard to cellar door wine sales. Such a move would discriminate against hotels and other liquor retailers which sell significant quantities of wine. I therefore seek a commitment from the Premier that any reduction in liquor licence fees will be applied across the board.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I thank the honourable member for his question. In any statements made on this issue I have always made it clear that we are obviously keeping the matter under review. Members will recall that we have already reduced by 1 per cent the liquor sales tax from the level stipulated in the legislation. In fact, the Government will continue to keep the matter under review. The report to which the honourable member referred details a response that I made to a question on a particular aspect of this issue at a meeting of the Wine Press Club yesterday. I had not directly considered the question in the way in which it was framed: it referred to the fact that cellar door wine sales are as much a part of the tourist aspect of the wine industry as is the actual selling of liquor.

That is certainly a fact. It has been a long and continuing tradition here in South Australia that people who want to experience the delights of the wine industry, which is very much fundamental to our whole tourist promotion, enjoy going to wineries, doing wine tastings, and purchasing liquor as a result of those wine tastings. Various classes of licences and considerable liberalisation of the laws have been introduced to assist that aspect of what I would call the tourist industry rather than the liquor sales industry.

It was pointed out that in recent years, largely because of the widespread discounting of liquor—of wine in particular—that has been going on cellar door sales have not provided a price discount as they used to do. Indeed, I do recall an article by Stewart Cockburn some years ago in which he drew attention to this fact—the disappointment of people going on tour to the winery, purchasing wine and discovering that it cost more than it would if they had bought it from their local liquor store. That is a problem that the wineries have not been able to overcome because of the retail mechanisms and price system in the wine industry.

The question was: in view of that are there ways and means in which we can reduce the price of cellar door wine as part of an overall tourist promotion? One suggestion that is in the control of the State Government would be to look at it in terms of the general liquor turnover tax. I said that that was an interesting suggestion which I would certainly be willing to look at as part of an overall review. In other words, perhaps a case can be established to provide some special arrangements to allow vigneron selling at the cellar door to tourists not to have to pay the same level of duty.

I understand, but I have not had time to investigate it since the question was first put to me, that some sort of arrangement like that applies in New South Wales. There is, in fact, a flat fee that applies to vigneron making direct cellar door sales. I have given an undertaking to investigate that and will do so, because I think that we should be keen to promote this tourist aspect of the wine industry.

ADDRESSING CHAIR

Mrs APPLEBY: Can you, Mr Speaker, make more clear for the benefit of all in this House the problem of how the Chair is addressed in the absence of the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker? I ask this question in the interest of members of this House, who on many occasions appear to be quite tongue tied and confused in addressing the minority gender when they take the Chair in this House. I refer to Standing Order 26 and suggest the use of the term specified in that Standing Order should be acceptable to all members in this House.

The SPEAKER: I thank the honourable member for her question and the notice that she gave me. In the event of any member other than the Speaker or Deputy Speaker taking the Chair, that person may be addressed as 'Mr Acting', 'Madam Acting Deputy Speaker' or simply as 'Mr Acting' or 'Madam Acting Speaker'. In the event of any member other than the Chairman of Committees taking the Chair in the Committee stages of a Bill or on any occasion where the presence of the Chairman is otherwise contemplated, that person should be referred to as 'Mr Acting Chairman' or 'Madam Acting Chairman', as the case may be.

EYRE PENINSULA SCHOOLS

Mr BLACKER: Can the Minister of Education obtain a report and advise this House on the programme of redevelopment of the Wudinna Area School, and can he also advise on the maintenance programme for the Cowell and Lock Area Schools? There is concern amongst the school councils at the aforementioned schools that maintenance is being neglected. In the case of Wudinna, maintenance programmes are apparently being deferred pending a redevelopment programme.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question. I will certainly obtain for him specific answers on each of the schools at Lock, Cowell and

Wudinna. The situation regarding Wudinna Area School is well known to me. I have visited that school both as Minister and before I entered Parliament, so I am aware of its redevelopment needs. Indeed, they have been brought to my attention by the honourable member and by other honourable members both in this House and in another place. One of the problems from which Wudinna has suffered is that it did have a place on the priority ranking of redevelopment of schools in South Australia in the early 1980s, but was dropped off at that stage and was not put back on again under the previous Government.

The problem we had to face was to deal with all the competing priority needs of other redevelopment projects around the State and determine how they should be met according to funds that are available. I am well aware that there is particular anxiety in the case of the Wudinna Area School, given the fact that an indication had been given earlier by the previous Government about its redevelopment, which up until now has not been adhered to.

One of the points raised by the honourable member is the impact of a promised redevelopment upon maintenance programmes conducted at a school. That clearly has been a historic problem in regard to schools throughout the State over many years. Members could quote examples of such a situation, and I could quote one example of a school in the Murray lands having its stage 1 redevelopment done this year although it had been promised redevelopment in 1962. That redevelopment is now taking place 22 years later. That school had written about the catch 22 problem that it had: every time it asked for some upgrading or some maintenance, it was refused because the school was to be redeveloped, and when it asked about redevelopment it was told that it was coming, but it never did seem to come. There is in fact a problem that takes place with schools in that situation.

I have asked officers in my Department to examine ways in which the two can be reconciled with each other, whether or not it is possible to consider the expenditure of certain sums that can be defined in some sense as maintenance but could also be defined in some sense as being upgrading within the context of a concept plan for a school, while not actually achieving a substantial redevelopment in the immediate term and deferring major redevelopment for an immediate term or longer term.

I believe that there should be such possibilities regarding a number of schools in South Australia. It really invites the question of rather than just having a minor works programme and a major works programme (which is stage redevelopment for most schools) having what one might define as a medium works programme, which would see moderate sums of money being available to some schools and which would assist with some upgrading within the context of a major redevelopment plan. That is something I have put to my officers, and I know that they will be discussing it also with officers of the department of my colleague the Minister of Public Works to determine just how feasible that type of proposition is. As to the specifics relating to the schools at Cowell and Lock, I will get back to the honourable member on them as well as the questions raised about Wudinna Area School.

WOMEN MEMBERS' HATS

Mr MAX BROWN: My question is to you, Mr Speaker, and it might be regarded as supplementary to the question asked by the member for Brighton. Will you, Sir, investigate changing Parliamentary Standing Orders to allow for women members of another place, if not of this place, to wear hats when speaking or asking questions in the Chamber?

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

Mr MAX BROWN: I suggest that the member for Glenelg ought to be in this too, because if anyone needs a hat he does.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MAX BROWN: I can only say that the member for Glenelg is jealous of my head of hair. I ask the question seriously, and it arises from the fact that periodically women members of the House (and the latest occasion involved the member for Mawson) are deprived of their right to wear a hat whilst speaking or asking questions. As I understand the Parliamentary system, our Standing Orders originated from the Westminster system. According to Erskine May, women peers of the House of Lords may wear a hat when speaking, without seeking permission of the House. It seems to me that this Parliament surely provides for women members of the other place to wear hats (and I do not suggest that those members are peers or anything like that); that being so, surely we should be able to change our Standing Orders to allow women to wear hats in this Chamber.

The SPEAKER: I thank the honourable member for his interest and his question. I will endeavour to continue our research into the matter. However, I point out that, first, the House of Lords has no Standing Orders as such. Members of the House of Lords have practices and they have developed their own Standing Orders on a day-to-day basis, so it is difficult to find a precedent there. Regarding the House of Commons, my research indicates that women did not get the franchise until 1925, yet the Commons was clearly sitting in the fourteenth century, if not in the thirteenth century and, by the time proper historical records were kept in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, it was common for men to wear hats inside public places. It appears that they would remove their hats in deference to a person that they knew or out of respect for a place.

I think that the member for Ascot Park mentioned in a recent speech that one of the most ancient meeting places in the Palace of Westminster was St Stephen's Hall, and at times that was used as a Parliament, a law court and a chapel at the same time. So, possible reasons lie everywhere. That is as far as I have been able to get in my research, but I will ask my officers whether we can proceed further.

WELFARE ORGANISATIONS

Mr BAKER: Will the Minister of Community Welfare say whether the Government is benefiting from the delay in the provision of Federal funding to welfare organisations, and what action is being taken to alleviate the critical funding shortages arising in those organisations as a result of delays? Recently, publicity has been given to the Salvation Army and the situation that its hostels are facing. Further, I understand that other organisations that provide such relief are in a similar situation. I have been informed that the State Government has received the appropriate funds, that interest is being received on those funds, and that several agencies are being forced to seek other forms of finance such as overdraft so as to be able to continue the programmes for which they are responsible. My question relates to the benefits and to any action being taken by the Government.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The honourable member refers to Commonwealth funded programmes in the community, and I believe that the programmes to which he has specifically referred are still the subject of discussions between the State Governments and the Commonwealth Government, especially involving the Minister for Social Security. Recently, a Ministerial conference discussed the additional funding provided by the Commonwealth Government for these programmes, and meetings are currently under way

between State and Commonwealth officers to clarify the programmes and to determine how the additional funds shall be spent. I assure the honourable member and the House that, as soon as that matter is clarified, those funds will be made available to those organisations. I understand that interim payments have already been made to those organisations currently providing programmes, but it is the additional funding that the Commonwealth Government has indicated it will provide which the honourable member wants paid.

Such funding is in the main for new initiatives and new programmes. I am carrying out the wishes of the Commonwealth Government and of State Governments as a result of the agreements that have been reached. Proper accountability and proper programmes need to be established, and those organisations would be harmed if money were to be paid on an *ad hoc* basis and it turned out that continued funding could not be provided. Indeed, the very persons that those organisations are trying to help would be harmed if that was not clarified. I assure the honourable member that every step is being taken to ensure that these moneys are spent as speedily and as properly as we can spend them.

TORRENS ISLAND POWER STATION

Mr GREGORY: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy say what action has been taken by the Electricity Trust of South Australia to prepare for the possible conversion of part of the Torrens Island Power Station to burn black coal? The Stewart Committee recommended that work should continue on the possible conversion of Torrens Island plant to burn imported black coal, to the point where tenders could be called for plant if necessary. It further recommended that work should commence on the preparation of an environmental impact statement.

Mr BAKER: I rise on a point of order. I understand that question No. 56 on the Notice Paper deals with this matter.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order. I will allow this question on the grounds that it is more general than the question on the Notice Paper.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Tenders for engineering studies and the preparation of an environmental impact statement for the partial conversion of plant at Torrens Island to burn black coal close with ETSA today. I think that I would not be the only person who would necessarily hope that such a conversion would not prove necessary and that a supply of gas of sufficient quantity and at a suitable price would be available so that we can continue to utilise the excellent capacity of Torrens Island, which is currently operating on natural gas.

However, should the Cooper Basin producers prove unable to come forward with a supply of gas, or should the price proposed by the producers be too high, clearly the steps that I have outlined will mean that ETSA will be in a position to carry out the conversion and continue the supply of electricity required in South Australia.

THE IMPORTANCE OF ENERGY

Mr ASHENDEN: Will the Minister of Education indicate what action he has taken in relation to the book *The Importance of Energy*, which is a prescribed textbook in the Education Department? I have a letter that was written to

the Minister of Education by a concerned parent about this book, and I would like to place on record the letter that the Minister received, as follows:

Dear Sir,

Re: *The Importance of Energy* pupils book

My daughter, who is a year 10 pupil of the South Australian Correspondence School, has shown me her copy of the abovenamed text, published by Peter Leyden Publishing of Sydney, NSW. The text contains many errors in all sections, but I wish to draw your attention to sections 10 and 11 of the text relating to nuclear energy.

The expectation of parents is that their children in school, particularly in regard to science subjects, will be taught scientific facts and not pseudo-scientific gobbledegook. Sections 10 and 11 of this text can only be described as a propaganda document of the irrational elements of the anti-nuclear activists.

I strongly object to a school textbook presenting a tissue of outright lies, false assumptions and half-truths to the children of this State and the country as being the basis of nuclear energy. This despicable attempt to mislead our youth about one of science's greatest achievements must be stopped and corrected.

I demand the immediate withdrawal of this material from the schools and its replacement with a text relating to science, not fantasy. If possible, the children who have already been exposed to this vile propaganda should be advised of withdrawal and the reasons for it.

The letter is signed, and I will not give the gentleman's name but, more importantly, I will give his qualifications: he is a Bachelor of Science, majoring in environmental science.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I would like to answer this question in some detail. I am somewhat constrained, I might say, by page 35 of today's *News*. I wish to do a service to the honourable member, so I hope that members will indulge me a little. The matter raised by the member for Todd has already been raised with me by the Minister of Mines and Energy, who sent me a minute on this matter some time ago because he had received similar concerns about the publication mentioned.

I referred that matter to the Education Department, to the Correspondence School and to officers of various sections of the Department concerning the allegations made about the content of that book. The response I received said that much of the information in the book is accurate. However, it is true that there are certain sections in it (the member for Todd has referred to some) that do contain inaccuracies. The officer said that they were proposing to cover over those inaccurate sections. My initial reaction was to be concerned about that kind of process because I have noticed previously in books in school libraries that where some attempts at censorship have taken place all that does is to encourage the student to find out what is under the blacked over printing.

So, I asked to see a copy of the booklet before I forwarded a reply to my colleague, the Minister of Mines and Energy. I duly received and read the whole booklet and I can confirm that most of the information contained in the sections other than those referred to is not only very interesting but accurate. However, it is true that other sections in that book are not accurate. As I was leafing through the book on initial reading, I found that I had reached the end cover without finding out what pages had been over-pasted. I then went back specifically to find them and could find what pages had sections pasted over them, but it was discreetly done and not immediately observable to me as a reader.

An overpasting has been done of sections of that book so that the other sections which are accurate and presented in an interesting way can still be available to students within the education system without, at the same time, trying to encourage them to peel off the pasted sections. It is acknowledged that there are sections in that book that were inaccurate and which did not add to the education of children in this matter.

WATER PUMPING

Mr MAYES: Can the Minister of Water Resources inform the House about costs related to pumping water from the Murray River to metropolitan reservoirs? In yesterday's edition of the *News*, Mr Gilfillan in another place claimed that more than \$600 000 had been spent on pumping water from the Murray River in July and August to metropolitan storages. He claimed that this money spent on electricity costs had been wasted because reservoirs had spilled following heavy rains in August. I ask the Minister to clarify the situation.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I welcome the opportunity to put the issue in its proper perspective and say that, if the Hon. Mr Gilfillan had sought from me or my Department the correct information before making those statements, he would have been better informed. The facts as related by the honourable member and reported in the press are incorrect and I welcome the opportunity to put the record straight.

The total amount of money spent on pumping water from the Murray River to the metropolitan supply systems during July and August was \$629 000. It was made up of three components: the Mannum to Adelaide pipeline, \$270 000; the Murray Bridge to Onkaparinga pipeline, \$33 000; and other miscellaneous pumping costs, \$326 000. The figure of \$326 000 was not related in any way to pumping water from the Murray River. The costs were associated with internal transfers between pressure zones. As most members would realise, there are a number of pumping stations in the metropolitan area which transfer water to elevated tanks so that in turn consumers can be supplied through gravitation.

The \$33 000 associated with the Murray Bridge to Onkaparinga pipeline is not directly related to supplying water in relation to the reservoirs, but rather to supplying water to townships en route on that pipeline. Those townships are all in the Adelaide Hills area and water is supplied to them by means of off-takes from the pipeline. That is the most economic method of providing water to those areas, and I point out that it is standard procedure. No water was pumped into storages through the pipeline during July and August.

In regard to the \$270 000 related to costs associated with the Adelaide to Mannum pipeline, about \$10 000 of that amount was used to supply water to townships en route. In addition, costs associated with pumping to the Warren and South Para reservoir system to maintain target storages were about \$50 000. At present that system is 53 per cent full while the majority of metropolitan reservoirs are over 90 per cent full. Therefore, there is no possibility of any water spillage occurring. The balance of the costs of the programme are related to pumping based on computer calculations.

In summary, no money has been unnecessarily wasted as far as pumping is concerned, as I have outlined in the facts I have just related to the House. As I have said earlier, it would be advantageous for members who are not aware of all aspects of the matter to ascertain the facts before making statements. I do not know whether they seek to obtain some political advantage by trying to convey to the public that the Government is unnecessarily wasting taxpayers' funds. That has not occurred in this case, as I have demonstrated in my reply to the question.

SPEED LIMIT

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I refer to the Government's decision to reduce the maximum speed limit to 100 km/h. Will the Minister of Transport say whether the Government will reconsider the decision to reduce the maximum speed limit from 110 km/h to 100 km/h, thereby maintaining the

existing limit? The evidence that I have from a study shows that most people will continue to drive at the same speed, regardless of the legal limit. A comparison of actual speeds driven on the open road between South Australia, where the limit is 110, Victoria and New South Wales, where the limit is 100, and New Zealand, where the limit is 90 km/h shows that in actual fact most motor cars travel at exactly the same speed in all four locations.

If that is the case, a reduction in the speed limit to 100 km/h will simply provide a revenue raiser for the Government and will certainly not reduce the road toll. I also ask the Minister to table any evidence to the contrary that he may have. So far the Government has not produced any such evidence. I would be the first to support such a move if it resulted in the saving of lives, but certainly the evidence that I have indicates that it will raise money for the Government but not save lives.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: There has been much debate on the matter of open road speed limits. A reduction from 110 km/h to 100 km/h in itself would not necessarily produce a major effect on road safety. However, I believe that uniformity is very important—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Uniformity with neighbouring States is very important. If in future it is thought advisable to change speed limits, I think that that can be achieved through the Australian Transport Advisory Council. I have had approaches on this matter from the Federal Minister, Mr Morris. The member for Davenport asked whether I was able to table any information. The Government, and my Department in particular, are currently collating a lot of the information on speed limits, and I have information which indicates that overseas experience suggests that reduced speed limits have led to a reduction in the frequency and severity of accidents.

Changes in speed limits on rural roads in several countries have had a major effect. For example, let us look at the European experience. In Finland there was a speed limit of 100 km/h, which was reduced to 80 km/h. The accident reduction there was 43 per cent. In Sweden, the speed limit was previously 110 km/h, which was reduced to 90 km/h, with a 30 per cent accident reduction.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: If the member for Mallee will be patient, I will get to other areas. He has been very impatient. In Denmark the speed limit was 90 km/h, which was reduced to 80 km/h, with a 17 per cent lower accident rate. In West Germany, where no speed limit applied, it introduced a 130 km/h limit, and as a result of reduction it is minus—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Have honourable members finished? If one looks at the American experience, when a 55 miles an hour (90 km/h) open speed limit was introduced a significant improvement in road safety was noted during the following two years. However, the effects of that speed limit were eroded two years afterwards, although fatalities remained at a level lower than expected had the limits not been reduced.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I place a high importance on uniformity and I think that, if this matter is discussed at the ATAC conference, we can reach uniformity with the other States. That is the Government's plan.

MORPHETT VALE EAST DEVELOPMENT

Ms LENEHAN: Can the Minister for Environment and Planning report to the House on the development of the Morphett Vale East area? I ask this question in light of the urgent need for land for home building and also the need to provide adequate facilities and services for the orderly development of this area. I have recently written to the Premier and to the Minister for Environment and Planning requesting that a manager/co-ordinator be appointed to facilitate the co-ordinated development of the Morphett Vale East area.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Yes, I can report on this matter because very interesting and important things have happened. The Morphett Vale East area is, of course, one that has been designated for some time as the next major urban development area in the south. Of course, a considerable amount of that land is in public ownership through the Urban Land Trust. For development to occur two things at least have to happen: first, the area has to be appropriately zoned and, secondly, it must be in the hands of people who are in a position to develop it.

That second point is important because, of course, under legislation which was introduced by the previous Government the Urban Land Trust is not able to develop the land that it holds. But, that was modified by this Parliament to provide that joint ventures can be entered into. In any event, what has happened is this: first, using section 43 of the Planning Act (which is a section that this Parliament recently entrenched into the Planning Act, whereas previously it had been sunset legislation) the Government, in concert with the City of Noarlunga, has rezoned three strips of land in that complex which are, in effect, immediately adjacent to services and therefore can be subdivided as quickly as the other matters can be got off the ground. Using section 43 was a fast track method of ensuring that a process of rezoning which might otherwise have taken many months could occur in a short space of time.

Secondly, we have then determined to auction these parcels of land as appropriate to private industry so that subdivision can proceed. As recently as 5 September (a very important date on the calendar—my birthday) two parcels of land, one of 25.3 hectares and another of 7.467 hectares, were auctioned. There is a condition on the sale, and that is that the new owners must proceed with the plan of subdivision within 12 months. Two other strips of land have been rezoned: one of these is currently in the process of a resubdivision which will change it from one parcel of land into three parcels of land, and two of those will be offered for sale to private industry just as soon as the resubdivision is completed. There is a third strip of land towards the southern end of the area, and that is subject to certain planning considerations in view of a road that is to be put through there. However, as soon as possible that will be available for development. The matter is proceeding.

I turn to the other matter raised by the honourable member in her explanation, namely, the suggestion that she put to me and to the Premier. It is certainly true that co-ordination will be an important factor in the development of this area because, as opposed to the Tea Tree Gully and Golden Grove development, where a joint venture is being negotiated between a private developer and the Government, in the south the land is under various ownerships, and we must ensure that the whole thing is pulled together in a co-ordinated way. Land use planning can be quite effectively co-ordinated through my Department. The matter of the co-ordination of the provision of human services is, however, a matter for the Government as a whole. The piece of mechanism identified by the honourable member is currently being investigated by the Government and that or something

like it will clearly have to be put into place if proper co-ordination of the services is to proceed. I will report further on that matter, and I thank the honourable member for her suggestion.

PARKLANDS

Mr LEWIS: I would like to know from the Premier why the Government has decided to build flats on land which was originally designated as parkland by Colonel Light.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Where? In asking the question the honourable member did not explain it. A lot of questions are asked which I believe do not need an explanation, but I would have thought that this one did require an explanation. I am not aware that I have given any such approval or permission. If the member would like to supply details, I would be very happy to respond.

HORSE-RACE RING-IN

Mr PETERSON: Could the Minister of Recreation and Sport say whether, if a situation similar to the Fine Cotton ring-in which recently took place in Queensland occurred in South Australia the public could expect a more effective procedure to be used in any subsequent investigation? All members are aware of the ineffective inquiry that was conducted by the Queensland Turf Club where witnesses would not appear or refused to answer questions when they attended the inquiry. I have been asked whether the interests of South Australians involved in the sport of horse-racing would be better protected under our respective inquiry rules, or could we anticipate a similar situation to that which applied in Queensland because of unenforceable and toothless procedures?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: First, I would like to say that I hope sufficient precautions have been taken by the respective authorities and the racing club stewards to ensure that that sort of thing does not happen in South Australia. However, knowing the nature of the industry, there are a few scallywags who, because of the large amount of money that changes hands, are inclined to make a quick buck. It is not my job to comment on the events that happened in Queensland, because I am aware of the numerous conflict that has occurred in the press reports that have been made in every national and State paper over the last three or four weeks.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: They were fairly consistent.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: There are some conflicts in matters relating to that event. I believe that 99 per cent of the racing industry is clean and that we need to worry only about the remaining 1 per cent. If such an event occurred in South Australia, I would expect the authorities to act more immediately in regard to any inquiry and that that inquiry would have effect at law. As I understand it, in Queensland the stewards inquiry had no effect in law. Certainly, if it happened here I would want to ensure that the perpetrators in the event would be apprehended before they left the race course because it is a fraud.

In reply to the honourable member, I hope that if it did happen in South Australia action would be taken immediately and, as Minister, I would ensure that the action taken would have an effect at law to apprehend the offenders almost immediately.

SPEAKER'S RULING

The SPEAKER: Last evening I indicated my concern about a member who had risen on the last two sitting days

at the end of the adjournment debate and sought leave to make a personal explanation. While a member has the right under Standing Orders to seek leave of the House to make a personal explanation at any time, the practice of the House has evolved whereby the Speaker gives the member the call at the next appropriate break in proceedings, when there is no question before the House. However, once the House has embarked on the adjournment debate it is with the full expectation that it will adjourn 30 minutes later without further discussion taking place. I believe that it is inappropriate for a personal explanation to be sought then.

It is a practice which could have unfortunate results, where it could snowball, and the best solution in my view is for the member to seek leave at the end of Question Time on the next sitting day. At the same time, I recognise that if a member feels that he has been reflected on in some way during the adjournment debate he may feel impelled to resolve the matter as soon as possible. My answer to that dilemma is to ask all members to refrain from reflecting on other members at any time and to take special care during the adjournment debate.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I appreciate the direction you have just given. Is it intended that it will extend to the taking of reports from another place? It has been the practice in this House that at the end of the adjournment such reports are taken before the House adjourns.

The SPEAKER: No. I had under consideration only the situation of a personal explanation.

Mr EVANS: I rise on a point of order. There is one critical error that I would like you to clarify. When, on the last sitting night before a break, a member believes that he has been reflected upon, I think that the House would be wise then to give that member an opportunity to correct it, because it could be weeks or months before the member had a chance to do so. When we know that it is the last night before a break, the member should be given the right to correct the situation if he believes that he has been reflected upon as an individual.

The SPEAKER: I think we can develop a flexible system if all members co-operate.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: MEMBERS' SHAREHOLDINGS

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In the past few days the Opposition has sought to make various allegations concerning certain conduct of the member for Elizabeth and the Hon. J.A.W. Levy and the Hon. K.L. Milne in the Legislative Council. Those allegations, stemming in particular from the Leader of the Opposition and from the Hon. K.T. Griffin in another place, have attempted to impugn the propriety and legality of the conduct of those members of the South Australian Parliament in having sold various of their respective shareholdings in Festival City Broadcasters Ltd to the Totalisator Agency Board. It is further alleged that those members have contravened certain provisions of the Constitution Act and thereby forfeited their legal entitlement to sit in this Parliament. In response to these developments I consulted the Attorney-General and asked him to commission a report from the Solicitor-General of South Australia, the memorandum of which I now table in this Chamber. Although it is not customary to table advice from Crown Law Office, I have decided to make an exception in this case.

The conclusions of the learned Solicitor-General are, in essence, twofold. First, he concludes that, even assuming there has been a breach or contravention of the relevant provisions of the Constitution Act by the members in question, the proper forum for hearing and determining the question of any Parliamentary vacancy that may arise is the respective Houses of Parliament to which the members belong.

Secondly, the Solicitor-General concludes that in any event there is no cause to raise in the respective Houses the question of any vacancy. Put simply, the Solicitor-General advises that there has been no breach or contravention of the relevant provisions of the Constitution Act by the members in question. The Solicitor-General's advice is based on the following considerations:

(1) The Full Court of the Supreme Court of South Australia, in the 1939 case of *Stott v. Parker*, concluded that the effect of section 43 of the Constitution Act was to leave to the Houses of Parliament the right to hear and determine the question of any vacancy;

(2) The Statute law of South Australia does not contain provisions like those found in the Commonwealth Electoral Act whereby questions of vacancies are to be referred to the Court of Disputed Returns;

(3) Parliamentary precedents show clearly that it is, in the absence of Statute law which ordains otherwise, for the Houses and the Houses alone to hear and determine questions of vacancies;

(4) The history of provisions like section 49 (1) (a) and section 50 of the Constitution Act (the provisions which the Opposition has largely sought to rely upon in this matter) shows that the acts of the members in question (that is, selling shares) are not, and were never, intended to be the subject matter of them;

(5) The former Chief Justice of the High Court, Sir Garfield Barwick, in the 1975 case of *in re Webster* considered the effect of the analogous provisions in the Commonwealth Constitution and concluded that they had only a very limited scope or area of application, which would indicate they do not apply to the present circumstances;

(6) The Supreme Court of Queensland had concluded, in a 1959 decision, that it would be wrong to conclude that any contract with the Crown or a State instrumentality is a contract 'for or on account of' the Government of the State. That Court concluded 'for or on account of' (the same phrase that appears in section 49 (1) (a) of our Constitution Act) does not mean 'with'; instead, the phrase relates to the subject matter of the contract, and it must be established that such subject matter deals with a matter of the Government of the State, such as the supply of goods, money or labour for the benefit of the public. Private contracts for the sale of shares in 5AA just do not fit that description;

(7) The fact that there exists, and has existed since 1981, an opinion of a former Crown Solicitor to the effect that the Totalisator Agency Board is not a Crown agency or instrumentality.

I would like especially to dwell on some of the comments made by Sir Garfield Barwick in the 1975 case to which the Solicitor-General has referred. The former Chief Justice indicated that, for contracts to be caught by the provisions of a law whose purpose is identical to that of sections 49 and 50 of the Constitution Act, they must be:

- (i) 'executory contracts': that is, contracts under which at the relevant time something needs to be done by the contractor in performance of the contract;
- (ii) contracts which 'have a currency for a substantial period of time'; and

- (iii) contracts 'under which the Crown could conceivably influence the contractor in relation to Parliamentary affairs by the very existence of the agreement'.

His Honour went on to observe:

In the climate of the eighteenth century, the likelihood of such influence upon a Government contractor could well be thought to be high. Accordingly, the mere existence of a supply contract justified the disqualification. But in modern business and departmental conditions the possibility of influence by the Crown is not so apparent;

His Honour also considered that the provisions ought to be interpreted strictly, because penal consequences are attached to them. (I need only refer honourable members to section 53 of the Constitution Act.) In accordance with ordinary rules of statutory interpretation, this strict view ensures that the liberties of the person are not unduly affected. His Honour also made the following observations, on the facts before him, which are pertinent to the present facts:

After a good deal of consideration, I have come to the conclusion that the agreement so formed does not come within the operation of s.44 (v). The agreement really has no term. It is not continuing: it is really casual and transient. I cannot conceive that, in these days, the Crown could exert any influence in Parliamentary affairs by anything it could do, properly or improperly, in relation to such an agreement. There are but bare theoretical possibilities unrelated to the practical affairs of business and departmental life, but these are not really conceivable.

The result of this opinion of Sir Garfield Barwick is that provisions on Government contractors (that is sections 49 and 50) do not—and were never intended to—deal with the sort of fact situation that the members in question have found themselves in. Their contracts for sale of shares are not executory: nothing remains for them to do. Their contracts did not have a long life span: they were transient. And the suggestion or implication that the Government could in some way be or be seen to be influencing those members of Parliament in relation to the affairs of Parliament is untenable. Where is the fairness in denying these members (or penalising them for the exercise by them of) the right to divest themselves of shares in 5AA in common with others?

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Leave has been granted.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The so-called free enterprise side of politics is finding considerable difficulty with these propositions.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: There is another set of rules, and you know it.

The SPEAKER: If honourable members wish to hear the Premier, I suggest that there be no further interjections.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I ask what would have happened if the provisions of the Companies (Acquisition of Shares) Code had applied. This would be so if the TAB had acquired 20 per cent of the 5AA shares on the basis of fair market dealings. In such a situation, these members (assuming that they had not already divested themselves of their holdings and were part of the remaining 80 per cent) would have been entitled to a similar offer from the TAB.

Would it have been fair to deny these members the right to entertain such an offer when all other remaining shareholders would have had that right? Surely basic notions of justice would be disturbed if they were denied that right. Is the Opposition suggesting that a member of Parliament must involuntarily retain his shareholding for so long as he remains a member?

Let me draw the attention of honourable members to another point. The Electricity Trust of South Australia is a Crown authority or instrumentality (see *Electricity Trust of South Australia v. Linterns Ltd* [1950] S.A.S.R. 133—a decision of the South Australian Supreme Court). Its constituting

Act was introduced in 1945 by the Playford Government and vested in ETSA the undertaking of the Adelaide Electric Supply Company. By section 31 of the ETSA Act it was provided that payment to shareholders of the superseded company was to be made by ETSA: that payment was fixed at the market value of the shares as at 1 August 1945 plus interest computed in certain ways, depending on the nature of the shareholders.

Two recipients of ETSA moneys were Liberal and Country League members of the Legislative Council: namely, the Hon. J.L.S. Bice and Sir Collier Cudmore. Mr Bice admitted in Parliament that he was a shareholder (he had perhaps £400 invested; his wife had several small parcels). Mr Cudmore, as he then was, appears to have had a far larger holding than Bice's. I assume that Messrs Bice and Cudmore were compensated by ETSA. It appears from the Parliamentary debates that no comment was made by anybody as to the propriety or legality of Messrs Bice and Cudmore having received moneys from a Crown authority for their shareholdings which I assume occurred.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Is leave withdrawn?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is also worth noting that the combined shareholding of Messrs Duncan and Milne and Ms Levy was 3.1 per cent. There had been more than 90 per cent of shareholders who had accepted the TAB offer, there being in fact only five shareholders with 1.12 per cent of the shares who refused to sell. Accordingly, had the members concerned not accepted the offer, under the provisions of the Companies (Acquisition of Shares) Code it is possible that the TAB could have moved to compulsorily acquire their shares in any event.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: That is quite immaterial to the argument—quite extraneous.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Honourable members should ask themselves what would be the view of the ordinary person on this matter. The Government cannot believe that the ordinary South Australian's sense of justice and fairness would be disturbed by what these members have done. In the terms of the mischief at which the legislation was originally aimed, surely the TAB could not be seen as exercising undue influence over these members, corrupting their deliberations, or warping their Parliamentary judgment such that the full exercise of their privileges, rights, and liberties as Parliamentarians is either impeded or negated. The Government is not called upon to raise in the respective Houses the question of any vacancy in either House consequential upon the facts alleged by the Opposition. I table the memorandum of advice from the Solicitor-General.

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 12 September. Page 824.)

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray): Last evening in this debate I referred to concerns that I have in regard to budgetary matters and the Chief Secretary's portfolio, particularly as it relates to correctional services. I want to refer now to matters pertaining to the Police Force in this State as they are seen in terms of the budgetary papers. If we look at the Estimates of Payments document under 'Ministry of Emergency Services', we note that a considerable amount is being

spent this financial year on communications equipment, and I support the move being made in that direction. On a number of occasions, I and other members on this side of the House have indicated the importance of an upgraded communications service for the police in this State, and I hope that financial assistance will be provided on an ongoing basis.

I look forward to the opportunity during the Estimates Committee debate to question further matters pertaining to the communications system in the Police Force and the assistance given by the Government in this matter. Whilst on the matter of communications involving the police in this State, I again refer to the incredible situation that has occurred on the summit at Mount Barker, where an up-to-date communications tower is being built to improve the situation that obtains, particularly in the Adelaide Hills, where a much needed communications system is being brought to a standstill. The construction of the tower is not proceeding because of suggestions made by a very small group of people that it was an Aboriginal site. I understand that that has now been disclaimed, and the move is being stopped by the efforts of the unions that are involved in that work. I understand that discussions are taking place, but it is an incredible situation that that construction should cease, and I hope that in the very near future we will see the continuation of the construction of that much needed tower.

I want to refer also to the increase in regard to computing equipment, which is also a much needed facility in the Police Force. When the opportunity is provided in the Estimates Committee debate, I look forward to seeking more information in regard to that matter. However, I give credit where credit is due. I am pleased that the Government has recognised the necessity to increase financial assistance in those two areas.

If we look at the Auditor-General's Report we find some interesting information. For example, traffic infringement notices are mentioned, and if we refer to the 1983 report we find that revenue received from the traffic infringement notice system (TINS) was \$4.9 million in that year. When one recognises the criticism that was levelled at this scheme by the present Government when it was in Opposition and when one recognises that this year the revenue received is in the vicinity of \$5.44 million, one concludes that when things are different they are not the same. We do not find that the Government is critical now of that scheme, because it is very happy to receive the increased revenue from it.

It is interesting to note that in 1983, 125 178 traffic infringement notices were issued and, to 30 June 1984, 122 609 notices were issued. Then we find some very interesting statistics that relate to the staff employed in the South Australian Police Force as at the end of June 1984. We also find that there has been a significant decrease in the number of police employed in South Australia. If we look back further it is even more interesting. In 1979, when the previous Liberal Government came into office, there were 3 802 employees in the South Australian Police Force; in 1980 the number was increased significantly to 3 875; in 1981 it was 3 878; in 1982 it was 3 847; in 1983 it came back to 3 842; and in 1984 it has dropped again, as I have just indicated, to 3 823. So, we find that now we are almost back to the situation that we were in at the end of the previous Labor Government's term.

It is quite obvious that the concerns being expressed in the community about the lack of manpower in the Police Force can be supported, because the numbers have dropped away, and it is no wonder that morale in the Police Force is low. It involves not only the manpower situation but also the problems that the police are having, the work that they do to keep law and order in this State and the lack of

support that they are being given by this Government in a number of areas. For example, yet again we have seen the police calling strongly for wider powers. Every time I speak in this debate I refer to similar calls by the police and to media releases that specifically relate to the need for wider powers on behalf of the police.

The most recent release comes from the Secretary of the South Australian Police Association, Mr Dan Brophy. I refer to a newspaper article, which states:

Restrictions on police investigative powers are allowing some criminals to get away scot-free, according to South Australian Police Association Secretary, Mr Dan Brophy. Now, the association has urged the State Government to give police wider powers to fingerprint, question suspects and carry out searches.

If one considers the legislation that I introduced last year as a private member's Bill, that is exactly what we were aiming to do. The Government refused to take on board that legislation and to support it. It indicated that in good time it would bring down its own legislation. We are a lot further down the track with the term of the Labor Government, but have seen no action. All we seem to be hearing about—and it is interesting that the people who seem to be talking about it are spokespersons for the Attorney-General, the Hon. Mr Sumner; certainly the Minister of Emergency Services does not appear to be saying much about it—is a statement from a spokesman for the Attorney-General that the Act is under review. How many times have we heard that the Act is under review and it is aimed to bring offences and penalties into line with current community standards? I shall be particularly interested to learn, when that legislation comes down, whether in fact the Government increases the powers. I have a sneaking suspicion that when that legislation does come down there will be a reduction in the powers that the police currently have.

If there is a reduction, I can assure the House that that legislation will be opposed very strongly by the Opposition and that much concern will be expressed by the community generally. I reiterate my concern and that of the Opposition in learning from the 1984 Auditor-General's Report of the reduction in the numbers in the Police Force in this State.

I want to refer only briefly to the environment and planning portfolio, because I will have the opportunity to take this up in a further grievance. The Financial Statement of the Premier and Treasurer states:

The allocation to the Department of Environment and Planning for 1984-85 of \$22.6 million includes a significant increase in resources, both staff and operating, for the State's national parks and for the protection of our Aboriginal, European and natural heritage.

It is the State's national parks on this occasion about which I want to express concern. Looking at the Estimates, one finds that in relation to the development of national parks the actual payment for 1983-84 was \$1.931 million. In 1984-85 it is \$1.4 million. Referring to improvements to the parks and reserves, there is a decrease from that voted in 1983-84 of \$1.881 million to \$1.876 million.

When one compares that with recent additional purchases of parks and reserves in South Australia, one recognises the problems being experienced in the area of management of the parks. Again, I refer to the concern being expressed by people, particularly those who own properties adjoining national parks, about the problems being experienced regarding the management of national parks.

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

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): Unfortunately, the Budget presented by the Premier does not contain very much for the average person in this State to be excited about. Indeed, there are a number of things in the Budget that should be of concern to the people of this State. Looking

at the overall situation that the Premier placed before Parliament, the estimated receipts in the Budget this year will rise by 20.3 per cent—a fairly hefty increase in the revenue to be extracted from the citizens of South Australia.

Of that proportion, State taxation has increased by 15.5 per cent and, looking at the expenditure side of the Budget, one can see that that has increased by 19.8 per cent. On numerous occasions the Premier has said that the inflation rate is now about 5 per cent, but at the same time he is extracting from the people of South Australia a 20.3 per cent increase by way of taxation and other charges. Those charges are being imposed when wages are fairly much at a standstill, and it will have a marked effect on the average person in this State.

Looking at some of the effects, I instance one of the major concerns brought to our attention recently, namely, the effect on the boating industry. The position was spelt out clearly in an article in the *News* of 29 August, under the headline 'Back-door tax row as boat fees soar', as follows:

A major new row on 'back-door taxation' flared today with the news that boating fees are to rise by between 42 and 140 per cent from Saturday. The Opposition Leader, Mr Olsen, claimed new fees for power boat licences set by the Government were 'another example of taxation by stealth'. The fees rise was the 135th imposed by the Bannion Government... Mr Bannion rejected the criticism, stating that the higher charges made up only a small percentage of the cost of providing facilities for the boating fraternity.

I well remember when the Boating Act was introduced. I had been involved in boating for a long time prior to any legislation being introduced in this House. In the late 1950s and early 1960s I was involved with the South Australian Water Ski Association when it decided that it was necessary that some form of boat registration be introduced in South Australia so that boats could be identified, thus enabling the responsible element in the boating fraternity to be clearly identified and recognised and not branded as being irresponsible, along with a very small minority group. As a result of that decision, the association introduced a voluntary registration system among water skiers which provided each boat with a registration number that was recorded so that that person or boat owner could be clearly identified.

The intention of the Boating Act and the registration of boats was to carry on to a greater degree the scheme that had been commenced by the South Australian Water Ski Association. Assurances were given by the then Minister responsible, Mr Corcoran, that it would be only a small charge and that it would remain that way. However, we now see very significant increases of between 42 and 140 per cent, and it is important to ask what is being achieved by such massive increases and the proposal before us. The Minister has indicated that the registration and licence fees levy is solely to meet the cost of administering the Act. However, it is a matter of how far one goes in administering the Act. How many inspectors does one put on the payroll? How many boats and what other infrastructure that must go with every inspector employed will there be? Just how far down that line does one go? It could go on forever. To what extent is that being effective?

The important thing is that boats are registered, clearly identifiable to the public and police and that the name of the offending person can be identified as a result of it. If it was not possible for the police and the public to identify offenders, there would need to be literally hundreds of boat inspectors in South Australia, with its massive coastline and large inland water areas, particularly along the Murray River and the lakes.

In relation to this legislation, and when considering the charges that are now being placed on the boating community in South Australia, it is worth asking just how many reportable accidents were reported State-wide during 1983-84.

Until such information is provided, it will be difficult to determine the need for increased charges. Further, how many accident reports were made direct to inspectors as compared to direct to the Police Department? Such information would give an indication of the need for more inspectors to be employed. Also, how many reports of offences were made in 1983-84 by marine inspectors and by police officers; and how many successful prosecutions resulted from reports of offences submitted by marine inspectors? Until answers to that series of questions can be provided the Government will not be in a position to in any way determine the number of inspectors required. I do not believe that any such survey has been undertaken, and I am certain that if I were to ask the Minister to provide answers to those questions he would be unable to readily provide them. A thorough study must be made into the need for increasing the number of inspectors and the charges to be imposed.

Further questions that I would like answers to are: how many successful prosecutions resulted from reports of offences submitted by police officers? That would give a clear indication of the extent to which the Boating Act should be policed. Further, what was the aggregate revenue raised by way of fines resulting from prosecutions of offences against the Act? What was the gross aggregate cost of wage, overtime, accommodation and travel expenses as well as any other allowances paid to inspectors during 1983-84? How many inspectors were on the pay-roll at the beginning and at the end of the 1983-84 year? Also, what was the average cost during 1983-84 per patrol boat in regard to overall running expenses, including all repairs, fuel and maintenance for the boat, trailer and towing vehicle, including capital depreciation? I would suggest that until the Minister has that information at hand and it can be assessed in total, the Government is in no position to determine the level of increase in the number of inspectors required under the Boating Act. The Government's decision to increase charges by a massive 42 per cent to 140 per cent was just a shot in the dark. That has been imposed on boat operators who must carry this cost, although it is unknown just how effective the results of it will be.

Mr Groom: Ten cents a week!

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Having had nothing to do with the boating industry, the member opposite does not appreciate that the need for this should be ascertained. Is this whole exercise purely a means of employing more people at the cost of the public's recreational enjoyment? If that is what the Government is doing, then let it say so. If the Government is to increase charges—

Mr Groom: What—by 10 cents a week?

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: This is a further example of increased charges by the Government since its coming to office which now amount to 135. Quite obviously in the time available to me I am unable to refer to the 135 charges increased by the Government. This is a very clear example of the manner in which the Government has gone about it. Only recently the Minister of Marine increased marine survey charges. In that instance, the Minister did not know what a marine survey was; secondly, he was unaware that he had increased marine survey charges by 350 per cent. He had not undertaken any study to determine the effect of the increased charge on the tourism industry in relation to its effects on house boats. Further, he did not undertake any study to determine its effect on the fishing industry. That was another glorious example of the Minister's merely signing a document into Cabinet while not having any idea of the implication of his action on the tourism and fishing industries. This increase in the cost of a boating operator's licence under the Boating Act and the increase in the annual registration fee is another example.

The original purpose of boat registration was purely to be able to identify vessels. In this House we argued at length that there was no need to have an annual charge on registration. In fact, a fee applied only when a vessel was being sold, in the form of a transfer fee purely to cover the cost of the book work involved. However, now, quite obviously, it has become a revenue raising source, because the Government will continue to add more and more inspectors to the staff as it increases charges on the boating fraternity. Certainly, it will help marginally with the unemployment figures, but at what cost, and why should the boating fraternity, which engages in a recreational pastime, be encumbered with fees?

I can speak only from my experience in the boating industry over the past 20 or 30 years. The voluntary registration system was introduced by the South Australian Water Ski Association in the late 1950s and early 1960s and served the same purpose as does the present legislation in enabling vessels to be identified so that an owner may be contacted. That voluntary registration applied only to power and ski boats and did not cover the full ambit. Naturally, the legislation that was introduced adopted the philosophy of the Water Ski Association and it was extended to cover all boats to South Australia. I had no argument with that whatsoever. In fact I totally supported it. However, I do not support such a measure serving as a revenue raiser.

The same can be said as far as the manner of the proposed reduction of the open road speed limit. The statement made by the Minister this afternoon about that matter was interesting. In fact, he virtually admitted that the reduction in speed from 110 km/h to 100 km/h would have very little effect on saving lives on the roads, but he claimed that it was being done because of the need for uniformity. The attitude of the community in relation to that matter is clear. I wish to give one or two references, but perhaps it would be fitting if I quoted the comments of the State Secretary of the Transport Workers Union, as reported on 2 September in the *Sunday Mail*:

Cutting the country road speed limit to 100 km/h is not the answer to the State's road toll. That is the opinion of 75 per cent of callers who responded to a television phone-in poll conducted late last week. And yesterday the Transport Workers Union attacked proposed Government reforms which would see the open road speed limit dropped from 110 km/h to 100 km/h.

He went on to brand the proposal as 'ludicrous' and 'laughable'. I believe that the Secretary of the Transport Workers Union has probably had more to do with people employed as drivers, working on the roads in South Australia and interstate, than has any person in this House. But, by the same token, many rural members here are well aware that there are plenty of roads in South Australia, such as major highways, of a high standard, and that our better quality vehicles can be just as safe at speeds higher than 100 km/h.

Obviously, the condition of the road will determine whether or not one travels at 110, 120 or 70-80 km/h. It is also interesting to note the comments in letters to the Editor. I quote a letter appearing in the *Advertiser* on 3 September 1984 from a Mr T. McDonnell:

As a professional driver I beg the Government to reconsider its decision to reduce the speed limit to 100 km/h. Whoever advises the Government on these matters can't spend much time on country highways.

I will give the Government the benefit of the doubt by saying I believe they want to reduce the road toll. There is no doubt this law will increase revenue, but there is no doubt in my mind it also will increase the road toll because it will force drivers to travel at a less-than-comfortable speed.

Numerous similar comments have come from a wide range of people, particularly from the country. If this measure is to be introduced largely in the name of uniformity (and I

believe that the Government has other motives for doing it) it will certainly put more money into the coffers of the Treasurer. It is all very well and good for members of this House who live in the metropolitan area and who are not confronted with travelling 50 000, 60 000, or 70 000 km a year in the country, back and forth to Adelaide servicing their districts, to sit here and say, 'We will reduce the speed and all will be well.' They would be well advised to take more note of the experience of those members who have a little more practical experience in this field. But, unfortunately, that will not be the case because the present Government, I think, has only two so-called country based members—the members for Whyalla and Stuart. I think that they travel by air most of the time or, in the case of the Minister, in Ministerial vehicles.

Mr Groom: You mean you didn't when you were a Minister?

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I am not saying that. All I am saying is that no members sitting on the Government side of the House are really confronted with the additional problem that the Government has decided to thrust on the people of South Australia, and particularly the country people. I am merely pointing out that it is all very well for members of the Government who live mainly in the metropolitan area to say, 'We know what is best for you, the people who live out there in the country.' The evidence is fairly plain. Even the Minister of Transport virtually admitted this afternoon that he doubted whether the reduction in speed would have much effect on saving lives.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: He said this afternoon that it was for uniformity and that ATAC, the official body, was—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Davenport cannot carry on a conversation in the middle of the member for Chaffey's speech.

An honourable member: He was just prompting him.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: So, once again, South Australia is backing down to the dictates of the Eastern States. Why do not the Eastern States fall into line for uniformity with the position that has been adopted in South Australia? There is no real evidence to indicate that it will help one iota. Certainly, I agree with many of the writers who have indicated their strong belief that the real intent of the Government is to increase revenue. Certainly, it will have that effect.

I would like to touch briefly on one other matter: that is, the reference to the review of State Government concessions. The relevant document indicates that the Government intends to reduce the number of concessions available for primary producers. An article headed, 'Rural budget threat to truck fee concessions' states:

In future they will have to provide a signed document stating that they are *bona fide* farmers if they wish to receive the concession on farm vehicles.

That, in itself, is fair enough; one is either a *bona fide* primary producer or one is not. The article further states:

But more worrying are two further registration proposals mentioned in the Budget but not yet introduced. Those are for registration concessions to be limited to one vehicle for every rural proprietorship, and for light commercial vehicles of less than two tonnes to be excluded from the concessions.

That means excluded altogether. On most rural properties there could be two or three such vehicles used for general running around the property. They are used on the roads but the average mileage, I would venture to state, would not be more than 2 000 or 3 000 km a year on the open roads.

That was recognised in the early days and was the very reason for the concession. Those vehicles are required on properties. However, many rural landholders' properties are

held in a number of sections, which means that they have to travel on public roads to get from one property to another. If those concessions are discontinued, farmers or any rural producers, such as fruitgrowers, would have to pay full registration on vehicles that hardly use the road. But, by the same token, if the vehicles are not registered, the owners are committing an offence; if they are not registered they cannot operate between the various sections of land held by farmers.

To proceed down that track will once again place an additional burden on primary producers. When I look at the dependence of South Australia on rural production (both agricultural and horticultural) and compare that level of production and its financial benefit to the State with any other form of revenue developed in this State, once again I believe that it is a shortsighted approach that is being adopted by the Government—which once again has only two rural members in its ranks—and a clear indication of its total lack of understanding of what the rural industries are about.

There is no doubt that the rural industries are still the backbone of the economy of South Australia, whether we like it or not, and that it will continue to be so for a long time. If the Government is determined to erode concessions that have existed for the purpose of enabling the rural industries to be developed to their fullest in this State, that type of action will only lead in the longer term to a reduction in the overall revenue the State, because of the magnitude of the effect that rural industries have on the economy in South Australia.

Mr BECKER: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport): In dealing with the State Budget I think it is appropriate that we look at the macro economy that faces South Australia and Australia at present. I was interested to see that the Premier has followed the tradition established by David Tonkin, when he was Premier, of tabling a special report on the state of the South Australian economy. In section 10 of that report the Premier deals briefly, unfortunately, with manufacturing industry. In reading that section on manufacturing industry, one gets the impression that perhaps things are not going too badly and that the industry is looking generally reasonably healthy and has a bright future, even though it underwent a significant decline in 1982 due to a world recession. At the bottom of page 19 the Premier stated:

Total Australian industrial production which fell sharply by 13 per cent between the June quarters of 1982 and 1983 according to the ABS quarterly industrial production index has since recovered by about 6 per cent to the March quarter 1984.

In reading that entire statement on pages 19 and 20, one gets an impression that there has been a turn-around and that all is looking reasonably rosy. My concern is that the true picture is just the opposite. Australian manufacturing industry is disappearing at an alarming rate. South Australia should be particularly concerned about a decline in manufacturing industry as it is this State's largest employer. Unless Australia maintains a substantial manufacturing industry, it will become a fools paradise, as standards of living will drop and our unemployment will increase substantially. The real danger is that an air of complacency has descended upon us as the economic recovery has stabilised jobs within manufacturing. However, that is only a short-term situation due to an artificial lift in housing and a good rural season. What is occurring in the car industry is symptomatic of what is occurring with the rest of manufacturing.

I would like to quote some information on what has occurred recently in manufacturing industry in Australia.

In 1971, 25 per cent of all employees had jobs in manufacturing industries but by February 1983 (12 years later) that level had dropped to 19 per cent. During the next few years I believe that that percentage will be further reduced substantially. Over 24 000 jobs have already been lost from our manufacturing workforce since it reached its peak in 1974. Changes in the manufacture of metal products highlight the dilemma. South Australia was the leader in such products, with 85 per cent of our production being exported either interstate or overseas. In 1972, 22 per cent of our manufacturing employment was in this sector. However, by 1982 (10 years later) that had dropped to a mere 9 per cent. In other words, South Australia has lost its position as the eminent metal pressing State of Australia, and it has certainly lost a large number of employees over the past decade, much of which occurred in the late 1970s.

My concern is that an air of complacency has now developed throughout Government levels and certainly that is apparent from the Premier's own economic statement regarding the apparent stabilisation of that employment situation in manufacturing industry over the past six to 12 months. High wages, low productivity, high workers compensation premiums, shorter working hours and poor quality control can all be blamed for the decline in manufacturing in Australia. Whilst these are important, there is one overriding factor: successive Governments have failed to understand the needs of manufacturing industry and what assistance is required to encourage its expansion.

The most recent Federal Budget is yet another nail in the coffin of manufacturing industry. As from June 1985 the investment allowance will be abolished. That was a major incentive for industry to buy more efficient equipment. In Australia only 25 per cent of our machine tools are less than 10 years old compared with 38 per cent in the United Kingdom, 39 per cent in the United States of America and 62 per cent in Japan and West Germany. That is a horrifying situation for this country to be facing.

We are making exactly the same mistakes that the United Kingdom made in the 1950s, 1960s and early 1970s when it failed to invest in new equipment for its manufacturing industry. It is well known now that Great Britain declined from being one of the great manufacturing nations of this world during that period because of that failure to invest in new equipment. Our expenditure on new equipment in Australia has for a number of years been very low, to say the least, and it is still low despite the economic recovery. There is an urgent need for the Federal Government to improve depreciation and investment allowances to ensure that it is financially attractive to companies to invest in new equipment which will raise the efficiency and quality of our production.

The next important issue to which I wish to refer concerns research and development, which is the key to our manufacturing industry developing new technology, including the improvement of products and productive processes. Much has been said about the role of high technology industry, and there is no greater advocate for that than the Federal Minister (Mr Barry Jones). However, despite all the rhetoric that comes from Mr Jones, the money for industrial research and development grants in the most recent Federal Budget has fallen by 4 per cent in real terms.

Recently I had the opportunity to undertake an official study tour to the West Coast of the United States of America and Canada. I visited San Francisco, Portland, Seattle and Vancouver. After that visit, I concluded that the technology gap between Australia and other developed industrial nations, such as the USA and Canada, is widening at a frightening rate. I cannot overstress that, despite all the words said about high technology by both the State and the Federal Governments over the past two years, both Governments

have failed even to stop the widening of that gap and have failed to achieve what they talked about and set out. As a result, Australia's industrial society, especially our manufacturing society, is falling further and further behind other industrialised countries.

Australian industry must export to take advantage of world markets if it is to achieve efficiencies of large production. No-one disputes the importance of exports, yet the money allocated in the recent Federal Budget for new export development grants fell from \$58 million in 1983-84 to \$35 million in 1984-85—a drop of 40 per cent. I find it astounding that the Hawke Government in Canberra, which has talked so much about our so-called industrial revival, the need for exports, and our need to compete on international markets, has actually reduced Government assistance for exports by 40 per cent this year. That is bad news.

The improved depreciation allowances in respect of commercial buildings was most welcome. The Federal Government has lifted that depreciation allowance from 2½ per cent to 4 per cent. However, the danger is that manufacturing industry is now being encouraged to invest in new buildings rather than in new equipment, especially with the abolition of the investment allowance, so we have had a complete distortion developing in Government incentives away from investing in new equipment to encouraging of investment in new buildings. However, new buildings will do nothing for Australia's manufacturing industry, whereas new equipment will achieve much in terms of better quality, efficient production, and certainly production on a scale that might be economic on a world basis, including exports.

We need to act immediately as a nation to stop this serious erosion of our manufacturing base. If we do not do so, our employment problem will increase and remain indefinitely. Agricultural employees comprise about 6 per cent of the Australian work force, mining employees between 1½ and 2 per cent (and that percentage is declining), and manufacturing employees about 19 per cent (and that figure is also declining at an alarming rate). If we lose our manufacturing base, this country will have to look at what will support it and particularly the massive service industries and government that we have built up around them. This country cannot survive on primary production only, nor can it survive on its mineral production only. We need and must maintain a substantial manufacturing base. Already the manufacturing base that we have at present is below a desirable level. One thing about manufacturing is that it requires a critical mass so that various manufacturing industries can support each other. If we do not have that critical mass, inefficiencies in remaining industries will result.

Take, for example, the motor vehicle industry, which depends on a viable plastics industry and a viable castings industry, especially in these days of modern alloy castings. It must have a substantial steel industry and a metal pressing industry, as well as a substantial rubber industry. If those components decline, it will become more and more difficult for Australia to manufacture the components to put into the motor vehicles. About 10 years ago we boasted that most of our motor vehicles were built in Australia with a 95 per cent Australian content. Up to two years ago, at least 80 per cent of our motor vehicles were manufactured in Australia with an 85 per cent Australian content. Now, however, we can only boast that we make only about 80 per cent of our motor vehicles (although that figure is hard to hold) and that the Australian content has already dropped to 80 per cent. Under the new policy of the Federal Government, the figure will drop very quickly to 70 per cent and could even drop as low as 60 per cent.

What does that mean in terms of actual production? One can sell in Australia a motor car with between 55 per cent and 60 per cent of so-called Australian content. If all the

metal has been pressed outside Australia and imported in a knocked-down form, and if all other components are made outside Australia, the only Australian components could be Australian tyres, upholstery and one or two other minor things. In terms of manufacturing, if one puts aside the assembly aspect, there is virtually no Australian componentry except the upholstery, the painting and the tyres on the vehicle. That is the scenario for our motor vehicle industry in about five years time, bearing in mind the way in which it is being led at present.

I was critical of Liberal Federal policy on the motor vehicle industry. I believed that that Government failed to comprehend what was needed. However, the policy of the present Government is even worse: it has less understanding. Certainly, its new policy will fail miserably. It is only a drop in the bucket to throw out a figure of \$150 million for product development in Australia. After all, \$150 million for product development in the automotive industry is peanuts. Indeed, it costs that much to develop one model alone, and now that amount must be spread over four or five manufacturers and all models.

The motor vehicle manufacturers have been encouraged virtually to buy imported components from each other, with a few minor local pressings, and to sell the vehicles under common names across the manufacturers. So, we have the Holden that has been manufactured by Nissan, and other vehicles are being manufactured under one name but sold under another. What is the real consequence of that? It is that our manufacturing work force and our manufacturing base in the motor vehicle industry are being largely lost. It is sad to think that in Australia, a developed industrial nation that used to produce motor vehicles of its own design to suit its own conditions, will not too far into the future have nothing left of that industry.

I do not suggest for one moment that we should return to the 1950s, because that would not succeed. International designs and adoption of standard components across the motor vehicle industry are facts of life, but we must ensure that we retain the manufacturing technology to design, manufacture and produce motor vehicles in Australia, and that includes a wide range of components. The situation is so serious in terms of the erosion of our manufacturing industry that I see about 30 000 jobs being lost in South Australia alone over the next six years, unless the State and Federal Governments take appropriate action quickly.

I refer to 30 000 jobs lost in South Australia alone and more than 300 000 throughout Australia. The first step should be a comprehensive manufacturing industry policy with appropriate financial incentives. Rather than talking incessantly about sunrise industries as does the Federal Government in particular and (Premier and the Minister for Technology have the same characteristic), the Labor Government should ensure that existing companies adopt new technologies. It keeps thinking that new technology is the prerogative of mushrooming new companies that do not yet exist, whereas in fact the people and resources already engaged in existing manufacturing industries are not competing because they do not have the technology.

So, I shun the idea of putting first priority on so called sunrise industries. The first priority must go into putting high technology into our existing industries, regarding both the products they produce and how they produce them. A manufacturing plan needs to be developed urgently and that plan should include the following points that I shall now list (I will not go into detail because of the time). First, there should be extended secondary education with students being stopped from leaving school early. I do not know whether people realise that something like 7 per cent of our students leave school before they finish year 10, and they

comprise the group that is destined to become permanently unemployed in our community.

Admittedly, they may get a job on a short-term basis because they are 15 years old and are being paid junior rates at the local Target or K-Mart store. However, that job will last only while they are juniors and are being paid junior rates: once they reach the age of 17 or 18, because they lack a decent education and vocational skills they will become permanently unemployed. It is disturbing to find that such a small percentage of our students even stay on to complete years 11 or 12. We have the worst record of virtually any developed industrial nation in terms of length of secondary education. I am dealing with only secondary education. There is also a need (as I will come to shortly) to take vocational training once students have left school.

Secondly, we need to make sure that there is effective use of computers in both primary and secondary schools, and at present this Government has an abysmal record in that regard. There is no financial assistance—

Mr Ferguson: It's better than yours.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: How can the honourable member say that it is better than ours? There is no financial assistance whatsoever from this State Government for the installation of computers in schools. Approximately 300 to 400 teachers per year are being trained on the very elementary basis of using computers as an educational aid. There are 18 000 teachers in the community, and about 300 or 400 a year are receiving any assistance at all. I am not criticising the people at Angle Park who are involved in this training programme: I am criticising the lack of resources given by the State Government to this important area.

Our students should be able to use computers in the same way that they can read and write. It would be disastrous to allow any student in this modern society to leave school so-called computer illiterate, yet that is what is occurring today in our schools. This year another 3 000 or 4 000 students will leave school basically computer illiterate. Why? Because of the inactivity of this State Government.

Mr Ferguson: And the previous one.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: The previous Government at least started a full investigation and started putting resources into Angle Park. However, there has been no progress whatsoever in the two years that this Government has been in office. The third point is that we need a campaign and a strategy to develop quality control in manufacturing industry. I suppose that the American community was the first to invent the so-called disposable concept and certainly to give minimal attention to quality control. Having recently been in the United States, I was amazed to find the attention now being given to quality control. At long last they have learned from Japan. Go back to the 1950s: Japan was a community renowned for its shocking quality. It then made quality the No. 1 objective as a manufacturing nation and within 15 years took over from all the other manufacturing countries to become the superior and dominant manufacturing force in the world.

Mr Ferguson: But they're not manufacturing in Japan now: they're manufacturing in other parts of Asia.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: If the honourable member thinks that they are not manufacturing in Japan, that highlights the blindness that is reflected by his Government at present. Of course they are manufacturing in Japan, and manufacturing very effectively. Manufacturing is also taking place in other countries associated with Japan, such as Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Malaysia and other countries such as those, but to discard Japan as a manufacturing work force is incredible. Japan is the world standard. I quote to the honourable member statistics from the latest *Australian Business* on the manufacturing work force in Japan as follows:

The steepest rebounds in production in the March quarter were registered by the Netherlands (5.2 per cent), Denmark (4.6 per cent), Finland (3.8 per cent) and Japan (3.7 per cent). The US rose 2.8 per cent. Despite the strong growth over the past 1½ years, the aggregate all-countries index is only 4 per cent higher than for 1980. Yet some countries have done remarkably better than others—notably Japan, and Denmark (whose indices are 13 per cent up on 1980), and the United States and Finland (9 per cent higher).

I take that comparison back to 1980, because the Premier in his statement on the State's economy was boasting about the fact that there has been a 6 per cent lift in our production index over a nine month period, when the earlier figures I quoted referred to a three month period, and we lost 13 per cent in 1982-83 alone due to the world recession. So, we are well below the level of production in the 1980s, whereas the rest of the industrial countries (or those that are successful) have jumped to well above it. Here are some classic examples, and Japan is the leading example according to that article.

The next point that needs to be considered is the assistance given by the State Government and the Federal Government to enhance our industrial design, which is something close to my heart. I stepped in when I was Minister to save the Industrial Design Council from going into liquidation because unfortunately the Federal Liberal Government had removed its funding. I notice that the Federal Labor Government, having been very critical of the previous Government at the time, has done nothing to reinstate that funding, so I level this criticism at both Federal Governments.

Mr Ferguson: We agree.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: The honourable member agrees with what—what the Federal Government has done? If that is the case, I am disappointed.

Mr Ferguson: We agree with the criticism.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I am glad that the honourable member joins me in that. In addition (and I know that the Industrial Design Council appreciates the effort and the money that our Government put in) we financed it almost entirely for two or three months just to save it from liquidation, and then we helped promote a campaign through which it could get money from industry. However, it is still a holding game, and the Australian Design Council desperately needs additional finance from the Federal Government. I find it incredible that a Federal Government, whether Labor or Liberal, can walk away and say, 'We don't need to worry about industrial design in Australia.' That highlights the very point that I am making: there is no Federal Government manufacturing policy and there has not been one for many years in Australia. Whilst that is the case, we certainly will not have a manufacturing base left in this country in the next decade if we are not careful.

Another area that needs to be looked at is youth vocational training. I mentioned training in schools, but we still allow our young people, having left school, to go into various vocations without any training whatsoever. We put money into universities for a minority, into colleges of advanced education for a slightly higher minority and some money into technical and further education, but that is still a minority: the vast majority of our students leave school and go into a vocation without any training whatsoever.

It is a subject dear to my heart, and one of my highlights in office, when Minister, was the introduction of the new Industrial and Commercial Training Commission, which for the first time allowed apprenticeship training across the board for all people. My disappointment was that I was not in Government for a longer period to extend that training to a larger group of people. We laid down the guidelines under which that should be done. I introduced a policy just before the election, and it disappoints me that nothing—

not one single thing—has been done about that since we left Government.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: The honourable member cannot dispute that. I will go on now, because of time, to list the other points. There is no retraining of people made redundant through changes of technology in manufacturing. There needs to be a greatly improved depreciation allowance for equipment and the reinstatement of investment allowances. I find it staggering that the Federal Government has scrapped the investment allowance.

Mr Ferguson: No it hasn't.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: It has. As from June 1985 there will be no investment allowances, and that is an announcement from the Hawke Government.

Mr Ferguson: It's a long way in the future.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Less than 12 months away! The man is a fool to make a statement such as that. I shall certainly remember that 'June 1985 is a long way away' in terms of the abolition of the investment allowance.

Mr Ferguson: Don't swallow your Adam's apple!

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Well, when a statement like that comes from a member—in fact, from the past President of the Labor Party—

Mr Ashenden: What hope have we got!

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: The past President of the Labor Party says it is a good thing to see the investment allowance scrapped in less than 12 months time!

There needs to be additional Government assistance for exporters. I highlight the 40 per cent reduction in export development grants this year, a decision which is unacceptable and unbelievable. There needs to be tertiary training in manufacturing industry and greater assistance in the introduction of robots within the manufacturing industry. Without robots we will not compete against other industrial nations. The choice for Australian manufacturers is to automate with the loss of some jobs or see industry eroded by international competition.

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

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): I want to address the Budget which the present Government has just brought down and to stress some effects and the severe impact it will have on the electorate of Todd and its residents. Since the Bannon Government came to power it has increased taxation far more rapidly than happened in any term of its predecessors, including the disastrous Dunstan years. The present Bannon Government has given warning to the State of South Australia that it is planning to increase taxation revenue this financial year by 15 per cent more than the taxation taken from South Australians in the past financial year. That, of course, is three times the rate of inflation.

What really frightens me is that its planned taxation revenue for this year is 22 per cent higher than that planned for the last financial year. I believe we will find that at the end of this financial year this State Government will have increased taxation not by 15 per cent but by probably in excess of 20 per cent. That means that, for every \$100 that South Australians are paying in tax, they will pay \$120 or more at the end of this financial year.

How long does this Government believe the South Australian taxpayers can keep paying out that sort of money? There is the so-called wages and income accord brought in by the Federal Government, and under that accord wages are tied completely to inflation. Yet, while every income earner's wages are tied to inflation the Bannon Government has said that it will take three times the rate of inflation in State tax over the next 12 months. What sort of economics is that?

What it brings home to me is that the Government does not have one member who has ever run a business in his or her life. It therefore has no idea and no comprehension of what is necessary to run a business, and the State of South Australia is a business. When it finds that its costs are exceeding its income, instead of looking at trimming costs the Government takes the easy way out—easy for the Government, that is; hard on the taxpayers of South Australia—and the decision it makes is that it will keep increasing taxes. It believes that the residents of South Australia have bottomless pockets, pockets full of money, into which this profligate Government, which has no idea of financial management, can keep dipping.

I do not have to remind the residents of Todd that this Government that came to power in 1982 promised that it would not increase any taxes, nor would it introduce any new ones. Already this Government has increased in excess of 140 taxes and charges since coming to office. The Premier then wonders why no-one in this State believes him. His credibility is absolutely zero.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: I would welcome the Minister, coming to the electorate of Todd at any time. I will take him around to my small business men, to the shopping centres and on door-knocking visits with me to let him hear what the residents of Todd think of the Premier and his Government. If the Minister believes that Mr Bannon and his Government are popular, I suggest that he come and find out exactly what the hard working people and business men of Todd think of the Bannon Government. I can assure the House now that at the next election there will not be a Labor member returned in either Todd or Newland, and I would not be surprised if we also pick up Florey.

So, that is so much for what I think of the Minister's statement. I would like it recorded in *Hansard* that present in the House at the moment is the Minister of Housing, who is laughing at the statements I am making because he and his colleagues believe that it is a big joke that there is in power a Government which does not think the honouring of promises is important; they think it is a laughing matter. They think that taxation revenue, which will probably be more than 20 per cent higher this coming year than it was last year and four times the rate of inflation, is amusing.

They think that the residents of South Australia, who will have less take home pay at the end of this financial year than they have at present, are laughable. I suggest to members that they should get out among their own people. The residents of Elizabeth may think that it is funny, but I can assure the Minister the residents of Tea Tree Gully do not.

More and more I am getting feedback from my electorate and during my door-knocking. My small business men cannot wait until the next State election to remove a Government in which they have absolutely no faith. One of my residents said to me this morning, 'The only thing I have faith in about the present Government is that I know when I wake up tomorrow it will have jacked up another tax.' Those were his very words this morning when he telephoned me about the recent 18 per cent hike in water rates.

Let us have it on the record that there are four members of the Government sitting in the House at present: all of them think these facts that I am putting forward are amusing. The member for Brighton thinks it is amusing, as do the member for Henley Beach and the Minister I have already mentioned. I cannot remember the name of the other honourable member's seat, because he is so forgettable. However, I can assure him and other members that this is an extremely serious matter. If those members would only get out amongst the people in their electorates, as I do in my electorate, they would find out just how unpopular the Government is.

Let us consider the performance of the Government. Because it cannot manage its finances, it takes the easy way out in regard to its overspending. Had the overspending that has occurred in relation to the Government's Budgets in the past two years occurred in a private company, the managing director and directors would have been sacked long ago. Overspending in the last financial year amounted to \$60 million. The thing is that most of this relates to the honourable Minister of Health (and we all know about his reputation), but not a thing has been done by the Government to cut the costs of running this State. As I have pointed out previously not one member opposite has had any experience in business management.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: The honourable member may have run a union, but he would know as well as I do that when more money is needed by a union one simply jacks up the fees, and that is the way the Government is running this State. In the running of a business, when ends do not meet one has two choices: increase prices or decrease costs. It is time that the Government looked at ways in which costs to the South Australian taxpayers can be decreased, instead of increasing by four times the rate of inflation the planned taxation income over the coming financial year. Overspending is a sign of absolute mismanagement.

Notwithstanding the Government's overspending, let us look at areas where the Government has underspent. First, there is the rapid public transport system that was supposed to have been completed to Tea Tree Plaza by 1986. That was categorically promised by the present Premier prior to his election to office in 1982. He made a categorical promise to the residents of the north-eastern suburbs that he would ensure that a rapid public transport system would be completed to Tea Tree Plaza by 1986. They were his words. However, the announcement has since been made that it was anticipated that it might now be finished by 1988.

But let us refer to the Budget report to see how importantly the Government regards the O-Bahn system. Money was allocated last financial year and the year before that for work on the O-Bahn project. However, incredibly, the Government did not spend all the money allocated. That shows just how importantly the Government regards the residents of the north-eastern suburbs. It does not give a hoot as to whether or not they have a rapid system of public transport available. The Government cries poverty in one breath, although its credibility has been shot to pieces, because the Budget papers show only too clearly that money allocated to the O-Bahn project over the past two years was not all spent. That is disgraceful. Had the Government spent the money as was planned, and had it continued with the plans of the previous Liberal Government, the guided busway to Tea Tree Plaza could have been completed by 1986.

It could still be completed by that time. Engineers have categorically assured me that there is no technical or technological reason to prevent its completion by 1986 provided that the Government can allocate the money by the end of this year. The only thing preventing its completion is the Government's not being prepared to allocate sufficient amounts of money to it. It has not even spent the minor amounts of money that have been allocated. That is the only reason we will not have a busway to Tea Tree Plaza by 1986.

The residents of the north-eastern suburbs were promised that there would be no increased costs. However, more than 140 taxes and charges have been increased since the Government came to office. Further, those residents were promised by this Government a system of rapid public transport by 1986, although now we find that perhaps it might be finished by 1988. All the Government can say is that it will be finished to Darley Road by 1986. From the feedback

that I am getting from residents in my electorate, I am absolutely confident that the members for Todd and Newland in the next Parliament will be Liberal members, and I believe that there is a very strong chance that the next member for Florey will be a Liberal also. That should indicate how seriously the residents of the north-eastern suburbs regard the performance of the Government.

In his Budget papers the Premier referred to the supposedly excellent work that has been done in creating employment in South Australia. However, I point out that the number of people employed in South Australia at the moment is lower than it was when the present Government came to office. Notwithstanding that, the Premier produced a report indicating that the Government was proud of the fact that South Australia has fewer people employed now than when the Government came to office. Again, the credibility of the Premier is at an absolute zero.

The Government promised to help small business, but what do we find as far as small business is concerned? It has had absolutely no help whatsoever. In his pre-election speech in 1982 the present Premier promised that a Small Business Corporation would be set up. However, it is still not in operation. Further, in regard to small business the Government has increased the cost of licences that those in small business need to operate. The Government introduced the FID tax. The member for Brighton is laughing again—why does she not go out and talk to the small business people in her electorate and find out what they think about the financial institutions duty?

People have told me only too clearly that the financial institutions duty is a severe impost. I suggest that the honourable member should talk to people operating real estate companies, life insurance companies, and so on, so that she will find out just what a big effect it is having on those businesses. This is occurring even though the Government maintained that it was going to help small business. Petrol prices have been increased. The Government has done everything that it can to make the running of a small business more and more difficult. Let there be no mistake about it—the small business men in my electorate are well aware of what the State and Federal Governments have done which has severely and negatively impacted on the way in which they conduct their businesses.

I suggest that the members of the Government should have a look at an article published in the *Advertiser* a week ago concerning the impact of the Federal Budget on small business. Again, the Minister finds this amusing, but the point is that small business men are extremely angry with the present Government, and that will be reflected in the ballot box at the next election.

The Government maintains that it believes in road safety. However, \$8.9 million of funds allocated to the Highways Department has not been spent. Because of that lack of spending no further work has been done on the Lower North-East Road since the present Government came to office. It was proposed by the previous Government that the widening and upgrading of the Lower North-East Road through to Grand Junction Road would be completed, but this Government has done nothing about that, and no further work has been done on that road following the work done by the previous Government. The roadworks on Grand Junction Road have been severely delayed, as has the work on the North East Road. Yet, in the last financial year \$9 million of the money budgeted for roadworks was not spent. Let us hear no more rubbish about the Government's believing in road safety. It has not even spent the funds allocated to it for spending in vital areas such as road building.

The Government intends to increase motor registration and driver's licence fees. Further, it has increased petrol tax. Last financial year \$38.5 million was derived from

petrol tax, but only \$25.7 million found its way to the Highways Fund. An amount of \$60 million was derived from motor vehicle registration and licence fees, but of that amount only \$14 million found its way to the Highways Fund. The Government talks about management of funds, but it bleeds areas desperately in need of funds in order to prop up its overspending and mismanagement. The residents of the north-eastern suburbs know this only too well. They live a long way from the city centre, and they are required to use their cars, because the public transport system available for the area is abominable.

Under the previous Government, I was able to get a new bus route developed—route 552—and at the end of the year in which the previous Government lost power that service, which was limited, was to be increased to a full service. One of the first decisions the present Minister of Transport made when he came to power was to stamp his foot on that, and route 552 is still a limited service. In fact, not only is it limited, but he has cut the number of services on it. This is a bus service about which I would have at least two or three phone calls a week from constituents complaining that buses are full along route 552 and that intending passengers are left standing.

Again, the member for Brighton is laughing about this. Perhaps she is lucky enough to have a good bus service in her district: perhaps the Government is doing the right thing by her. But, I suggest that she takes a trip out to my side of town to see the appalling conditions that my people have to put up with in their public transport. Also, the previous Government was going to reroute bus service 541, because at the moment four or five bus services travel down North-East Road, and it was intended to take one of those away from the section from St Agnes to Tea Tree Plaza and redirect it so that it would travel through the suburbs of St Agnes, Modbury, Hope Valley and then to Tea Tree Plaza. Again, this Government has refused to make that change.

It has said that what it will do is that if and when the O-Bahn is ever completed to Tea Tree Plaza it will redirect route 541. So, until 1988, if this Government is returned—and it will not be, thank goodness—my residents would not have upgraded services until that year at the earliest, which is appalling. The residents of the north-eastern suburbs know which Government's fault it is that they do not or will not have O-Bahn by 1986 as promised; they know whose fault it is that route 552 is having its services reduced; and they know whose fault it is that route 541 has not been redirected.

Along that proposed route 541 are three senior citizens villages. At the moment, the residents of those villages have to walk more than a mile at weekends, because there is no public transport available to them and because route 552 does not run on weekends—three senior citizens villages! They want to link with each other; they want to go to Modbury Hospital—no bus service at all! This Government does not think it is important. It has cut out and reduced route 552 and will not allow it to be developed into a full service and will not reroute route 541 which would have assisted the residents of those senior citizens complexes.

What else do we find that this Government has done? It has increased water rates far in excess of inflation; increased bus fares far in front of the rate of inflation. Bus fares are a very sore point, because, as my residents point out to me, the service is, to quote them, 'lousy', and they are expected to pay even more for it. While we are on this subject, let us have another look at what this Government is doing in relation to the new transit infringement notices. What a revenue raiser and gold mine the Government has hit on here!

Innocent people who catch a bus and inadvertently pay the wrong fare are being issued with transit infringement

notices. They are expected to pay fines of \$50 purely and simply because they did not pay 20 cents more than the ticket they are holding. Not only that: I have another constituent who has been given a transit infringement notice of \$50 because she was walking on the platform at Adelaide Railway Station. I have taken this matter up once with the Minister. Already the representations I have made for my constituent have been rejected. I have now requested a meeting with the General Manager of the State Transport Authority and my constituent so that it can be thrashed out. But, that is a fact. She was stopped coming out of Adelaide Railway Station off platform 11, if my memory serves me correctly, and given a \$50 transit infringement notice for trespassing, which is absolutely incredible.

Yet, at the same time, we find that the STA will not assist the fare paying public. Let me give a specific example. I have been contacted by a constituent who is 8½ months pregnant. She wanted to catch a bus home and unfortunately the bus she caught was one which, prior to reaching where she wanted to join the bus, came past a high school and more than half the bus seats were taken by students from that high school. Many adults were standing. The bus was quite crowded. The students would not stand up and the bus driver would not ask them to stand up. My pregnant constituent was so uncomfortable that she had to leave that bus and catch a taxi home. It is absolutely disgraceful! That bus driver refused to ask the children to stand. I have taken this matter up with officers of the State Transport Authority who have told me that the union refuses to allow bus drivers to ask children to stand. The union has instructed drivers not to ask children to stand so, as a result, children who are on half fare or even less than half fare are occupying seats. Bus drivers are not asking the children to stand.

Another constituent pointed out to me an occasion when he was required to stand when many children were sitting. An inspector of the State Transport Authority got on the bus. My constituent asked the inspector to ask the children to stand (and this was after transit infringement notices were brought in) and the inspector said to him, 'No, it is not our policy to do that.' In other words, we have transit infringement notices being issued for a 20c underpayment of a bus fare, for someone being on a railway station platform, and not only will the STA not issue them against children sitting down or take any action to have those children to stand and let full paying passengers sit, but it refuses a request from the public to ask those children to stand. It is not only the bus drivers— it is the inspectors as well.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: The regulations say that, but the unions say otherwise. We all know who runs this State: it is the unions. This Government has no concern whatsoever for the people of South Australia. This revenue raising way in which the Government is using transit infringement notices is being abused, and at the same time, where it could be used to good purpose, it is refusing to provide any assistance for genuine needs of the fare paying public. Is it any wonder that the residents of the north-eastern suburbs are frustrated? No O-Bahn, no extension of route 552, no redirection of route 541, increased bus fares, crowded buses! One of my constituents had to wait for six buses to pass before one stopped to pick him up because the others were overloaded. It goes on and on. This Government stands to be absolutely indicted. Although I have other points to raise, to assist in the running of the House I have agreed to conclude my remarks now, but I certainly will on future occasions continue to point out the total inadequacies of this Government.

Ms LENEHAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

JUSTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Ms LENEHAN (Mawson): I wish to devote the 10 minutes that are available to me this afternoon in this adjournment debate to a discussion of the issue of what has been termed video porn and aggression. I am very concerned about the situation that exists currently in respect of the availability of extremely violent and sexually violent films and videos. I wish to particularly relate my remarks to the video porn discussion, and I would like to quote from a recent press release from the Attorney-General. In his press release the Attorney states that the Government is concerned that incorrect information about this matter has been published recently.

I believe that the programme that I saw the other evening on *Nationwide* was part of that incorrect information that is being promulgated. In the *Nationwide* programme the impression was given that snuff movies, child pornography and the video *Black and Blue* were classified as X and were therefore available in South Australia. Quite obviously members of this House know that this is not true, but I believe that many members of the public are under the impression that such absolute filth is available and has found its way into people's homes. In his press release the Attorney-General said that under the present Government:

Videos depicting child pornography, bestiality, detailed and gratuitous depiction of acts of considerable violence or cruelty, explicit and gratuitous depictions of sexual violence against non-consenting persons are refused classification—

that in my view means that they are banned—

and if sold or hired the person so doing would be subject to prosecution.

I wish to heartily congratulate the Attorney-General on the action that he has taken in relation to this and also on the steps that are presently being taken to implement a system of compulsory classification of all videos. I have been an advocate of that for quite some time, because I believe that every parent and indeed every citizen has the right to go into a video shop and know exactly what they are taking from the shelf and whether it has a general rating, an NRC rating or whatever rating it has.

I really want it put on record that I sincerely congratulate the Attorney on the action that he has taken, and I am aware that he is instigating discussions with other Ministers responsible for censorship in Australia to try to bring about a change in the method of classification of videos. However, I am very concerned that we must address this debate in a rational and unemotional way. I guess I find that fairly difficult. As members of this House will know, I have been involved for some time in trying to bring about reform to the rape laws of this State. I was therefore particularly concerned when I read an article in the *'Saturday Review'* of last Saturday's edition of the *Advertiser*, which stated that research would appear to show that:

Films that portray extreme violence against women sexually stimulate nearly a third of all men—even though the films may contain relatively little that is explicitly sexual—according to newly-reported findings.

The report continues:

Several researchers have also found that repeated viewings of films such as *Friday the 13th* and *The Texas Chainsaw Massacre* instil attitudes in the minds of the viewers that are similar to those found in rapists. For example, viewers, including women, become more callous in the face of violence toward women, and male viewers are more likely to say they would rape a woman if they could get away with it. Other data show that such scenes have proliferated in commercial films in the past two years. A survey found that one in eight movies commercially released in 1983 depicted violent acts against women, a sharp increase on 1982. And, according to one researcher, an as yet unpublished survey by the US Justice Department reportedly has found the higher rate to be holding this year.

The article goes on in great depth to quote some studies that have been released in America. I would like to refer to some of the points made in that article, as follows:

In a series of tests on the effects of graphic, non-sexual violence against women, Dr Neil Malamuth, a psychologist at the University of California told the symposium that he found that 30 per cent of the men studied were aroused by non-sexual violence. . . . Some of the research describing the specific effects of repeated viewings of such films was done by Edward Donnerstein, a psychologist at the University of Wisconsin. The study assessed the psychological effects on men of watching, over a period of several days, five *Slasher* movies, which feature graphic scenes of bloody violence, mainly to young women. The men were given psychological tests before and after seeing the series of films.

After seeing the films, according to data described at the symposium, the men expressed more willingness to rape a woman if they could do so without being caught, and found the movies to be progressively less upsetting, more enjoyable and less debasing to women. According to Edward Donnerstein, when the men were asked to sit in as the mock jury on a rape case—

which sounds quite typical of some of the situations here in South Australia—

they more often judged the rape victim to be at fault for what had happened.

The article continues:

During the study of the *Slasher* films, a small group of men showed such a strong similarity to the profiles of known rapists that for ethical reasons they were not allowed to view all five films . . .

These men also reported being sexually excited by one or more non-sexual aspects of rape, including the subjugation, degradation or domination of women. According to Briere, these men were not particularly heavy users of pornographic films or magazines. I conclude on this point. As members of Parliament, we must be careful, if we are asked to vote on this matter, to isolate the effects of gross violence and sexual violence from what has been traditionally known in the pornography debate as straight pornography. It would seem from the research that has been conducted that perhaps the effects of violence are much more horrendous than those of traditional pornography.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: I am pleased that the honourable member did. Unfortunately, I was not in Parliament then, but I certainly am now.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: I cannot take responsibility for my colleagues, but I can for my own views. I feel so strongly on this issue that I have asked the Parliamentary Library research section to search the publications that are available to support a tenable point of view. The staff have come up with an enormous list from which I will ask them to find extracts on such matters as the effects of mass media exposure on acceptance of violence against women, and so on. Once I have the results of that research I intend to pursue this matter, because it is extremely important in the community. It has arisen because of the change in the way in which people get their entertainment: namely, from home videos. I shall be taking part in the debate on this subject, I hope from the points of view of intelligence, information and sensitivity, and I hope that other members will participate in such a debate.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles): I draw to the attention of the House a problem that has arisen in my district concerning Paradise Primary School, which has an extremely active council. That school came to me in April 1983, asking for my support of a submission for activated pedestrian lights in George Street and on Silkes Road, both of which are near the school. That submission had been extraordinarily carefully researched, in fact, it was one of the best submissions that I have received from a school in my district. The submission made the point that, between 8 a.m. and 9 a.m. on 8 February, no fewer than 29 trucks had travelled along George Street and that, between the same hours on 9 February, 23 trucks had done so. The point was made that most of the vehicles did not slow down when passing through the school crossing perimeter: that is, the existence of the school and the crossing was apparently not acknowledged. If motorists slowed down, they were invariably overtaken by other motorists.

Honourable members will acknowledge that that is one of the most dangerous situations for pedestrians, especially for children; when they see a motorist slowing down for them they step out and suddenly they are in the middle of the road and another car is bearing down. As a result of the submission and the work of the school council, over a period of effort on the part of the council and on my part as local member, there was an unofficial telephone call at the end of that year from the Education Department (or perhaps it was the Highways Department) stating that the school's application had been successful. On 26 January 1984 I received the following letter from the Minister of Transport:

A recent investigation showed that there is now a need for the installation of a school crossing on George Street . . .

The letter continued:

As George Street is under the care, control and management of the City of Campbelltown, council will be responsible for its installation, subject to it being funded by the Education Department and the approval of the Road Traffic Board.

That all seemed very clear; the council was very pleased with the progress, and so was I. On 5 April 1984, in response to a further letter from me to the Minister of Education in order to make absolutely certain that funds had been provided, I received the following letter from the Minister of Education:

I have pleasure in confirming that the Education Department has set aside funds for the provision of this crossing.

As far as I was concerned, that was probably the end of the matter. My job as local member had been done, and I did not expect to receive further representation from the school.

However, I was very concerned this morning when the Secretary of the school council came to me in a very distressed state to say that the whole project has now been abandoned, for reasons which I will outline. She was at her wits end, and so is the school council, to know what to do next. In order to make sure that everything was proceeding through the proper channels, the Secretary of the school council rang the Campbelltown council in August during the school holidays and was alarmed to find that the Campbelltown council knew absolutely nothing about the project other than that approval had been given.

The council had not been advised of its responsibility to draw up plans or to arrange for the construction of the crossing. The Secretary of the council then rang the principal engineer of the Highways Department, who said that the city of Campbelltown was supposed to have done the job by letting it out to subcontractors. However, the principal engineer acknowledged that there had been unnecessary delay and poor communication between the Highways Department and the Campbelltown council. The Highways Department engineer then rang the City Engineer of Camp-

belltown and asked that plans be drawn up immediately. He also contacted the Road Traffic Board to say that it would be given top priority because of the misunderstanding. In other words, my impression is that the Highways Department, after some inadequate communication, recognised that the Paradise Primary School had suffered as a result of inadequacies, and efforts were made to make amends.

Then came the hammer blow. A visit to the school was made by Mr J.R. Tillett, Liaison Officer, Facilities, for the Adelaide area of the Education Department. The Principal was told that the lights on George Street are unlikely to be installed in this financial year, and the reason given was that because of the reorganisation of the central office of the Education Department the minor works budget items have been discontinued. This item (the George Street crossing for the Paradise Primary School) therefore had been referred to the minor works budget of the Adelaide area. The area budget has apparently already been worked out (although one can only wonder what has happened between March and August), and this is the crunch: the area office only received the information on 1 August, although approval was granted in March.

Because the budget for minor works has already been filled, the flashing crossing lights on George Street will be put into priority 2 (that is, very little chance of being funded) and will be funded this financial year if funds become available. This information was later confirmed by a letter from Mr Tillett to the Principal of Paradise Primary School, which stated:

I have no doubt that your school community will be disappointed, to say the least. However, there is little that can be done until we know our 1984-85 minor works budget allocation, probably early in the third term.

To say that the school community will be disappointed is one of the great understatements of this year. The Secretary of the school council has informed me that the community will be more than disappointed: it will be devastated. She says that, whilst the council is desperately concerned, if the parents and the school community as a whole knew about it (and they will at the next general meeting), there will be an absolute riot. That was how she put it. These parents live in the Torrens Valley, in the suburbs of Paradise and Dernancourt. They are desperately concerned for their children's safety and have been for many years. They were assured earlier this year that the project had been approved, that necessary approvals—council, Highways Department and Education Department—had been given, and then suddenly, through some apparent failure in the Education Department in its reorganisation, this approval document was lost.

That is one aspect for very strong criticism. However, another aspect for even stronger criticism is the failure to take the decision, once that mistake had been known, to put the project into category 1. These budgets are not immutable. Once Ministerial approval has been given, how is it possible that a department can say to a school, 'Sorry; we have made a mistake. We fixed up a new little budget for this year. We are cancelling out the approvals for last year and you go back to the bottom of the list again'? That is simply not good enough! It is completely unacceptable to me as the local member. I am sure that it is equally unacceptable to my colleague the member for Todd, whose constituents are similarly affected across the river, and it is completely unacceptable to the Paradise Primary School community. I urge the Minister to reconsider and to give instructions for that crossing to proceed at the earliest opportunity; certainly not to wait until the end of the third term to ascertain whether the money is available, and to extend the apology that I believe is warranted in these circumstances to the council of the Paradise Primary School.

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

Mr MAYES (Unley): I wish to turn my attention to an issue that has been of great interest to the community both in this State, nationally, and I suggest internationally. I refer to youth unemployment and youth wage rates. Quite a number of comments have been made recently in the local press, the daily press and the national press regarding pay rates for young people. I have had a number of inquiries at my office from young people in the Unley area who have been employed for a period of time by an employer and dismissed at the end of a certain period. In some cases it may be at the end of the Commonwealth grant to the employer to assist to encourage youth employment. Some employers (and I stress 'some') have been rather unscrupulous and have used those schemes purely to assist the economic welfare of their own organisations. As a consequence of their attitude they have dismissed young people at the end of the period of assessment, throwing them on to the labour market, and doing so without a credential to find another job.

There was an interesting comment from the General Manager of McDonald's restaurants food chain in the *Sunday Mail* on 2 September in which he drew attention to the issue of wage rates in Australia, and drew a thread between youth wage rate and unemployment. The article states:

A comparison of McDonald's youth pay rates around the world indicated Australian rates were pricing the young out of work, according to McDonald's Family Restaurants managing director, Mr Peter Ritchie.

Many eminent economists attached to the OECD international labour organisation would argue very strongly against that line of approach from Mr Ritchie. The effect has not been endemic just to Australia but in fact it is linked internationally: the same effects felt in Australia in the 1970s were felt around the world.

Australia is not the only country to suffer from high youth unemployment, and I hope in the time available to me to draw the threads together to give what I believe are the reasons for the high youth unemployment from which this country has been suffering and from which other countries in the OECD group have also suffered. Mr Ritchie continued:

All our statistics indicate the Australian youth pay rates are unnecessarily high.

He continues:

The number of permanent jobs available for young people makes it appear there has been a conspiracy among large employers, Industrial Commissions and State Governments to discriminate against young people.

I agree with part of that comment, and I hope later to indicate why. In some ways large employers have discriminated against young people. The article continues:

Mr Ritchie said one of the most illogical aspects of the current award system were 'proportional clauses' which restricted the numbers of young people which could be employed by a particular employer.

Referring to the youth unemployment figure, he said:

This figure is staggering but not surprising when you consider the unions, the industrial courts and to a certain extent State Governments, have all colluded to increase the proportion of young people unemployed.

Mr Ritchie joins with the former Secretary to the Treasury (Mr John Stone) in his knee-jerk reactions—very simplistic, very much an instant public outcry, one which shows little analysis of the situation which has occurred in the labour market over the past 14 or 15 years. John Stone in his swansong gave the Federal Government and the previous Governments a serve about their economic mismanagement which is quite extraordinary from a fellow who has been purportedly behind most of the Federal Budgets presented

in the past 20 years, and who has also been purported to have had inordinate and extraordinary influence over Treasurers in those years. An article in the *National Times* of 31 August, under the heading 'Where John Stone has gone wrong', by Keith Windschuttle states:

Now that I am able to do so, I wish to say publicly that there is no single fact more disgraceful to the conduct of our national affairs than the manner in which we have permitted, and are still permitting, more than 25 per cent of the 15 to 19-year-olds in the workforce to be unemployed.

I agree with the dramatic statement about the tragedy of having so many young people unemployed. I will now disagree with what Mr Stone then put forward as the reasons for that unemployment, which were as follows:

There is clear evidence that it is the excessive legal minimum award rates payable to young people which are at the heart of their disgracefully high levels of unemployment . . . The truth is our system of wage determination today constitutes a crime against society.

It might be worth saying that about the only thing Mr Stone agreed with in the current Budget and the Federal Government's policy was, I think the floating of the exchange rate. I am led to believe, from press comments and statements generally, that it was the only thing on which he disagreed when advising the Treasurer. So that is an amazing about-face, and certainly his statements in Western Australia reflected a degree of bitterness rarely seen in public life.

The article then looks at the relativities of junior award rates with adult rates in the 1970s and puts to death the argument that John Stone advanced so simplistically and I say 'knee-jerked' to the community in the course of his comments to that Western Australian group. I quote:

Average hourly earnings for male juniors in 1977 were 55 per cent of the adult hourly rate, while for female juniors they were 66 per cent of the adult rate. By 1982 these had slid to 51 per cent for the males, 60 per cent for the females. The fall in wage rates was most marked for young women, yet it has been women who have fared by far the worst in levels of youth unemployment—reaching 31.9 per cent in early 1984.

If high wages were the cause of youth unemployment, the fall in relative wages experienced since 1977 should have improved the position of youth in the workforce a little, as they became

more competitive with adults, or at least stemmed their rising jobless tide. The fact that neither occurred demonstrates Stone's pronouncements to be worthless.

I absolutely support Mr Windschuttle's account. We find that there has been a drop in the relativities and, if one looks at documents presented by the OECD examining the early 1970s, one will find again that the facts do not support Stone's outrageous knee-jerk reaction. The article continues:

In reality, youth employment has several causes, none of which are confined to Australia with its allegedly over-regulated labour markets. It is a phenomenon endemic to nearly all Western industrial economies since 1974. It derives primarily from youth's natural disadvantages in the labour market—lack of experience and skill—at a time of recession, stagnant output and low labour demand.

In the past decade, in an economic environment where growth slowed and profits fell, employers have sought to reduce labour costs. Rather than following 'pure' market theory and dismissing their more expensive existing workers, employers initially sought to reduce labour by reducing recruiting, a policy that inherently disadvantaged youth.

Many employers have also abandoned their former practices of training unskilled juniors on the job. They have found it cheaper and more convenient to allow youth to be trained full-time in technical colleges, CAEs and universities and to take them on when they graduate. This is a more expensive form of youth labour but a more profitable one.

That, I think, puts the complete picture of the situation that has been presented by people such as Mr Stone that high wages in the youth market automatically mean higher unemployment, and the community ought to have this information, because it is very easy to say, 'Yes, increased wages mean higher unemployment.' A study was carried out in France in the early 1970s on the effect of increases in the minimum wage and the impact on employment. This was a study undertaken by the OECD, and it is reported in the OECD papers.

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

Motion carried.

At 5.29 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 18 September at 2 p.m.