HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 13 February 1985

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

CLASSIFICATION OF PUBLICATIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

At 2.1 p.m. the following recommendations of the conference were reported to the House:

As to Amendments Nos 1 to 6:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on these amendments.

As to Amendment No. 7:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its disagreement thereto.

As to Amendments Nos 8 to 15:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on these amendments.

As to Amendment No. 16:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its amendment but make the following amendment in lieu thereof:

Page 6, lines 17 and 18 (clause 9)—Leave out 'liable to a penalty not exceeding ten thousand dollars or imprisonment for six months' and insert 'liable—

(a) where the Board has subsequently classified the film under this Act and the defendant proves that he exercised restraints, or observed conditions, upon or in relation to the sale, display or delivery of the film that were not less stringent than the conditions (if any) imposed under this Act—to a penalty not exceeding two thousand dollars;

(b) where the Board has subsequently classified the film under this Act but the defendant fails to prove the matters referred to in paragraph *(a)* —to a penalty not exceeding five thousand dollars or imprisonment for three months;

or

(c) where the Board has subsequently decided to refrain from classifying the film under this Act—to a penalty not exceeding ten thousand dollars or imprisonment for six months.

and that the Legislative Council agree thereto.

As to Amendment No. 17:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its amendment but make the following amendment in lieu thereof:

Page 6, line 20 (clause 9)—After 'subsection (3)' insert 'that relates to a prescribed film'.

and that the Legislative Council agree thereto.

As to Amendments Nos 18 to 22:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on these amendments.

As to Amendment No. 23:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its amendment but make the following amendment in lieu thereof:

Page 7, lines 16 to 35 (clause 9)—leave out all words in these lines and insert 'a film that is not classified under this Act or under a corresponding law and—

(a) that has been refused classification under the corresponding law;

or

(b) that has had a classification that has been revoked under the corresponding law.'

and that the Legislative Council agree thereto.

As to Amendment No. 24:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its amendment.

Consequential Amendments:

That the following consequential amendments be made to the Bill—

Page 1, line 21 (clause 3)—After 'videotape' insert 'or videodisc'.

Page 1, line 23 (clause 3)—leave out 'optical or electronic record' and insert 'form of recording'.

Page 6, lines 45 to 47 (clause 9)—Leave out all words in these lines and insert "by striking out from subsection (6) the passage "on a date specified in the complaint" and substituting the passage ", or had not been assigned a classification under this Act, on a date specified in the complaint, or that the Board had on a specified date decided to refrain from classifying a publication specified in the complaint," '.

Page 7, line 12 (clause 9)—leave out 'subsection (7)' and insert 'this section'.

Page 7, line 36 (clause 9)—leave out 'subsection (7)' and insert 'this section'.

Page 8, line 10 (clause 11)—After 'amended' insert:

'—

(a)'.

Page 8, after line 14 (clause 11)—

Insert word and paragraph as follows:

'and

(b) by striking out from paragraph *(b)* of subsection (2) the passage "restricted publications by the authority or body administering any particular libraries, or libraries of a particular class" and substituting the passage "publications by specified persons or bodies, or persons or bodies of a specified class" '.

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the recommendations of the conference be agreed to.

The recommendations, which are before honourable members, fall into four categories, two of which are machinery measures and I will deal with them before I debate the more substantive matters. One of the points raised at the conference was what anything we did here in relation to videotapes should apply to videodiscs. Although this is a technology that is hardly at this stage commercially available in Australia, it almost certainly will be in the future, and it was considered that this control should apply. Honourable members will find that listed under the consequential amendments on page 2 of the amendments.

Also, it was pointed out that there was a specific problem with a facility such as the South Australian Film Corporation library. These materials have often been produced for educational purposes, but there has not been any need in the past for classification, and it will be a long task indeed to undertake the classification of the whole of its holdings. It was thought that there should be some exemption available by way of regulation written into the Bill, and that is set out on page 3 of the amendments.

In relation to the two substantive matters I should say that the procedure adopted by this conference was unusual in that it did not report back immediately to the Houses but indeed met on one occasion during the Christmas break and then again yesterday, with the permission of the Houses through the suspension of Standing Orders, and finally came to a decision last evening. That is probably an undesirable precedent. It meant, for example, that members of the conference were lobbied from time to time by people in the community, and that is quite unprecedented in the history of conferences. We adopted that procedure because when we met on the last day of sitting last year the Attorney-General explained to the conference that he was negotiating with the Commonwealth Government over certain matters, and that it perhaps would be unfortunate for the South Australian Parliament to come to a final decision in this matter, if we did not have the full advice available from the Commonwealth.

Therefore, we adjourned, basically to give Mr Sumner an opportunity to speak to the Commonwealth authorities. Yesterday, at the conference he tabled correspondence that he had had with Commonwealth Attorney-General Bowen. The Government's desire in this matter has always been to try to get uniformity of classification with the Commonwealth and between the States. However, it became increasingly apparent as we moved forward to legislating on this matter that this possibility of consensus was becoming shattered. The Commonwealth Government finally told us that it was intended to set up a Commonwealth Select Committee, either in the Senate or possibly on a joint House basis, further to consider this matter and that the Commonwealth Government would not make a decision until that Select Committee had met. That did away completely with any

possibility of consensus or uniformity in the matter; therefore, I do not think that any member of the conference had any great qualms in recommending, in the light of that fact and with a desire for uniformity or something close to uniformity, that the ER category should not be proceeded with. So, the bulk of the recommendations before members relate to the fact that we should not proceed with the ER category.

The final matter to which I advert concerns penalties, over which the conference managers spent much time. I shall try to simplify the matter as much as possible. In effect, we provide for four tiers of penalty: first, a penalty of $2 000 where a person sells or hires a video unclassified; secondly, a further and greater penalty of $5 000 or three months imprisonment where a person sells an R-rated video to a minor; thirdly, a further penalty of $10 000 or six months imprisonment where a person sells an ER or X-rated video to anyone (that would be, within the terms of the verbiage of the new legislation should that be approved by the House, a video that is refused classification in this State); and, fourthly, a penalty of $10 000 or six months imprisonment and the closure of the business for a period where the video sold or hired to a person is refused classification not only in South Australia but also in the A.C.T. In the light of the action that the Legislature in this State is being invited to take, the A.C.T. and the Northern Territory are the last bastions of X-rated videos. The details of the penalties to which I have referred, and which are the maxima in each case, are set out on pages 2 and 3 of the report that I have placed before members.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I support the motion. The Minister has suggested that a compromise was reached because it had occurred to the Government that uniformity between States could not be achieved, but that is a fairly specious argument because it was apparent for the whole of the time the Government was promoting this Bill that agreement would not be reached between the States because the Premiers of the two non-Labor States (Queensland and Tasmania) had made it patently clear from the start—

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am talking about the two non-Labor Premiers in Queensland and Tasmania, who made it clear that they would not have a bar of an X-rated category in any shape or form. So, the Minister's explanation is not perfectly accurate in relation to the deliberations of the conference: in fact, there was no uniformity. Indeed, the Liberal Party was not prepared at any stage to accept what the Government proposed, so in the end it came down to a decision by the Government whether it was prepared to back off or to be left without a Bill. That was its decision, but the outcome is highly satisfactory to the Liberal Party.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: One of your people seemed to compromise considerably.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: He may have, but I am talking about the policy which has been enunciated by the Leader of the Opposition from Day 1 of this debate. Further evidence came to the managers during the course of the conference which, as the House knows, extended from December until yesterday. In particular there was evidence from video retailers who quite obviously had a vested interest in the outcome and they arranged a meeting for Monday night, a so-called seminar, at which people were to attend by invitation. I rang the organisers and suggested it did not strike me as being a terribly well balanced seminar when it was not open to the general public. In the event, they did allow the attendance from people for the Standards for Children's Television group—I forget their precise name—but I told organisers I had read carefully their well presented submissions. It has been presented to the Senate Select Committee which has been established for some time and which is going to become a joint Select Committee of the two Houses of Federal Parliament.

I have made the point to the gentleman concerned that I had read their well presented submission with some care, because I did not want to have a blinkered attitude to this question, but the point on which I parted company with their point of view was that they believed the onus was on us—those who had some cautious approach to this question of video pornography, people with our point of view in the Liberal Party—to prove that it was not harmful to children. My view is that the onus is on the people who are selling this material, when the public has very serious doubts in relation to the effect on the development of pre-adolescent children particularly, to prove that it is not harmful.

During the deliberations of the conference there was some publicity given to the fact that we viewed a range of material, and there was the view abroad—a mistaken view, I might say—in the community for those who were seeking to institute an ER category that pornography had been removed from the scene. That is far from the truth. The fact is that the ER category contained what has always been termed as hard core pornography, which is prohibited, I might say, from public showing, even in restricted theatres. In those circumstances it simply served, I think, to reinforce the view which we had in the Liberal Party that this material was not suitable for access to the homes of South Australia, and we shared the very grave concerns of a large number of responsible people in the community who have concern for their fellow human beings, particularly the young.

We were in step, as I say, with the Labor Premier of Western Australia, the Labor Premier of New South Wales, the Premier of Queensland (the Governments, at least, of those States) and the Premier of Tasmania; the only people who have gone down the track the Labor Party wish to go in this State, as I understand it, is the Victorian Government, and it intends to institute this system when the Federal position is clearer. The result of the conference is eminently satisfactory and I support the motion with pleasure. I think common sense has prevailed.

The fact is that there is a range of quite stiff penalties, but I think a sensible range of penalties has been incorporated in the proposed amendments. The ER category will not exist. There will be a compulsory system of classification of videos. That in itself is a considerable advance, and the penalties in our judgment are appropriate to the seriousness of the offence. For instance, if a video retailer inadvertently labels a G film as PGR, that is technically an offence but the penalty for that would be quite minor. However, if a retailer sells to a minor one of the video nasties which are beyond the hard core pornography material stage, then that is considered a serious offence and the penalty prescribed for that will be $10 000 or six months in gaol, and the courts have the added power to prohibit the person from carrying on the business for up to 12 months, which we think would be a fairly serious deterrent for people involved in crime in an organised way seeking to promulgate this material.

So, the Government has backed off, and we congratulate it for that. The Government has seen the error of its ways, and I believe that common sense has prevailed. I think that a very large number of people in the community will heave a very large sigh of relief, because it is a fact that there is evidence (and there was evidence in the media quite recently) that, no matter what restrictions are put on people who can handle this material, once it gets into homes one cannot keep it out of the hands of kids. One of the dailies contained some commentary on that quite recently. The matter of whether or not material which up to now has always been described as hard core pornography gets into the hands of

children is something over which we put a great question mark. For retailers to suggest that the onus is then on those who are objecting to prove that it is harmful to the normal development of their children is a quite false onus of proof to be put on parents and others, whose concerns are quite considerable. It is with some pleasure that I commend the amendments to the Committee.

Mr LEWIS: I will not delay the Committee for very long. I want to make three points in addition to those already made by the Minister and my Deputy Leader. The first is that I found myself in a rather unique position in this instance when, as a representative of this Chamber, I went to the conference of managers of both Houses in that Standing Orders require those of us who are so appointed to advocate the view expressed in the House. That can be interpreted in one of two ways. If one were to examine the debate on any such matter, one would be able to conclude from that debate where the majority opinion seemed to lie. One could otherwise look at the way the House voted—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have to point out to the honourable member that he is now entering into a question of Standing Orders, and I do not think that that can be lined up in any shape or form with what happened in the conference. I ask the honourable member to come back to matters pertaining to the conference.

Mr LEWIS: Fair enough, Mr Chairman. The point I was trying to make was that, regrettably, the only view expressed in this Chamber that I could responsibly take to the conference of managers was the strongest possible condemnation of the Government's proposition in the Bill and as put by the Minister in his second reading explanation. There was no other view expressed by any other member of this Chamber, and I think that speaks volumes for the Government's conviction, or lack of it, in relation to this matter prior to the time the conference became necessary. The only speakers were the members for Mount Gambier, Kavel, Goyder, Coles, Flinders, and Glenelg, and myself. There were other members of the same persuasion who wished to speak.

In their speeches all those members condemned the proposition. There was an interjection from the member for Ascot Park at one time that bore no relationship to that. So, I found myself in the regrettable position of advocating what was expressed in this Chamber even though that may have appeared to have been in conflict with the majority vote. The Labor Party stands condemned for that reason.

The second point I wish to make is that whilst the Government believed (and the Minister stated) that it had a responsibility and a desire to make arrangements consistent with the decisions reached by Ministers responsible for censorship elsewhere in the Commonwealth, that was simply never on. I believe that the Minister misled the House when he indicated that that was the intention of the Government. History now shows that that has not happened and cannot happen, nor will it happen.

I think that what we now have is in keeping with the vast majority of the wishes expressed to members of this Chamber by the constituents in their respective electorates throughout the State. Therefore, I am happy to support the proposition put by the Minister and supported by my Deputy Leader, and trust that I never again have to go to a conference of managers where I have no expressed point of view supporting the majority vote of this House.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chair is not going to allow the honourable member to enter into that sort of debate.

Motion carried.

PETITION: SPECIAL WATER LICENCE

A petition signed by 14 092 residents of South Australia praying that the House establish a public inquiry into the environmental effects of the special water licence granted to Roxby Management Services, suspend the existing licence pending the outcome of the inquiry, and release the environmental impact statement on the Olympic Dam project for public comment was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

PETITION: ETSA INQUIRY

A petition signed by 87 residents of South Australia praying that the House call upon the Government to establish an inquiry into the financial management of the Electricity Trust of South Australia was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

LAW AND ADMINISTRATION REPORT

The SPEAKER laid on the table a Report and Recommendations concerning the Law and Administration in this State, by W.A.N. Wells, Q.C.

QUESTION TIME

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

That the time for asking questions be extended to 3.27 p.m.

Motion carried.

NUCLEAR POWERED VESSELS

Mr OLSEN: Will the Premier advise whether the South Australian Government will facilitate the use of South Australian ports by United States naval vessels? The current debate in Australia and New Zealand about MX missile testing and United States ship visits has raised serious questions about the future of the ANZUS treaty.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable Leader to resume his seat so that we can get this quite clear. I have allowed the question as being quite proper and admissible. However, the explanation of the question must also be proper and admissible. The test of admissibility in these circumstances is whether the Minister, in this case the Premier, to whom the question is addressed has any responsibility for the matters being adverted to. So far as the port is concerned, I rule that admissible. So far as the ANZUS treaty at large is concerned, I rule that inadmissible as being in the hands of the Federal Ministers for Foreign Affairs and Defence, the Prime Minister, and maybe others. I ask the honourable Leader to follow those rulings carefully in his explanation, otherwise I will withdraw leave.

Mr OLSEN: In South Australia the Dunstan Government decided in 1976 that it would not agree to visits to South Australian ports by US nuclear powered warships. The subsequent South Australian Liberal Government, in consultation with the Commonwealth, reversed that policy and agreed to the use of South Australian port facilities for such visits, provided necessary safety standards and radiation monitoring were maintained. More recently, however, we have seen other State Governments, particularly the Victorian Government, adopt a policy of not permitting visits of nuclear powered or nuclear armed vessels to Victorian ports. In view of the policy adopted by other State Labor Governments and divisions within the ALP, which have become apparent—

The SPEAKER: Order! I will not give any further warning. That matter is also inadmissible.

Mr OLSEN: I therefore pose the question to the Premier: in view of divisions within the ALP in South Australia as it relates to—

The SPEAKER: Order! That is a direct flouting of the Chair, and I warn the Leader.

Mr OLSEN: Will the Premier make a clear statement of his Government's policy on the use of South Australian port facilities by United States naval vessels sailing in Australian waters under the ANZUS treaty?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The ANZUS treaty is entered into by the Australian, United States and New Zealand Governments. As the Leader has mentioned, the Victorian Government indicated a particular attitude in a specific case some time ago. It was made quite clear at that time that the matter was not within the purview or control of the Victorian Government. I understand that to be the situation in South Australia as well.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Unley.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the House to come to order.

BLACK FOREST PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr MAYES: This is a question on a serious note. Can the Minister of Education outline to the House and the constituents of Unley what steps have been taken to provide facilities to Black Forest Primary School to allow the school year to continue for junior primary schoolchildren in the Black Forest area? As most members would know, the junior primary area of the Black Forest Primary School was burnt to the ground last Saturday night, leaving some 200 schoolchildren with no school facilities for the forthcoming year. As yet, it has not been determined from the Fire Prevention Unit or the Police Department whether or not the fire was an act of arson.

However, following an inspection on Sunday morning with the school Principal and again on Monday, it is quite clear that there were certainly several spot fires within the building that has been razed to the ground. The Principal of the school has stated that most of the teachers in the primary and junior primary areas spent Saturday placing their own equipment, much of their own school facilities and bookwork in that building prior to the fire on Saturday night. Had the fire occurred on Friday night, they would not have lost all that personal equipment. The tragedy has been quite extensive and I have never seen such fire damage done to a building. The school is to be congratulated, as are the teachers and parents who rallied on Sunday to gather together all the resources available to relocate the children. Indeed, I would personally like to thank the Principal and his staff for their hospitality.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: First, I would like to concur with the member for Unley in his comments about the serious nature of the fire that took place at Black Forest and the very serious effect it has had on the education programme of that school and also to put on record in this House my appreciation of the very hard work done by the staff and parents of that school, both in the education programme generally and also in terms of coping with the aftermath of the fire on Sunday. In fact, I have heard quite separately from another person who happened to know one of the teachers who had worked all day Saturday preparing work for this year how much enthusiasm they had for the year ahead. They said that they had never known such a level of enthusiasm in looking forward to a new school year as they had, having got together a very good education programme. One of the teachers involved had 25 years teaching experience and had gathered together and had in the school much of the information and material that had been collected over those 25 years. One can imagine just how bitter and demoralising it would be to have that totally wiped out by the fire.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Irreplaceable.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: As the member for Torrens says, it is indeed irreplaceable: those things cannot be recreated. So, the concern of the Department and the Government is not just in relation to the significant cost of damage to the school: it also involves the damage that has been done to the school's education programme. However, I am confident that the calibre and enthusiasm of the parents and the teachers of the school will ensure that things get back on educational rails as quickly as possible. I will report quickly on the situation. On Monday, the school had delivered to it six classrooms worth of basic furniture. At the school they are using an activity room as two classrooms. They are also using other unoccupied rooms at the school, including the music room and the single timber building that was used as a kitchen. In addition, the PBD hopes to get some other buildings on site within three or four weeks.

The school has been granted $20 000 for replacement of some facilities and equipment and a stationery order was placed on Monday; some of that arrived yesterday morning. Clearing up is beginning today. The PBD has already assessed the external walls and determined that they may be structurally sound, but the Department is still awaiting the final results of that assessment. If that is the case, the cost of replacing the building will be about $750 000, and that is a highly significant cost.

The Government had already had a commitment to the redevelopment of Black Forest Primary School in 1986, and the work was already under way in that regard in terms of the priority listing in the capital works projects. I have indicated to my Department that since significant amounts of work will have to go into the rebuilding of the school it would be appropriate for the concept plan for redevelopment to take into account not just the rebuilding of the fire damaged school but also the tying in of it with the redevelopment of the whole of Black Forest Primary School. That will mean bringing forward by some months the redevelopment that was already on the schedule. We hope that that will result in a good facility being provided as soon as possible to the school. My personal sympathies go out to the students, the staff and the parents of the Black Forest Primary School community and my hope is that 1985, after such an inauspicious start following the fire, will be a much happier year for them all.

TAPED TELEPHONE CONVERSATION

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Premier order an investigation into the circumstances in which a telephone conversation between a senior person in the Government service and a member of this House was taped and information gained from that conversation provided to a Legislative Council Select Committee?

Information to the Upper House Select Committee on Bushfires in South Australia reveals that a telephone conversation on 5 December last year between the member for Eyre and a senior public servant was taped by the public servant. This is revealed in a minute to the Minister for Environment and Planning dated 10 December from an officer in the National Parks and Wildlife Service. Just to make that point clear, that phone call was taped by the person concerned, passed to another person in the National

Parks and Wildlife Service and then sent off to the Minister. The minute, which was handed to members of the Select Committee, in part states:

> At approximately midday on 5 December, Mr . . . received a telephone call from Mr Gunn, M.P., of which I have a transcript as it was recorded.

I understand the senior public servant had telephoned Mr Gunn in response to an earlier approach by the honourable member and that the public servant must have had the tape recorder set up when he made the call.

The member for Eyre wished to inquire about the handling of a major fire in the Danggali Conservation Park and the officer in the National Parks and Wildlife Service communicated information from the taped call in the minute to the Minister which was subsequently provided to the Select Committee. The member for Eyre had no knowledge that the call was taped. The minute appears to implicate both the senior public servant who had the telephone conversation and the National Parks and Wildlife Service officer who wrote the minute to the Minister in breaches of the Listening Devices Act, which, except under certain specified circumstances, outlaws both the use of any listening device to record any private conversation, and the communication of information derived from the use of that device. I might add that, when this was passed on to the Select Committee, another offence was probably committed. The maximum penalty for both offences is $2 000, imprisonment for six months, or both.

As this incident involves possible serious breaches of the law and the ALP has been particularly vocal about illegal use of listening devices, I ask the Premier whether he will investigate the matter and say what action the Government proposes to take.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will certainly investigate the matter and advise the honourable member.

WHYALLA INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT OFFICER

Mr MAX BROWN: I have a short but important question to ask the Premier. Will he say when a decision will be made on the appointment of an industrial development officer for the City of Whyalla?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: As the honourable member is well aware, applications for this position have been under consideration for some time. In fact, I have just been informed by the selection panel, comprising the Mayor of Whyalla (as Chairperson), Mr McNeilly (General Manager, BHP Whyalla), Mr Elkins (representing the Whyalla Combined Unions Council), and Mr Masters (representing the Department of State Development), that it has unanimously recommended Mr Graham Hill for appointment to this important position.

An interesting aspect is that, although there were a number of applicants, some from Whyalla and some from other parts, Mr Hill has been identified very strongly with the development opportunities in Whyalla. In fact, last year I appointed him a delegate to the State Development Council and, with Government sponsorship, he has also been involved in a business migration seminar in Europe. Therefore, he is very knowledgeable about Whyalla and its needs and has been involved, in an honorary capacity, in activities of this area previously. The position is important for Whyalla. We are all aware of the problems in the industrial and manufacturing sectors that Whyalla has suffered over recent years. Major studies have been made of these problems without successfully finding what sort of placement industries are required to consolidate Whyalla's future.

Certainly, the Commonwealth Government's action (initiated by Prime Minister Hawke and finalised by Senator Button) regarding the steel plant as part of promises made in 1983 meant that BHP Whyalla was put on a much sounder basis than it might otherwise have been. Thank goodness that action was taken. As part of that plan for the steel plant, funds have been made available to provide for development projects. In fact, Mr Hill's position will be funded from the steel plan money as part of the ongoing move to ensure that Whyalla's future development is secure. Without underestimating or playing down the problems involved at Whyalla, I believe that, as the honourable member for Whyalla would know, one of the problems suffered by Whyalla at present is a severe loss of confidence, almost a loss of self-esteem. Whyalla has much going for it: it is our second largest city; it has a substantial location; and it has a fine infrastructure and many skills. So, there is no need for the community to be despondent but, unfortunately, certain people in Whyalla, for various reasons, seem to be intent on denigrating the city and its future, trying to find anyone else to blame but the community itself. Such attitudes must be changed and I believe that the appointment of an industrial development officer with specific responsibilities in this area will certainly help change those attitudes.

We have organised a seminar, to be held in Whyalla in March, at which the industrial development officer will be present and at which representatives of the whole community can be involved in considering what activities can be undertaken by that officer and what opportunities exist. So, I believe that Whyalla's prospects are very positive and that, if we inculcate such an attitude into the city, there is no question regarding the will of the Government or, I believe, of the will of industry to ensure that Whyalla fulfils the promise and potential that it clearly has. I am sure that the honourable member will welcome the appointment of this industrial development officer. He will take up his appointment soon and then it will be 'all systems go' over the next year.

TAPED TELEPHONE CONVERSATION

Mr GUNN: Will the Premier order an investigation into the reasons why a minute referred to by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in his question about the taping of a telephone conversation that I had with a senior public servant has been removed from the minutes of evidence given to the Upper House Select Committee on bushfires? I have been informed that copies of the minute referred to by the Deputy Leader were given to all members of the Select Committee and that committee members assumed that the minute was incorporated in the committee's minutes of evidence.

The SPEAKER: Order! While I understand the concern that the honourable member has, I rule the question out of order as being in the hands of the Legislative Council. I do, however, invite the honourable member, and will endeavour to see that he will not lose the question, to approach the table to see whether it can be taken up in some other way.

REAL ESTATE COURSE

Mr GROOM: Will the Minister of Education give consideration to having the TAFE real estate course application for 1985 amended by deleting a question which appears in the application? The question is as follows:

> Do you need this qualification to join a family business? If 'Yes', give details overleaf.

Prior to Christmas, I was approached by two constituents, quite unrelated to one another, who had applied for the course and had contacted me strongly objecting to the ques-

tion appearing in the application form. I understand that there has been something like 1 100 inquiries for the real estate course at the Kensington Park College of TAFE, and this led to something like 600 applicants and only 80 to 90 available places. My constituents' objections appear to have some considerable merit, because also appearing in the application form is the question immediately above, as follows:

Are you currently employed in a real estate office or related area? If 'Yes', give details overleaf—

which would appear to adequately answer the question. The question appears, as my constituents have related it to me, to put applicants not connected with a family business at a disadvantage. Their objection, in other words, is that the presence of the question is capable of giving the impression, rightly or wrongly, that the perpetuation of family dynasties is being assisted in this area of commercial activities. My constituents object that there should not be any perceived advantages to one group of applicants over another, and I would ask that the Minister give consideration to having the question objected to deleted.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I noted the concern of the member for Hartley about this matter, and he is quite correct: there is another question in the application form that asks about employment, whether a person is already employed. In the light of that other question already existing there, I can accept that certain applicants do seem to believe it is intrusive to have that other question and that, therefore, it is perhaps misinterpreting the aim of the selection process for that course. I will be instructing the Director-General of the Department of TAFE to have that question removed from future application forms. I think that most of the forms for 1985 will have gone out and have been processed, but with any future forms I will instruct that that question be removed.

NORTH-EAST TRANSPORT

Mr ASHENDEN: Will the Minister of Transport advise the House when he is going to instruct the STA to provide adequate bus services to the north-eastern suburbs to ensure that schoolchildren are not again left waiting for buses for two hours? As the Minister would well know from the voluminous correspondence I have forwarded to him, the services to the north-eastern suburbs are totally inadequate. I have frequently asked him to provide additional services on routes 550, 551 and 552. Despite these requests, the Minister has ordered a reduction in services on route 552. I have been frequently contacted by constituents complaining that the services on all three routes are too infrequent and that during peak periods the buses are so crowded that intending passengers are not allowed to board. Again, the Minister is well aware, from my letters to him, of the anger of my constituents who are frequently late for work because bus after bus passes their stops, leaving them standing.

Yesterday afternoon, however, the worst incident yet occurred: over 100 students attending Thorndon High School were left waiting at bus stop 26 for up to two hours. These students wished to travel to their homes after school had finished. Parents contacted me last night and this morning, and they are angry. I shall mention just two of the incidents referred to me, the first involving a student who wished to catch a bus following route 552: the first bus was full and she waited as nine buses for routes 550, 551 and 552 passed, leaving her and other students standing there. Finally, she was able to board a route 551 bus but then had to travel to Tea Tree Plaza, which is in Modbury, having to then walk all the way from there to her home in Hope Valley.

Secondly, another parent became so alarmed about the non-arrival of his son home from school that he drove to the school and undertook a thorough search to try to find his son. My constituents have made it clear to me that they are angry. Both the local STA school buses and normal service buses are so overcrowded that they cannot pick up the children. Will the Minister immediately ask the STA to provide additional services to ensure that this never happens again, as the safety and welfare of children must be given the utmost priority.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I will instruct the STA to conduct a further inquiry into the allegations raised by the honourable member. He knows as well as I do that a number of inquiries into the services to which he referred have been undertaken. I understand that some alterations will be made shortly to the route 551 service. I am not sure about the other services to which the honourable member referred. Some of the information that the honourable member has related in his question today is additional to the information that we had previously when those investigations were carried out.

I am not in a position to direct the Authority to immediately put in further bus services in his area, in view of the limited resources that are available to the Authority. Services are lacking in other areas which have no public transport at all, and the Authority is trying to cater for these needs. I am doing the best I can within the resources available to try to accommodate local residents and provide transport to all parts of the metropolitan area. I will be happy to refer this matter to the Authority and have it conduct an immediate investigation into the additional matters that the honourable member has raised today, and I will obtain a report for him as soon as possible.

OVERSEAS BANK HEADQUARTERS

Mr TRAINER: Will the Premier advise the House of the situation relating to South Australia's bid to win a licence to allow a major overseas bank to set up its Australian headquarters in Adelaide?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No doubt the honourable member saw the references to this matter made recently, I think even this week, in the *Australian Financial Review*, where the Federal Treasurer made a statement that he had the matter under consideration, that there was the question of a number of licences to be granted and that a decision was expected shortly. It has been no secret (indeed, I think it should be widely known) that the State Government has been working very hard indeed in support of an application that has been made by the Standard Chartered Bank.

Why should we be doing that? The simple answer is that of all the applicants for foreign banking licences (and it began with about 60 or so, which I think was narrowed down to about 40, which are still alive, as it were, and the Federal Treasurer will be getting some sort of recommendations from that large number of applicants) the Standard Chartered Bank has made a firm commitment to establish its headquarters here in Adelaide, where it will have its national base.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: They started when we were in Government.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: They started at the time of the collapse of the Bank of Adelaide, at which time they had undertaken discussions with the Corcoran Government with a view to stepping in and assisting with the rescue and saving of the Bank of Adelaide headquarters in this State. To the misfortune of this State, the change of Government occurred at a crucial time of those negotiations and the incoming Tonkin Government would not support that

application; in fact, it allowed the Reserve Bank will to prevail, and the ANZ took over the Bank of Adelaide and removed its headquarters from here. That is when it started. Since that time—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: What I have said is the truth. The Standard Chartered Bank had a proposition for the takeover of the Bank of Adelaide in 1979 which was put before the Corcoran Government and supported by it. It was not supported by the Tonkin Government, but I do not wish to get into that. The fact is that we have had close discussions and association with Standard Chartered's bid on the basis that, their interest having been first kindled in Adelaide as a result of the Bank of Adelaide situation, they have remained interested and therefore, with this opportunity, were very willing to see themselves established and headquartered in Adelaide.

If that alone was the case that they were putting, it may well be difficult to justify their standing amongst the 40 or so possibles for the very few foreign banking licences that will be issued. However, in fact, Standard Chartered offers, I believe, a number of other major advantages which conform precisely to the Federal Government's intentions in allowing foreign banks to operate in Australia. For instance, they have a branch network spread and a range of business, including retail banking throughout Asia (particularly the Pacific rim and South-East Asia). In fact, of most of the applicant banks, and particularly all the British banks involved (they are headquartered in Britain, but they are a world bank), Standard Chartered would claim to have a much greater spread and more branch presence than any other.

If the argument is developed that foreign banks should be allowed to operate in Australia because of the access it will give us to export to and investment from those countries, then this organisation has a major contribution to make. In terms of size, it is certainly in the top 50 banks in the world. Therefore, its presence here would be substantial. It would be headquartered in Adelaide: it has undertaken to develop a branch network which would involve other capitals and also regions in South Australia.

True, it will supply some competition to our own State Bank, in particular, but I do not think the State Bank has anything to fear there; indeed, our whole financial sector has a lot to gain from that competition. The important thing about its presence here in Adelaide is twofold: first, that it will provide the headquarters decision-making that has been obviously a major deficiency—the vacuum that has existed since the takeover of the Bank of Adelaide here in South Australia—and, secondly, the demonstration effect: that a substantial financial institution can establish its headquarters here in this State and operate effectively on a national and international basis from this city.

That was something on which we laid great stress in the election, and if we are able to achieve this location as a result of the issue of the licence that will be a major feather in the financial cap of South Australia and will have an important demonstration effect. So, it is for those reasons that we have backed the application very strongly. It is not easy, because the number of licences will not be many. There are certainly some major banks in competition, and various regions have put in their claims. However, I believe that all South Australians should get behind this, and let us hope that the decision of the Federal Government will see a private sector headquarters bank re-established here in South Australia for the first time since 1979.

TAPED TELEPHONE CONVERSATION

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Was the Minister for Environment and Planning aware of the contents of the minute to him outlining the taped conversation involving the member for Eyre, and did he authorise its being made available to the Legislative Council Select Committee on Bushfires?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I was just out of the Chamber a few minutes ago because I was wanting to telephone my officers to get some background information in relation to the matter that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition raised. The Whip came out and said that I was required in the House in order to answer a question that the honourable member wanted to ask me, so I was not able in fact to get to the telephone. I will get all the required information for the honourable member. I will consult—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The Premier has given a commitment to the House—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The Premier has given an undertaking to the House—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The honourable Premier has given an undertaking to the House that he will investigate the matter and give the full details to honourable members. I will fully co-operate with the honourable member and give him all the information I have and in turn it will be available to all honourable members of the House.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Henley Beach.

WATER QUALITY

Mr FERGUSON: Will the Minister of Water Resources advise whether the Government is taking any action in relation to potential pollution activities in water catchment areas in order to maintain adequate water quality for Adelaide's metropolitan reservoirs? Approximately half my electorate is connected to a filtered reservoir; the other half is not. In one half of the electorate my constituents can pour a glass of beautiful clean water, but in the other half it sometimes looks more like a glass of milk. I know that the Minister is doing his best with filtration, but any reduction in pollution would be of assistance to half my electorate.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: A few aspects of this matter are of public interest, because water quality is very important. I do not know whether the Opposition is interested, but I am sure that the public at large will be. The existing legislation and regulations provide some control over potential pollution in water supply catchment areas, but there is little effective control over ongoing activities which lead to pollution. Water quality impairment resulting from the use of pesticides and fertilisers and, indeed, on occasions the unsuitable disposal of waste water, is causing concern to the E &WS Department and the Government in relation to the quality of Adelaide's metropolitan water supply.

The pollutants of most concern are dissolved organic compounds such as pesticides. Although the water laboratories regularly monitor metropolitan reservoirs and the Murray River as far as pesticides are concerned, generally the levels that have been detected are within levels recognised

by the World Health Organisation guidelines for drinking quality of our water.

However, recent preliminary results have indicated an area in the Mount Lofty Ranges in the Piccadilly Valley where there is a need to control the use of pesticides for the water catchment areas of South Australia. The Piccadilly Valley is recognised as one of the most significant sources of organics and nutrients into the Onkaparinga River system. Out of all this, the Government has formed an inter-departmental working party—

An honourable member: Another one?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The walking alarm clock, as the member for Todd has been termed by my colleague who was acting on my behalf as Minister of Water Resources over the past six weeks or so, goes off at any time—

Mr Ashenden interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: That may be the case. We have formed an interdepartmental working party comprising representatives of the E & WS Department, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Environment and Planning, the Department of Fisheries, and the South Australian Health Commission. The working party's terms of reference are: to identify and to quantify pesticides used in South Australia; to identify pesticides which have an impact on the aquatic environment and the public water supplies; to collect data on pesticide levels in waters; to recommend any need for further monitoring, surveillance and investigations to provide adequate information in regard to the matters already mentioned. Importantly, it is for the working party to recommend measures required to control pesticide residues in waters at acceptable levels for the protection of both public health and the environment.

POLICE COMPLAINTS LEGISLATION

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the Minister of Emergency Services now confirm the intention of the Government to withdraw the police complaints and disciplinary proceedings legislation, action called for by the Leader of the Opposition soon after the introduction of the Bill in this House, and does the Minister concur with the inflammatory comments made by the Premier about the position taken in regard to this Bill by both the police and the South Australian public? Press reports this morning indicate that the Government plans to withdraw the Bill. I remind the Minister that this course was suggested by the Leader of the Opposition on 11 November last year.

It appears that the Government now may have accepted the suggestion with a view to resolving a longstanding dispute over the Bill. While the Opposition would welcome this course of action and recognises the vast amount of opposition to the legislation expressed by both the police and the public of South Australia, it appears that the Premier has tried to inflame further the situation by stating on the Jeremy Cordeaux radio programme this morning that 'a lot of emotional nonsense' has been talked about in regard to this legislation.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I appreciate the question, because I think it is about time some facts were put on the table in relation to this piece of legislation. First, let me say that I did not hear the remarks of the Premier, but I would be very doubtful if they were inflammatory. It is not his style or his custom, and I would be very surprised if his comments were inflammatory; so, I would deny that, not having heard them, but I would be very doubtful if that description was accurate. In the second part of his question, the honourable member suggested that there was a press report this morning stating that I may withdraw the Bill. The headlines are quite misleading, in fact. All of us would appreciate, I suppose, that when journalists phone they put a series of questions, such as, 'Is this a possibility? Is that a possibility? Might you do this? Might you do that? Might you do something else?' We have all experienced that. Then they take for themselves the best headline that they think possible to attract some attention. It was interesting, of course, that the article was on page 20, I think; it was a wonder it was not on the front page. However, there has been a—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Well, it is a wonder it was not. If we want to get to the core of the matter about who is inflaming the situation, I think that members of the press could take some looking at about this matter, because they have kept it running.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: No, I am not describing newspapers as being grubby at all. I am just saying that they like to steal a headline where possible and create a situation that sometimes does not exist.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: You've had your share, Jack.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I get my share of publicity. I do very well out of it. I do not complain, actually—not in the circumstances.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the tea table conversations will cease.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: It has kept me being elected now for 13 years, so I have no complaint about it in reality, but I just refer to this morning's headline. There has been a great amount of tolerance on the part of the Government in relation to this piece of legislation.

Let me make it very clear that in the first instance the Association, through its Secretary, agreed to that legislation's being introduced with two minor amendments to which I agreed. The agreement was reached on the day the legislation was introduced into the House. What happened next is now history. There was a dispute within the Association about the position of the Secretary and unfortunately the legislation got caught up in that dispute. Nevertheless, that being the case, the Government was still tolerant enough to have eight or 10 meetings with members of the Association. I have not kept count of them all but they will be recorded publicly soon.

I do not know what more we can do. I think the Opposition ought to be cognisant of this and be somewhat responsible in the matter. On Monday of last week I invited the full executive of the Police Association to attend a meeting with me to discuss what I considered to be the final offer, and I thought they would accept that situation. That is the way the dispute started.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: A final offer from the Government?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Yes. It was up to them to accept or reject the offer. There were only three matters outstanding during my absence on sick leave. That is the way the dispute started in the first place. The full executive came to my office and met with my full committee and we went through the whole legislation. I invited them to come again last Friday, but only three members of the executive and one non-member arrived. I am not responsible for who comes; all I can do is invite those who, in my opinion, should attend a meeting, but I cannot dictate who ought to attend, because that is naturally in the hands of the Association. That body agreed unequivocally to the conditions laid down and said that they would make recommendations to their meeting on Monday evening to accept those proposals. There is no question about that, and I do not think anyone at that meeting would deny that.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: The police generally don't accept that the legislation is—

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The Government cannot deal with every individual member of the police community, nor can it deal with individual trade unionists; we must deal with the authoritative body which in this case is the State Executive and it is rather intriguing that, when this issue first became inflamed and the whole dispute was at crisis point so far as the police were concerned, 1 500 people attended meetings, but that number has dwindled down progressively over three or four meetings. If one could take notice of the figures, which were not supportive, fewer than 300 people attended the meeting on Monday night that was to declare certain people out of their positions. That suggests to me that there is a feeling that the majority of the Police Force believes that what the Government has done is acceptable.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: I don't agree with that.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: You can agree or disagree: your attitude has been to inflame the situation. The honourable member and his Party have no responsibility in this regard: the Government has responsibility and it has kept its word on everything it said to the Association; it has not gone out publicly and criticised the Association, as the Association has continually done to the Government, but it is coming to an end very abruptly.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The Government will have its say about this in many ways. I have just been told by the member for Brighton that she had a deputation this morning from the police in her district. They unequivocally support the Bill. That is the situation.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Did you read the legislation before you introduced it?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Let me repeat for the honourable member what actually happened on Monday evening at the Police Association meeting. First, there was a vote of confidence in the Secretary. I make no comment about that, because it is none of my business. The executive of that Association, through its Secretary, its President and its executive officers, carried out their part of the bargain that they had made with me and made a series of recommendations to the full meeting. That was rejected. To me that was a vote of no confidence. It is terribly inconsistent, in my view, on the one hand to express confidence in a Secretary and then, on the other hand, not accept the recommendations of the executive. I do not know how one follows that course of events. I will not withdraw that legislation, but I have told the Association (and I will keep my word on this) that I am prepared to put into the House a redraft of the Bill, to discharge that piece of legislation and embody in the new legislation the amendments to which I have agreed (and there are a lot of those).

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: A lot?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Indeed; you have been well informed. You have your methods of getting information. I do not walk around with my eyes closed. I know whom you talk to and I know where you get your information in most cases.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Do you?

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

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The member for Murray has time on his hands to get around and talk to people. Some people have time to talk to me; I am not walking around with my eyes closed, either. The clear situation is that I have given no assurance, I have not made a mistake and said that I will withdraw the Bill holus-bolus. What I have told the Police Association is that the amendments we have agreed to will be in the redrafted form. I will get it back and it will be a clean Bill and much easier to handle. That is where it is. It is at the position we agreed upon last Friday. I will agree that when I receive a request to meet them again I will not refuse to meet them, and I will listen to their problems, but if, as reported in the press, they want the Bill withdrawn holus-bolus and a complete redrafting, that is not on.

I understand that at the moment the Police Association lawyer is looking at some legal interpretations. He has advised them belatedly, although the executive accepted the proposition put by the Government, not to accept the Bill. I have written to them asking for their points to be made in writing. When I see what they are, I will have them legally examined by an independent lawyer to see whether or not they are consistent with the advice received by the Association. That will be the basis on which I agree or not to any further amendments.

There being a disturbance in the Strangers Gallery:

The SPEAKER: Order in the gallery! If there is not, I will order that the gallery be cleared.

VISIT OF *QE2*

Ms LENEHAN: Can the Minister of Tourism explain the initiatives he has taken to ensure that the coming visit to Adelaide next Tuesday of the liner *QE2* will be a resounding success for both the visitors and for South Australia generally?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I would like to put right the impression that the shadow Minister of Tourism, the member for Coles, is trying to generate within the community about the visit of the *QE2*. I understand that the member for Coles wishes to debate next Wednesday the provision of facilities for craft groups from South Australia when the *QE2* will be here and gone on Tuesday, so one can determine the cynicism of the member for Coles. The member for Coles and her colleagues did not have the opportunity when they were in office to deal with the visit of a major passenger vessel to Outer Harbor and we will have had two, the *Oriana* and next week the *QE2*. I point out to the Opposition that our performance in both these visits in which we have been and will be involved has been and will continue to be excellent.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The member for Coles knows this, although she will not acknowledge it, but obviously her back bench colleagues do not understand that, when the *Oriana* first came in 1983, the Department of Tourism in South Australia organised the visit and it was a magnificent gala day. However, when the *Oriana* came in 1984 the organisers told the Department and the Government that they had everything in hand and that they did not need the involvement of the Department or of the Government. So, we were not involved and it was a disaster. It was left to the private tourist industry of South Australia to organise, and the industry fell short. At that time we gave an undertaking that when the *QE2* visited South Australia we would be involved, and so we are.

What have we done? We have been dealing with the Cunard Line through ACTA (the South Australian representatives for the owners, Cunard) and with American Express (the appointed agents for pre-booked shore excursion). A special eight-minute video presentation will be shown to passengers on the Sydney-Adelaide leg of the journey. Motivational literature is also being supplied to the vessel in Sydney, to be distributed on board. The STA is supplementing normal train services to provide capacity for *QE2* passengers, and timetables relevant to those STA services are also being supplied to the *QE2* in Sydney.

Pre-sold tours of the city, Barossa Valley and Kangaroo Island have been organised by the appointed ground oper-

ators. The Department of Tourism has arranged for the Tanunda Town Band to stage a concert on board the *QE2* for the benefit of passengers, and the South Australian Police Band will farewell the vessel from the Outer Harbor terminal. Senior staff from the Government Travel Centre and the STA will be at Outer Harbor to assist incoming passengers who will be here for the day. The Department of Tourism is co-ordinating the itinerary for the visiting Texas industrialists and their wives who are travelling on board the *QE2*. As a result (and I take up this point with the member for Coles and ask her to consider what she is saying), I have contacted the industry through the South Australian Tourism Industry Council.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Yes and—

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: For the benefit of the honourable member, let me say that the tourism industry in South Australia has known for 12 months that the *QE2* is coming next week. I have written to the Chairman of the South Australian Tourism Industry Council pointing out what the State Government is doing and inviting members of that industry to complement what we are doing in any way that they feel is appropriate.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Would the—

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I wrote, giving them a fortnight's notice. The honourable member and her colleagues have an interesting concept in this matter. Is it the Government's job to do private industry's job in this State? Of course not! We have told the industry what the Government will do to ensure that the visit to South Australia will be a success both for South Australia and for the visitors.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Does the—

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The honourable member raises that point because she knows that we were dealing with that aspect long before she ever heard of it. She also knows that negotiations are taking place, but the honourable member wants to jump on the bandwaggon and try next Wednesday to take credit for something that might happen in the meantime. The industry has a responsibility to be innovative and to show initiative itself. It cannot, and will not, be hand fed by the Government. I believe that the industry in South Australia is competent and able to do its own thing. This Government has encouraged the industry in South Australia to join with it and provide a service that will benefit its own operation next Tuesday. Even if the industry cannot do that, the visit of the *QE2* will be a success because the Government has everything under control. The industry has undertaken that it will co-operate in whatever way it can.

REGENCY PARK COMPUTER

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Why has the Minister of Education refused to give $27 000 to buy computers and word processors for disabled children at Regency Park Centre School, and why does the Minister refuse to even see a deputation from the school council concerning this matter? The Regency Park Centre School has requested $27 441 to purchase computers and word processors to assist severely disabled children to learn and communicate. In 1984, the school was granted a mere $2 000 for technological purposes. It was refused funding from the Commonwealth Computer Education Programme, under which $6.3 million is available for the whole of Australia. The only consolation from the Minister is that the school can reapply for funds in 1985. The Education Department has allocated the grand sum of $13 000 for the use of students with special needs across the State. For many disabled students at Regency Park Centre School the use of a computer is their only hope of effective communication. As the Government has allocated $4 million for the Grand Prix, surely $27 000 can be found to help disabled children to communicate. Why did the Minister of Education in his letter to the school of 24 December 1984 even refuse to see a deputation? Some Christmas present!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I suggest that the honourable member get his facts straight. He talks about the Government allocating a mere $2 000 per school, but the previous Government allocated nothing to special schools.

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw the Minister's attention to the fact that Question Time has expired. Call on the business of the day.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: KINDERGARTENS

Mr GREGORY (Florey): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr GREGORY: In this House on 6 December 1984 I sought leave to make a personal explanation. Leave was granted and my statement was as follows:

In this House on Wednesday 5 December, the member for Todd, when speaking on the Children's Services Bill, said:

> Of course I can tell members opposite that kindergartens from their electorates have contacted me because they felt that there was absolutely no use in approaching Government members because they had been told—

Then I asked which ones, and the member for Todd stated:

> One of the kindergartens in the member for Florey's district has contacted me to make it quite clear that that kindergarten regarded approaching the honourable member as being useless . . .

At the time that was said, I had doubts whether contact had been made at my office. I have checked with my secretary, and she has no recollection of having been rung or of receiving any correspondence. I have checked with the Directors of the three Kindergarten Union kindergartens in the electorate of Florey, and they assure me that they have not attempted to contact me or the member for Todd. I can only assume that he must be the new member for Balfours because of the pork pies he tells.

Later that day the member for Todd sought leave to make a personal explanation. Leave was granted. His statement was as follows:

I refer to the personal explanation just given by the member for Florey. I make two points because, obviously, the member for Florey has two complete misunderstandings. First, I will quote the words I used in the Parliament on Wednesday. After an interjection from the member for Florey asking which kindergartens I was referring to, I stated:

> One of the kindergartens in the member for Florey's district has contacted me to make it quite clear that that kindergarten regarded approaching the honourable member as being useless . . .

I did not state that they had approached the honourable member, but the words given to me by the parents from the kindergarten were quite clear, in that they said that they regarded—

After some interjections, the member for Todd continued:

> In other words, I gave the absolute truth because I said that they regarded it as being useless. The words are there for the record, so members can squawk all they like. I also make the point that it was a group of parents representing one of the management committees of one of the kindergartens in the District of the member for Florey that approached me.

I again checked with the Directors of the Kindergarten Union for the following kindergartens in the Florey electorate regarding the allegations of the member for Todd: Enfield, Ingle Farm, and Valley View. They advised me as follows: (1) that they had not approached my office or sought to; (2) that they would have known if the management committees had approached my office or sought to and they advised that they had not; (3) that they had not approached any other member of Parliament or sought to; and (4) that they would have known if the management committee had approached any other member of Parliament's office and they advised that it had not.

I then contacted the Kindergarten Union Directors whose kindergartens will be in the electorate of Florey after the

next State election. The Director of the St Agnes Kindergarten, which is in the electorate of Todd, advised me she had not sought to approach any member of Parliament and that the members of the Management Committee had not done so. The only contact with a member of Parliament had been a telephone call from the Secretary to the member for Todd who had asked for the addresses of the members of the Management Committee of the St Agnes Kindergarten so that he could advise them of the Liberal Party's view in the matter of the Children's Services Bill.

The Director of the Modbury North Kindergarten in the electorate of Newland advised me that she had not sought to approach any member of Parliament and that the members of the Management Committee had not done so, either. The Director of the Modbury Kindergarten, which is in the electorate of Newland, had approached the member for Todd because she lived in the electorate of Todd although the kindergarten was not in her electorate. It is obvious that allegations made by the member for Todd are incorrect. I thank the member for Todd for accepting that I will be the member for Florey after the next election.

TERTIARY RESIDENTIAL FUNDING

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON (Torrens): I move:

That this House condemns the Federal Government for its decision to phase out recurrent funding for tertiary residential colleges and halls of residence and in particular, condemns the Federal Minister, Senator Ryan, for—

(a) refusing to discuss the decision with the heads of colleges and halls of residence;

(b) ignoring the report of the Universities Council which stated 'The Council is concerned that the effect of this (cut) could be that fees will rise thus imposing an increased financial burden on students from non-metropolitan backgrounds who constitute the majority of residents';

(c) ignoring the advice of the Tertiary Education Commission 'that an amount equal to the recurrent grant should be made available to the heads of colleges and halls for grants to needy students in residence to help them meet the costs of accommodation, an amount which could be effectively used for the limited number of students in residents'; and

(d) her argument that university colleges are elitist and cater principally for private school students,

and further, this House notes that a recent survey conducted by Professor David Beswick of the University of Melbourne shows that 80 per cent of collegiate students have to live away from home, more than half come from Government schools and a quarter come from homes where the combined parental income is less than $300 per week.

Obviously, that is a very lengthy motion and, as the time for private members' business is winding up, I intend to keep my remarks reasonably brief. Most of the context of the remarks is contained within the motion. I wish only to quote from copies of correspondence which I have and which will give a broad view of the feelings of the community in this matter. The first letter from which I wish to quote is to the Prime Minister, Mr Hawke, from the Archbishop of Melbourne, which says:

In its report for the 1982-84 triennium, the Commission—

that is, the Tertiary Education Commission—

drew a clear distinction between collegiate and non-collegiate forms of residence and recommended that funding continue at existing levels to those residences which qualified as 'collegiate' in character.

The Archbishop then says (and this is very important):

Without any warning, without any consultation and certainly without any regard for consensus, Senator Ryan responded by announcing that the recurrent grant for 1984 would be cut by 25 per cent.

Senator Ryan then asked the Tertiary Education Commission to review the whole question of funding for colleges, and in its 1985-87 triennium report the Commission recommended that an amount equal to the existing recurrent grant be made available to residents and distributed on a certain needs basis. What was Senator Ryan's response to that? The Archbishop goes on:

Senator Ryan's guidelines for the triennium 1985-87 have announced the Minister's decision contrary to the Commission's recommendations to phase out the grants from the colleges altogether.

We have a situation where, in response to the Senator's decision to cut the grants by 25 per cent initially, she referred it to the Tertiary Education Commission. They recommended that the grants be retained under certain conditions at current levels, and her response to that was to cut the grants out altogether. In fact, they were to be phased out over a three year period. The Archbishop's letter finishes as follows:

Although I write to you as Chairman of the Councils of the three Catholic colleges in Victoria, I am far from alone in my disquiet, which is shared by my brother Bishops in this State. I am further confident that my concern is also shared by my brother Bishops in Townsville, Brisbane, Armidale, Sydney, Canberra, Hobart, Adelaide and Perth where there are Catholic university colleges meeting the needs of hundreds of students.

The words of the Archbishop of Melbourne are not to be taken lightly.

I return to the position in South Australia. I received a communication from the South Australian Chapter of the Association of Heads of Residential Colleges and Halls of Universities in Australia. At the time of writing, the Chairman of that South Australian Chapter was Doctor Kenny, from St Ann's College. She said in her letter:

In South Australia, university colleges provide places for about 900 tertiary students, more than 95 per cent of whom come from homes outside the metropolitan area. Some students are from overseas but others are from interstate—particularly from the Northern Territory and Tasmania, where the courses they are attending in Adelaide are unavailable—and the rest must live away from home in order to pursue tertiary studies. We consider them, by reason of that fact, to be disadvantaged compared with city students.

University colleges are open to students of all tertiary institutions: they provide supervised accommodation, study facilities, tutorials and personal counselling. These services provide some form of redress for the disadvantage to students in having to live away from home and adjust to city life while undertaking their tertiary study. From the parents' point of view, country families experience disruption and uncertainty when children must leave home to study; for many, the university college with its care, supervision and personal contact with a college head or tutors makes the process bearable.

I think that is very important because one of the biggest groups in the community which is disadvantaged by Senator Ryan's decision is country students.

That is further emphasised in the quote from a letter I have from the Chairman of the Murray Bridge High School Council. It states:

Presently there are nine ex-Murray Bridge High School students who live at Lincoln College alone, and Lincoln is only one of five colleges or halls in Adelaide. The college environment allows students who are forced to live away from home an opportunity to get to know others at university and settle down into tertiary studies. Colleges provide social and sporting opportunities creating a community feeling that undoubtedly speeds the transition of living away from home, friend and family.

The following is important:

In closing I will quote the rather bleak conclusion of the Beswick report . . .

. . . one effect of funding cuts to residential colleges and halls will be to reduce participation in tertiary education by students from country districts.

The letter then ends on this note:

It baffles us [that is, the Murray Bridge High School Council] that such a decision has come from a Government that preaches consensus and 'equity and participation' in education.

Those are the views of the Murray Bridge High School Council. I have other letters here, from which I will not quote at length, from individual students who are pleading that these grants be re-established by the Federal Minister, Senator Ryan.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: It's particularly difficult for the students at Roseworthy Agricultural College.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: My colleague the member for Light, who has an intimate knowledge of the difficulties of students at Roseworthy Agricultural College, would well know that. Most members, certainly on this side of the House, have been approached by country students who have been disadvantaged by this proposal. I want to conclude my remarks by saying a little about the Beswick Report. I have mentioned very briefly the conclusions in that report. The Beswick survey found, among other things:

More than 80 per cent of college students came from non-metropolitan areas: in terms of social and educational backgrounds they did not appear to be especially privileged and were typical of university students in general and the colleges play an important role in acclimatising students, particularly those from outer metropolitan and isolated areas, to a totally new environment.

I believe that the Federal Government's decision is in total contradiction of that Government's professed commitment to widening access of tertiary education to disadvantaged groups. I believe that the resultant rise in fees at residential colleges will only make it more difficult for students in the greatest need.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

FARM VEHICLE CONCESSIONS

The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport): I move:

That this House calls on the Government to reject the proposals to remove the concessions granted to primary producers for the registration of certain farm vehicles and supports the continuation of the present concessions.

In moving this motion I urge the Government and particularly the Premier (as basically this is a Treasury matter), and also the Minister of Transport, to now give an absolute guarantee regarding the removal of these concessions on registration fees for primary producers' vehicles. Currently the Government has before it a report which is being examined. The report from the Concessions Review Committee which was made available in August of last year makes the following recommendations at page 75:

Motor vehicle concessions. The 11 recommendations of the Department of Transport subcommittee are presented below together with the Concessions Review Committee's conclusions on each.

1. That there be legislative change so that the primary producer concessional rebate is granted only where primary production is the principal occupation of the vehicle owner. Estimated saving, $200 000 per year.

That recommendation was endorsed by the Concessions Review Committee. The second recommendation was as follows:

Primary producer concessions on utilities and other light commercial vehicles of less than 2 tonnes unladen mass be disallowed. Saving, approximately $1 million per annum.

That recommendation was also endorsed by the Concessions Review Committee. The third recommendation was that:

Only one vehicle per proprietorship be able to obtain primary producer concession—

with a resultant saving of an estimated $500 000 a year. That also was endorsed by the Concessions Review Committee. In other words, the Government has before it an actual recommendation that three areas of concessions for lower registration rates for primary producers should be abolished and that they should pay the normal registration applicable to those in country areas.

It is appropriate that I tackle the real issues behind this issue. Concessions were originally granted because many primary producers' vehicles are driven on farm properties rather than on roads. It is well known that registration fees are collected and put into the dedicated Highways Fund. All of the money from that fund is used for road construction. Of course, the concessions were granted because, as many primary producers were using vehicles on their farms rather than on the roads, they should not have to pay that fee for road construction. Furthermore, many of the roads in country areas are nothing more than small dirt tracks, and there are many unsealed roads in this State in the rural areas particularly on Eyre Peninsula and in the North of the State, as well as in some of the more settled areas of Yorke Peninsula and the Central Mid-North. One can appreciate very quickly when looking at those roads that very little money has been spent.

Therefore, farmers who use those roads (if they use them at all), should not have to pay substantial amounts of money to the State Government for registration of their vehicles. It would be totally immoral to go ahead and threaten the removal of those registration concessions applicable to primary producers. If those concessions were removed farmers would be forced to pay an extra $1.7 million to the State Government. That would cause additional hardship to thousands of farmers who already face a very sharp reduction in farm income. I want to quote from an article that appeared in the *Stock Journal*, a weekly publication that country people use almost as their Bible.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I keep in touch with all those areas of the State, and I regularly read the *Stock Journal*. I refer to an article that appeared on page 15 of the *Stock Journal* of 7 February. Headed 'Further farm income drop looming, says BAE chief', it states:

Farmers' incomes are expected to continue to fall in 1985-86, Bureau of Agricultural Economics' Director, Dr Andy Stoeckel, has warned. Farm incomes are already predicted to drop substantially in 1984-85, due primarily to high world commodity stocks and a smaller national wheat crop. But Dr Stoeckel, speaking after the closing session of the National Agricultural Outlook Conference, said the BAE's early projection for 1985-86 was of a further drop of between 15 and 20 per cent in farm incomes.

Dr Stoeckel said this projection was assuming normal seasons. He could not see much improvement in world commodity prices and the movement in the United States dollar could have a further de-stabilising effect on income.

That highlights the fact that primary producers in South Australia are suffering a substantial drop in income this year, on average, from 15 to 20 per cent and many suffered a substantial drop in 1983-84. In fact, in 1983 it is generally recognised that the average income of dairy farmers in this State suffered a drop of about 27 to 30 per cent, so for two successive years it would appear that primary producers (or some, at least) will suffer a substantial loss.

Honourable members would agree that a drop in income of even 15 to 20 per cent in one year, let alone a drop of perhaps up to 30 per cent in the previous year for some of those farmers, is very substantial. I know that of a number of rural families now, particularly in the dairying industry, are facing a very difficult and tight situation. Madam Acting Speaker, that is substantiated and if you would like to look at some of the articles in the *Stock Journal* it is freely available in the Library. Those articles make interesting reading and it is appropriate that members opposite should peruse them, because I know that they very seldom take an interest in primary production and the primary producer in this State.

Mr S.G. Evans: That's not true: they buy milk!

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: They use the commodities but take little interest in the activities of the primary producer. My concern is that the Government should be aware of the financial crisis facing the large majority of primary producers throughout the State so that it understands why the concession for registration for motor vehicles belonging to primary producers was introduced and it should therefore bring down an appropriate decision and do so very quickly.

The original recommendation came before the Government and this Parliament in August last year when the State Budget was introduced. That is now about six months ago. The Government has had that recommendation for six months and it is time that we had a decision from it. The last thing we want is further procrastination until after what the Government thinks is a State election that it will win, so that it can then make the decision. We want a clear commitment from it now so that there will be no dropping of those concessions for primary producers.

It is appropriate that we briefly examine the effect that the recommendation would have. It says that vehicles with a gross unladen mass of less than 2 tonnes would be disallowed from the concessions. Virtually every farmer in this State would have some sort of utility that comes within that category. Therefore, they would lose their concessions on that. Across the whole State, that alone would mean about $1 million additional revenue for the State Government. Secondly, only one vehicle per farm or proprietorship would be available for that concession. There would be many farms with two, three or perhaps four vehicles currently obtaining that concession. Of course, the more vehicles there are invariably those mileages are only travelled on the farm rather than on the open road. Again, if that concession was removed it would cost primary producers in this State an extra $500 000 a year.

The third area was the so-called hobby farmer or other substantial farmers who may have invested money in non-agricultural pursuits who would also have their concessions removed. That is plainly unfair for those people, particularly if they decided to diversify, yet the vehicles concerned are still being used solely for primary production purposes.

Therefore, I move the motion and urge all members of the House to support it: it is a motion that pays significant importance to primary production in this State. After all, primary production still accounts for something like 50 per cent of the exports of commodities out of South Australia or in excess of 50 per cent of the export income of this State. Without that, and without a viable primary industry, this State's economy would be in diabolical trouble. I commend the motion to the House.

Mr BLACKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ALCOHOL CONSUMPTION

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I move:

That in the opinion of the House the Government bring in legislation to allow district councils, corporations and the Outback Areas Community Development Trust to restrict and control or prohibit consumption of alcohol in public places, streets and roads similar to the legislation that operates in the Northern Territory.

The purpose of the legislation would be to give local communities the opportunity, if they so desired, to control disorderly behaviour in streets, parks and other public areas within their boundaries. The current situation is that certain councils, as I understand it, have authority to bring in by-laws. However, that would require them to have their own inspectors to police them. The only satisfactory way to resolve this matter is to have in place legislation enacted by this Parliament which then gives local administrations, which can react to public concern in their areas, the opportunity to set aside certain parts of their areas. It is a quite simple and reasonable proposition to put forward which then will allow the police in their normal duties to be the people who carry out and enforce the legislation. It is not aimed at any one group or groups of people.

We all know what took place at Glenelg some months ago, and we know the problems that have taken place at Memorial Drive at rock concerts. I am aware of the problems that people have had in the Mall, with louts throwing beer bottles, and of other disorderly behaviour. We are aware of the problems that have taken place at Coober Pedy, Port Augusta, Ceduna and other places. This motion asks the State Government to investigate the possibility of bringing in legislation similar to that which currently operates in the Northern Territory, where it has been successful.

If anyone thinks that allowing large numbers of people to behave in an anti-social and disorderly manner, annoying locals and tourists, is a good situation and one that people should have to tolerate, I believe that they are failing to properly appreciate and understand the feelings and concerns of those communities that have to tolerate such unnecessary and disgraceful behaviour. I will give a few examples to the House and I read from an article in today's *Advertiser*, as follows:

A submission by the City of Port Augusta argued for a law against drinking in certain places after outlining complaints of antisocial behaviour, litter and broken glass in various places in the city, notably in Gladstone Square and the main beach. The submission stated: 'We view a law of this type in the same way as all other laws necessary for the orderly control of any community, a tool to protect the rights of all persons to the quiet enjoyment of a public utility.' Some of the comments in favour of a drink law included:

Gladstone Square gives a bad image to Port Augusta to tourists.

The Croquet Club is affected by the swearing and the rubbish problem in Gladstone Square.

For tourists the scene is frightening. Why should they have to see drunks throwing bottles around at the beach front?

I further quote from an article, headed 'Council concerned . . .' in the *West Coast Sentinel* of 19 December 1984, which states:

According to council overseer, . . . the problems associated with the foreshore area have increased to such a degree over the past three months, it has been necessary to spend an extra eight hours per week cleaning it up. On one particular warm day a council employee estimated he collected ten dozen bottles from the lawns and roadway. This figure did not include the number of broken bottles which had to be swept up or hand picked from the lawn.

The *West Coast Sentinel* of 16 January states:

Councillor . . . said the situation was very serious. 'It has become so intolerable, you could not drive a car along the foreshore. We are paying penalty rates for the council sweeper to work there on weekends and it is time this situation was resolved once and for all.'

Councillor Miller, who is also Chairman of the Far West Aboriginal Progress Association, supported the concept. 'I've had a gutful of the problems on the foreshore too.' Councillor Miller said. 'These few give all Aboriginal people a bad name. an Aboriginal liaison officer could be a good idea, but a person should not be the officer in his own area.'

I could go on and quote from a number of other documents. We are fully aware of what has taken place down at Glenelg and in other parts of the State. I wrote to the Minister of Community Welfare on 12 November stating:

Dear Mr Minister,

Further to our telephone conversation in relation to the problem at Nundrew—will you give urgent consideration to bringing in amendments to the Local Government Act, so as to prevent drinking outside public places, like hotels, and to alleviate the problem at Nundrew, Ceduna, Port Augusta and Coober Pedy?

I understand that such a law operates successfully in the Northern Territory. I have had a number of requests in recent days and I ask you to give it your urgent consideration.

I have had other correspondence with the Minister following certain problems. The Northern Territory legislation makes it an offence to consume alcohol within two kilometres of a licensed premise. Local government bodies should have the authority to determine which area should be declared under the proposal I put forward, because local people are affected by this disorderly conduct about which I have been complaining. I have had complaints of tourists having been abused and threatened in areas adjacent to hotels. I could list a number of unfortunate instances. I do not want to unduly highlight the problem, but I want to see the Government take positive action to rectify the situation once and for all.

It is all very well for people such as those who compile the report mentioned in the *Advertiser* today to say that that is not the way to solve the problem. They are in the happy situation of not having to live with or put up with what the local residents have to put up with. If those people had to tolerate this disorderly conduct outside their houses or in streets adjacent to where they live, they would support the motion before the House.

It is all very well for them to sit in their lofty towers and unrealistically put forward academic viewpoints when they are not affected by this anti-social behaviour. I guarantee that the people at Glenelg would like something done about it as they have had a gutful of the situation. The people at Port Augusta, Ceduna and Coober Pedy would also like something done about it. We are not helping the people involved. It is degrading to see them lying around the streets in this unfortunate condition. We want the problem sorted out once and for all.

We are aware of the sorry state of affairs in Victoria Square and other parts of Adelaide in the early hours of the morning. I agree with appointing liaison officers, and funds ought to be made available to that end. One of the real problems is that these unfortunate people do not have employment and have nothing to do with their time. When we see any group in our society in that situation we will have problems. The proposition I put forward is only one way of solving this unfortunate problem for this group of people in our society.

It is not necessary for me to comment further. I have had a Bill drafted. I have been most patient; I have not brought the Bill forward, and I have given the Government fair warning. It is my intention, if the Government does not act during the next session of Parliament, to bring in the Bill and test the will of the Government. I have a responsibility to those people in my electorate and in other parts of the State who have had enough of this unruly and anti-social behaviour. I look forward to the Government's response.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ACCIDENT TOWING ROSTER SYSTEM

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. D.C. Brown:

That the regulations under the Motor Vehicles Act, 1959, relating to the accident towing roster scheme, made on 30 August 1984 and laid on the table of this House on 11 September 1984, be disallowed.

(Continued from 14 November. Page 1890.)

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I was surprised that this disallowance was moved by the member for Davenport, as the previous Liberal Government passed this legislation through the House. There was a delay of many years before the regulations were brought down; they were under discussion for some time, and the regulations brought down were virtually the same as those proposed by the Liberal Government. In my opinion, the member for Davenport is playing a mischievous game. He is aligning himself with the very people who opposed his Government's legislation and who subsequently opposed the two sets of regulations that have been enacted.

By way of interjection in the House I suggested to the member for Davenport that in making these proposals he was supporting bribery, thuggery and attempted murder within this industry. He asked me to justify that statement and this is the first opportunity that I have had to do so. The industry had to be controlled because of unsavoury practices occurring within it. I refer to evidence given to the Subordinate Legislation Committee on this question of the unsavoury practices which were in operation in the towing industry and which brought about the regulations and the necessity for a towing roster. We were told:

1. The premises of 'A', a crash repairer and tow truck operator, were feloniously entered during a weekend. A tow truck was then used to ram three repaired and painted vehicles on the premises awaiting delivery to their owners. About $2 000 damage was sustained.

2. 'B', a tow truck driver, induced an injured and shocked accident victim to sign an incompleted authority and then inserted on the authority the tow truck driver's depot as the place to take the damaged vehicle instead of the accident victim's home as requested. The accident victim's credibility and that of an independent witness was disputed at a subsequent court hearing.

3. 'C', a tow truck operator, in the presence of two of his tow truck drivers, assaulted an opposition tow truck driver in the parking allotment of a hotel near a damaged motor vehicle. The assault was denied.

4. 'D', a tow truck operator, falsely represented his qualifications to a shocked and injured accident victim. His tow truck certificate was subsequently suspended.

5. 'E', a tow truck operator and crash repairer, was 'pirating' accident location information relayed for two-way radio code for the use of 'G', another crash repairer and tow truck operator. During a weekend the rear door of 'K's' business premises were damaged by a shotgun blast—possibly a warning.

6. 'F', a tow truck driver appears to have incurred the wrath of other tow truck drivers because of his abrasive remarks at accident scenes and,

(a) during November 1983 he had his tow truck parked outside a friend's residence and the tow truck was damaged—ignition wiring pulled out etc.

(b) during March 1984 he received a bogus call to attend an accident scene late at night—the area was deserted when he arrived at the supposed scene and he saw two unknown men lurking nearby—he drove away. Later that night he was assaulted at his home by two unknown men.

7. 'G', some time later whilst driving his tow truck along a main road a fire mysteriously started under the bonnet of his vehicle causing approximately $1 000 damage.

I could go on and on. Six other incidents were reported to the committee of problems that were occurring within the tow truck industry prior to the introduction of this legislation.

Let us consider an area that is unregulated, and that would be the result if the member for Davenport's proposition was successful in this House today: we would go back to an unregulated situation. We have the situation in New South Wales now where certain problems are occurring. A report in the 7 January 1985 edition of the *Sydney Morning Herald*, under the heading 'Government bid to smash towing rackets', states:

A range of proposals to clean up rackets in the tow truck industry will be recommended to the State Government within four weeks. This follows the killing of a tow truck driver four months ago, bashings, standover tactics and allegations of bribes to police over the past seven years.

The recommendations are to go to the Minister for Industrial Relations, Mr Hills, in four weeks, from a report compiled by the Tow Truck Industry Advisory Council chaired by Mr Vince Nash, the head of the Motor Vehicle Repair Industry Council. The Minister will be asked to consider setting up a statutory Tow Truck Industry Council with a wide range of disciplinary powers under new laws.

It is understood that any new council might begin by cancelling all licences and start afresh. Police records would be checked, and criminals barred. Violence has become commonplace in the industry: brawls at crash sites, attacks in back alleys where tow hooks, blocks of wood and in several cases shotguns have been used.

Deregulation of the industry would return us to the law of the jungle, and I hope that the House would not be prepared to support such a ridiculous proposition.

I would also like to refer to an article in the 4 February 1984 edition of the *News* referring to what is happening in Sydney, where no regulations are currently in place. The article, under the heading 'Police named in tow scandal', states:

A high level investigation has been launched following allegations of police involvement in a tow truck racket. A man who claimed he had evidence of police being paid up to $50 a time for early accident tip-offs was knocked down hours later by a hit-run driver.

Allegations of police involvement were made last week by Ian Stephen, 23, a former tow truck driver. He named several police, including a chief superintendent, as being involved in a 'kick-back' scheme. All the police were based at one Sydney suburban station.

We had the opportunity on the Subordinate Legislation Committee to examine witnesses who had something to say about the sort of things that were happening in the tow truck industry in South Australia before regulations came into effect. All these papers are available to the Parliament. They are public documents and have been available to the press for some time. I quote from page 64 of paper No. 255, where Mr Fischer's evidence appears:

135. The Chairman: Mr Fischer, what is your interest in this matter?—(Mr Fischer) I have also been involved in the crash repair industry and a towing service over a long period. We believe it is absolutely essential that the present situation be changed, especially in the tow truck area, where a lot of customers are being mistreated and a lot of things are happening that are against the law and almost criminal, It must be stopped sooner or later. If there is not control of some kind, things will get out of hand, and everyone will go back to the old system of getting out the shot gun, as happened 10 years ago. I believe that changes are absolutely necessary. I agree with Mr Henricks, who referred to most of what we have to achieve.

So, I was asked to provide to the House the evidence of bribery and corruption going on within this industry, and the need to provide this sort of legislation. This is why I am prepared to produce this sort of thing to the House. A very interesting piece of evidence was given to that committee by Mr Shipp, who stated:

I go along with what Geoff and Horst have said. Many of the drivers are cowboys—they are out for the thrill of it; they chase accidents; they do not give a damn whether they damage the vehicle more. This is mainly in relation to the part-time blokes, the main operators are not that way. But those people are only interested in a quick quid. There are a couple of matters that the Executive Director left out which we still have to talk with the Registrar about. I refer to the matter of the towing roster review committee at which there should be an industry member at all meetings. Another point concerned being open on Saturday mornings.

He then goes on to list the problems that he wished to take to that committee. I would like to put on record some questions and answers about problems within this industry. I refer first to a question asked by the member for Hartley of a witness to this committee:

215. If you have a good reputation in the industry on the repair side you should be able to recapture that proportion of the market?

The witness replied:

It brings up another very complex problem: the direction of work by insurance companies. Whether it is legal or illegal, over or under the table, it happens. Once that guy takes his car home and rings up the insurance company, he may or may not get on to someone on the counter who has a friend down the road. When he says, 'Where do I take my car', it only takes one word and he takes it to Joe Blow. If one sent 90 per cent of people into insurance companies without telling them anything, there is a good chance one would lose a repair job, irrespective of the standard of one's work.

Therefore, prior to the introduction of this legislation and regulation we had bribery and corruption within the industry and talk about over and under the table payments. Later, I questioned the witness as to what he meant by over and under the table payments. Apparently, over the table payments are payments that are legally usable and taxable. Under the table payments are payments that apparently the Taxation Department does not see.

If ever an industry needed regulation, and if ever an industry needed a towing roster system, this was the industry, and I am totally surprised that the Liberal Party—or members of the Liberal Party (they have yet to be tested out)—are prepared to support the deregulation of the industry which would bring back problems such as bribery, corruption, thuggery and everything else that goes with it that we have seen in the past. I would hope that many members opposite do not choose to support this proposition. In relation to the way the towing roster system has gone since its introduction, I have had passed on to me correspondence—

Mr Baker interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: Does the member for Mitcham want to see deregulation of the industry? Does he want to see this bribery and corruption continue? Does he support the sort of things that have been happening within the industry?

Mr Baker: Absolutely incompetent!

Mr FERGUSON: I am surprised that the member for Mitcham is willing to support people who are prepared to go on with the sort of problems that have been experienced within the towing industry.

Members interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: Unfortunately, I do not have time to answer all the interjections.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitcham will have an opportunity to speak at a later time. The member for Henley Beach.

Mr FERGUSON: I would like to refer briefly to the roster system as it has been operating. We have heard a lot from the other side about the way in which the towing industry allegedly has not been working. Correspondence has been received by the Minister (and, as I am part of the Minister's legislative committee, he is allowing me to use this material today) about how the roster system has been working since its introduction. These letters are from people within the industry. The first one is from Plaza Crash Repairs—

Mr Baker: What about the—

Mr FERGUSON: I know the member for Mitcham supports the sort of bribery and problems that were going on within the industry: I know, too, that he would like to see deregulation. However, that would bring the same sort of problems in South Australia that are now being experienced in New South Wales. The letter from Plaza Crash Repairs states:

We write to you today regarding the accident towing roster scheme. We have been assessing the situation since it was introduced on 14 October 1984. We hope that our letter and our information will be of assistance to you. There seems to be some confusion about us, the tow truck operators. As far as we, Plaza Crash Repairs and Towing Services, are concerned, the new accident towing roster scheme is working well. In the first month from 14 October 1984—

Members interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: I know members of the Opposition do not like this, but the letter continues:

In the first month from 14 October 1984 our fuel bills alone have dropped by one third: our general operating costs are down and we now feel confident that we are offering a far more efficient, economic towing service to the public.

In reference to the gloomy predictions of certain people within the industry that our work would be greatly reduced, we are

pleased to say that, if anything, our work has increased to the extent that we have employed new staff since the accident towing roster scheme was introduced. However, we feel there are certain areas which could be greatly improved. We have received many inquiries from our own customers regarding the freedom of choice of crash repairers.

We heard a lot about freedom of choice when this matter was put before the Subordinate Legislation Committee. The letter continues:

It would seem that the general public has not been educated enough on their rights and options. They (the public) feel that there is no choice of their own repairer. There should be more publicity for several reasons. First, that the public should contact the accident tow truck hotline with much more efficiency than they are now doing in the interests of the motorists involved. Secondly, to improve the time delay between the occurrence of the accident and the appropriate towing service being called. We are doing our part in providing a 24 hour service, seven days a week, and responding promptly to any accident towing roster scheme directive.

We admit to having had reservations about the new scheme, but since its introduction we have now every hope that, with a few improvements and a little more publicity, the accident towing roster scheme could be a very successful operation for the crash repair and towing industry, as well as the Motor Vehicles Department and the Tow Truck Inspectorate but, most importantly, the motoring public.

I have received from Shipp Bros Pty Ltd a similar letter which reads as follows:

Dear Sir,

I write with regard to an article published in the Sydney (NSW) papers reporting of difficulties experienced within the tow truck industry in NSW. There are similarities to those of our own industry prior to the implementation of our recent legislation, indeed I reported various instances over the years experienced by some members of fire bombs, bullets through windows, etc.—

he is talking about South Australia when he talks about fire bombs, bullets through windows, etc.—

to our Subordinate Committee and police representatives. The new roster system generally appears to be effective; in fact, to approximately 99 per cent of accident directions our company has received, we have successfully attempted to time our arrival between 5 to 20 minutes of receiving a direction.

There have, however, been some occasions where I believe tow trucks have been deliberately late to scenes of accidents, then either fabricated or elaborated on stories of long time lapses. Fortunately, less of these are being reported as the roster continues. I believe that, at a recent Tow Truck Owners and Drivers Association meeting of 13 members present, eight voted in favour of the current roster system. For your interest I have enclosed a tear sheet from the Adelaide *News* from Monday, 4 February, outlining only one instance which occurred recently in Sydney.

Another letter, from the Manager of M.E.C. Crash Repairs reads as follows:

Dear Sir,

We are writing to you in regards to the new tow truck roster scheme. We would like to express that as far as our company is concerned the new roster is proving to be a good and timely scheme needed within our industry. We now find there is a more even distribution of work, enabling us to have a better control on the quality of workmanship. Therefore, we find we have a definite saving of time and money.

The member for Davenport referred to a survey that he took—a limited survey, if I might say so. The towing office also took a survey, which shows interesting results. The survey states:

Of the 467 persons contacted during this period, 355 of them expressed satisfaction with the scheme; 39 were satisfied but made minor complaints which were rectified; 50 were satisfied but complained of delay in a tow truck attending the scene; and 23 claimed that they were not satisfied with the scheme. Currently, a similar survey is in hand and the results so far show that practically all motorists contacted are extremely satisfied with the roster scheme and only one or two have complained of a delay. Of particular significance is the praise bestowed upon the roster scheme by motorists who were unfortunately involved in accidents both before and after the introduction of the roster scheme.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I support the motion. I have been a member of the committee of which the member for Henley Beach is a member. He has quoted only a few small portions of the evidence to which that committee had the misfortune to have to listen day in and day out. If ever a Minister was ham fisted, and did just as his public servants told him because he did not understand what he was putting before the House, it is the current Minister of Transport.

Nearly all the argument and the controversy which resulted in the bringing down of these regulations could have been avoided if common sense had prevailed, but the Minister did not understand. He took chapter and verse what certain public servants put before him—public servants who had been involved in this section for years; it was their pet subject. They had an aversion about tow trucks. We all know that there were scoundrels in the industry and that action had to be taken to clean up that industry, although it was not only the tow truck industry that needed cleaning up. I refer to this Government's track record in handling the tow trucks and the taxis. It botched up the taxis by referring that matter to a Select Committee. In this matter, the Government has brought down the most Draconian regulation that I have seen since I have been a member of Parliament. Those regulations would not have been accepted by any industry. The requirements on a person who wished to participate in the industry were the most ridiculous ever seen. I do not believe that they would have stood up in a court of law.

The long and short of it concerned a public servant with a phobia about finding scoundrels under the seat of every tow truck, and the Minister and his advisers were completely irresponsible in accepting that sort of nonsense. The member for Henley Beach has given us certain examples, but members should read Mr Shipp's evidence because it is a lot of nonsense. Mr Flashman gave evidence to the Subordinate Legislation Committee, and he did not represent the overwhelming majority of the industry. Dozens of people appeared before the Committee, dissociating themselves from Mr Flashman's remarks. I do not take a scrap of notice of what the honourable member said about Mr Shipp and others of that ilk, because some people in the industry would close it down: they would wipe out the small operators with one truck and the operators of family businesses who do not break the law. A few people would prosper from this exercise concerning the regulations under review, and that is the sort of ham-fisted arrangement that the member for Henley Beach asked the House to support.

I look forward to the very near future when the Liberal Party is returned to Government, when we can deal appropriately with those public servants who have been involved in this matter for too long by giving them more productive work to do, and when new blood can be appointed to this section so that people may consider this matter with an open mind. We have made that clear. When Minister Wilson introduced the original legislation, he set out the ground rules, stating that the Liberal Party would not tolerate the criminal element. On a number of occasions I have said that there were scoundrels in the industry and action was taken. However, one does not need to use a 14 lb sledge hammer to drive tacks into a shoe, but that is what this Government has done. The Minister clearly did not understand it. Government members have been given the task of supporting these Draconian regulations seeking information that no law-abiding citizen in a democracy should have to provide. Government members who have the unenviable job of supporting these regulations have stood up in this House and asked us to go along.

What has happened to the small operator, the one-truck operator and his wife? Why should such an operator have to give a 24-hour service? Surely they are individuals running their own businesses. Why should they be locked into this great bureaucracy, which will help one or two large operators

by lining their pockets? Once the Government licenses and controls operators, it helps a few. There are examples of that in other industries. We have created monopolies, and we will create a monopoly here. Following this, the Government will move on to look at the crash repair industry, and costs will increase as they have already increased as a result of this legislation.

The involvement of the member for Davenport in this exercise has been commendable. Through his initiative and his action these regulations have been disallowed by the Legislative Council and a number of significant amendments made to improve them. The Government has not gone far enough. Had it not been for the member for Davenport and other members on this side, the people of South Australia would have had foisted on them the most Draconian regulations that I have seen in my nearly 15 years as a member of Parliament.

For members opposite to say that members on this side have supported criminal activities is nonsense because Minister Wilson introduced the legislation. The member for Henley Beach repeated a complete untruth, which was peddled by a witness before the Committee: that these were Liberal Party regulations. No such regulations were taken to Executive Council or to the Parliament by the Liberal Party. Such regulations would not have seen the light of day under a Liberal Government. So, it is a complete untruth to try to convince this House and the public that the regulations have resulted from Liberal Government action. The people peddling such nonsense should be ashamed of themselves because there is not one scrap of evidence to justify that sort of comment.

It was enlightening and interesting for me to be a member of the Subordinate Legislation Committee and to have to listen to the extensive evidence that was given. I believe that that Committee played an important role. Indeed, had it not been for the evidence collected by it, the Legislative Council could not have disallowed the regulations. However, the Legislative Council had the evidence and therefore disallowed the first set of regulations. The Legislative Council then gave us the chance to cross-examine at length those people who were trying to administer the regulations and to bring before the Committee those people who had legitimate objections.

There are still certain problems with the regulations. For instance, I am still concerned about the one-truck operator, involved in a small family business, and about the attitude of some of the people who are administering the regulations. I am also concerned about the welfare of the unfortunate motorist who is involved in an accident. Why should a person who is involved in an accident have to take the tow truck that is rostered? Why cannot he contact a person with whom he has done business previously and engage him? If I am involved in an accident, I shall not be told by a police officer which tow truck operator will tow my vehicle. Why should a member of the public be required to do so? It is absolute nonsense. When the regulations were introduced, the Government Motor Garage could not even use the Government tow trucks. That is how silly the regulations are, yet the member for Henley Beach said that a marvellous job was being done under the regulations. Merely because the Minister has a number of Dorothy Dix letters, the honourable member expects us to support the regulations.

Mr Ferguson: There are more to which I didn't have time to refer.

Mr GUNN: We could go out and get lots of letters saying that the regulations are not working satisfactorily.

Mr Ferguson: We want you to act with integrity.

Mr GUNN: How about the sort of nonsense that Mr Shipp gave before the Subordinate Legislation Committee? Do not talk to me about integrity. I was disgusted with the nonsense that that witness gave before the Committee. I was absolutely disgusted with the performance of that witness. I could go through the huge amount of evidence available and quote chapter and verse.

We do not support the illegal activities that took place. We initiated the legislation and we have monitored closely what has taken place in Victoria. We believe that the regulations should be based on common sense and that they should be fair to the industry and protect the public. For the reasons I have given, I commend the member for Davenport for moving his motion and look forward to the time when the appropriate department of the Liberal Government, under the administration of the honourable member, will introduce regulations that will eliminate a considerable amount of bureaucracy and the unfair parts of the regulations, and also straighten up the provisions that are currently causing concern. I support the motion.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Fisher): I, too, support the motion. When it was first suggested that zoning be introduced in the tow truck industry, I had grave doubts, but I accepted the proposition of my Party that such legislation should be introduced. At the time, I feared that, if such legislation was introduced, it would be impossible in future for any young person to get into the industry, as has been the case in many other areas where the Government has introduced licensing, and this at a time when young people with initiative and skills would like the chance to get out into the world. This is another area where we have eliminated their chance of doing so.

I support the motion: it goes halfway to eliminating the zoning of operators. Earlier, I took the opportunity of informing those who were licensing new operators that they should check on a specific applicant for a new licence, and I referred to matters on which they would need to check regarding that person's previous way of life. Certain operators were still licensed and at least one operator of whom I know touts for business. By having these regulations the person who has an accident can go only to the operator who is rostered. That operator may operate a crash repair business and say to the person who has had the accident, 'There is no need for your car to be taken to your regular garage where you have had work done before. It can go to my garage for the repairs to be done. We do a better job in our crash repair workshop.'

When you get to the point that the tow tuck operator can virtually con as customers all the people involved in an accident, where the insurance companies do not have a say, to take the vehicle to his own workshop, this Parliament has guaranteed for those people clientele for a long time into the future, because how many customers are going to come forward and complain? Very few. That applies especially if the tow truck operator is on the spot, saying, 'We are going to take it.' A decision has to be made to take it to that operator's yard or to the regular mechanic's yard, because if the people concerned change their minds afterwards they must pay another towing fee.

The reason the community is not upset in large numbers—and by that I mean 40 or 50 per cent of the population—is that proportionately few people are involved in accidents, and it is only those actually involved in accidents who know the difficulties faced with this zoning in operation. For example, I am told by a lady who had an accident when her vehicle and another collided on Portrush Road, after they had just left a friend's place nearby, that there was a lot of emotion and shock at the accident. The driver of the other vehicle was slightly injured so the lady who was driving the car and to whom I refer in particular asked a passing motorist to phone in that they needed a tow truck. That motorist was told that they could not take a call for

her and that it had to be the owner of the vehicle or somebody associated with it, I believe.

What a stupid situation! A person is upset, there are two vehicles immobilised on the road at night-time (it was not necessarily right in the winter months but it was a wet night, causing some concern to other motorists) and a person is told that they then have to go up to a public phone and ring in. However, when the lady in question did that and said, 'There is another vehicle there for a second tow truck,' she was told, 'No, the owner or driver of that vehicle must ring in and give details.' How damn stupid are we? You have to give the details of the vehicle, and the person ringing in might not know that, or the people concerned do not have the details in their minds, so they have to go back to the car.

I have some very close friends in the crash repair industry and I know reasonably well other people in the tow truck industry. What we have done is place in the hands of a few people a guaranteed clientele whom they can exploit if they are ruthless enough, and some of them on the other side tell us that they are. I have no doubt that in the past there have been some shocking deals in all forms of business, trade unions or whatever else. However, we have placed in the hands of those few people a business that nobody else can get into, and it is an impossible situation. Surely we can see how stupid that is now that we have tried to put it into practice. The Liberal Party introduced the proposition, but in practice we can see the difficulties.

I do not know whether the Minister will respond, but will he guarantee to the House that he will ensure that there is more advertising of the correct towing fee? For example, I had one case recently where a couple were charged $94 for the tow of a vehicle over not a great distance, about 10 or 11 miles, and that is a lot of money for that distance. I believe we need more publicity telling the public what they have to do in the case of an accident if we are going to stick to these regulations. I know we do not have the numbers over here to beat it; as much as the member for Davenport would like to win on a vote, I know we cannot do that because that is the way Party politics operate. But surely we should be advertising and telling the community what their rights and responsibilities are and what is the appropriate fee for a tow of any particular type.

I am disgusted with the way it has worked out. I am disgusted with some people who are left in the industry with a guarantee of clientele and an opportunity to tow for business. In fact, it is a form of semi-blackmail for business, and I hope eventually, if we are not successful this afternoon, that somebody else in Parliament will make sure that these regulations are chucked out. I have hoped for a long time that zoning would also go out.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (19)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Becker, D.C. Brown (teller), Chapman, Eastick, S.G. Evans, Gunn, Ingerson, Lewis, Meier, Olsen, Oswald, Rodda, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (23)—Mr Abbott (teller), Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon, M.J. Brown, Crafter, M.J. Evans, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Mayes, Payne, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Pair—Aye—Mr Blacker. No—Mr Peterson.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

HOUSE NUMBERS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Baker:

That this House urge the Government to encourage local government councils to develop a comprehensive programme aimed at clear display by householders of house numbers for all metropolitan and urban allotments.

(Continued from 31 October 1984. Page 1676.)

Mr TRAINER (Ascot Park): I move to amend the motion as follows:

Leave out the words 'the Government to encourage' and leave out the words 'of house numbers' and insert in lieu thereof the words 'and owners of commercial premises of numbers'.

The syntactical construction of this amendment is perhaps not the best, but it is within Standing Orders, and would lead to the motion reading as follows:

That this House urge local government councils to develop a comprehensive programme aimed at clear display by householders and owners of commercial premises of numbers for all metropolitan and urban allotments.

The member for Mitcham's original motion does not deal with commercial premises, and I believe that they should be covered by this motion. The member for Unley has previously mentioned some of the problems that emergency services, and so forth, have had in contacting residents who have wanted them to call. The honourable member mentioned the problems that taxi drivers, in particular, have in locating various residences. Several years ago I spent a not insignificant time driving taxis, so I have some personal first-hand experience of some of the difficulties that can be created by inadequate house numbering of either residential properties or commercial premises. Even in broad daylight, locating premises in a poorly numbered street can be a very time wasting procedure. Even if the property that one is looking for has a very good number on it, that in itself is insufficient and is of very little help unless everyone else in the street has their place well numbered.

In the process of locating a certain house or building, one goes through roughly three steps: the first is to find the street, which is not always that easy, either, because some of the sign-posting is not all that effective in some areas. That matter will be addressed in a further motion this afternoon. Having found the street, one must then determine which side of the street has the odd numbers and which side has the even numbers, and then one must determine at which end of the street the numbers begin. Again, that is not so easy, although one can get some assistance from sign-posting in some areas which provides the name of the street and the direction of the numbers for that street.

In locating a house or property, one needs to find a sequence of numbers that will lead up to the property one is looking for. However, often one just cannot find enough numbers in the street to even determine which way the sequence operates. Trying to do this, even in broad daylight, while steering, braking, accelerating, gear changing, and carrying out all the other various procedures involved with driving—

Mr Mayes: Door knocking.

Mr TRAINER: It is also difficult when door knocking, as the member for Unley, present and future, points out. It is difficult enough in the day time, particularly when the risk of over-shooting the address can mean that one cannot get back to it for a while if it is in a one-way street or if one is unable to reverse or finds it difficult to turn around and come back again because of traffic conditions. It is frustrating and time wasting, and in busy traffic it can be quite dangerous in terms of the collision potential of that sort of situation. If it is raining or dark or, worse still, both, then one is operating in a dimly lit situation, which makes the problem 10 times worse, even if one has a powerful torch to assist.

I point out that in most cases it is not much good relying on one's car headlights because often the numbers are set back from the street; even if they are close to the street, often they cannot be seen, because one is driving along parallel to the kerb, so the car must be stopped or turned

into driveways, one after the other, startling all the occupants within with the car's headlights, as one tries to work out where the numbers are. In many cases numbers are poorly maintained. They may be merely painted numbers and the paint may have faded. In some cases, as the member for Henley Beach pointed out to me earlier, there are reorganised streets in which numbers which applied previously no longer apply but where residents still have the old number as well as their new number on their verandah, gatepost or whatever else.

Mr S.G. Evans: Plus the neighbour's because they may have bought his gate!

Mr TRAINER: Possibly that may exist in the honourable member's area: I am not quite sure whether they can afford gates down my way. In some cases the numbers can be covered over with undergrowth, and so on.

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mr TRAINER: As the member for Hanson points out, junk mail (which is probably Liberal Party pamphlets) protruding from the letter box could also cover the number. Several times when I was driving taxis I would very gently chide the passenger, saying, 'I am sorry that it took a while to find you but you did not have your number set out clearly.' They would point to a tiny number set way back from the street behind a bush and say, 'I know where it is, how come you didn't find it?' In such cases it could only have been found if someone had got out the hedge trimmers, yet people can get quite hostile if you suggest that they do not have the clearest number in the world.

However, even finding the house of a conscientious house owner, quite apart from those houses which do not have good numbers, can be difficult if the sequencing in the street is not very good. Possibly this sort of situation could cause death if an emergency service vehicle were unable to locate an address quickly enough, and this could apply to an ambulance in the case of an injured person or perhaps a police car trying to get to the scene of a crime.

The numbering system that we have can be improved by local government if it really wants an improvement. Local government has adequate power. I do not want to take up too much of private members' time but I refer to section 367 of the Local Government Act, which provides:

(1) The council may assign a number to every house and building in any street, road, or public place within the municipality, or any township within the district, and may from time to time, whenever the council deems it expedient, assign any other number to any such house or building in lieu of the previously assigned number.

(2) The council may cause the number assigned to any such house or building or a plate bearing that number to be painted or affixed in a conspicuous position on the front door of the house or building, or on the front gate of the premises belonging to the house or building, or such other fixture on any such premises as is approved by the council or surveyor, and for the purpose of any such painting or affixing any officer or servant of the council, or any person who has entered into a contract with the council in that behalf, may enter upon any private land and may do all such other matters and things as may be necessary for or incidental to that purpose.

(3) The owner for the time of the house or building or premises belonging thereto whereon any number is painted or number plate is affixed under the powers conferred by this section shall be liable to pay to the council the cost of painting such number or supplying and affixing the number plate.

That is a fair amount of verbiage, but nevertheless it makes quite clear that a council has the power to direct someone in that respect, although perhaps it may be a little heavy handed. I am not aware of too many councils having actually carried that out, but nevertheless, councils have that power.

I also draw honourable members' attention to an excellent article that appeared around this time last year (on 10 February 1984) in the *Weekend* section of the *Advertiser*. It was written by Mark Davies, and dealt with this problem. He pointed out that one can also have confusion caused by varying subdivision and allotment sizes. The article states:

When areas are subdivided, a lot number is usually given as the address until the council can allot street numbers, but when the new number is ignored, or an old sign is left up—

that is a problem I mentioned earlier—

discrepancies occur. And as all the allotments are different sizes, there can also be differing gaps between numbers.

He points out that this is a particular problem with commercial premises in the city. The report continues:

This is why so many city buildings are numbered 21-29 or similar, due to the small size of standard city allotments.

One building can cover what would otherwise be premises numbered 21, 23, 25, 27 or 29. The report continues:

The trouble is, they invariably display only one number, and the crazily disjointed sequences lead to people with cricked necks continually bumping into you muttering '220, 220, 220' as you wander down King William Street . . . This daily muddle may be accepted as normal by most people, but for emergency services it can be a nightmare.

Where there's fire there's smoke, and the fire brigade can usually find it, but what about an ambulance trying to locate a heart-attack victim, or the police chasing a prowler?

It is not only commercial premises that are not always well marked, some Government departments are not exactly first class, according to this article, which states:

I tried the Highways Department, listed as No. 33 Warwick Street, Walkerville, in the current white pages.

Nary a number 33 in sight.

Luckily 12-storey buildings are easy to spot in the middle of suburbia, but there was not so much as a tiny number over the entrance.

I must draw this to the attention of the Minister of Transport. Mark Davies goes on further to make a remark about the Local Government Association not having its premises terribly well marked. Following advice from the Highways Department, which said, 'It's nothing to do with us; try Local Government', he states:

Following that advice I contacted the Local Government Association, 2 Hutt Street, City. Odd, despite a nice sign proclaiming 'Local Government House' in front of the spanking new office, a street number could not be found.

On the other hand, the Minister of Local Government can take some pride in the fact that the very same article states that his offices are well marked, because Mark Davies says:

Back to the phone book. 'Local Government, Department of, 44 Pirie Street.' At last, a big, clear number 44 outside the Commerical Union Building.

I can see that the Minister of Local Government is quite pleased by that reference.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr TRAINER: I can only hope that the floors inside are just as clearly marked.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I always get lost!

Mr TRAINER: The Minister may get lost from office to office but he never gets lost amongst the legislation. Mark Davies further points out:

. . . but until councils, Government and private enterprise can get together we can only make sure our houses display legible numbers that don't need the use of bifocal binoculars.

However, as I pointed out, it is not much good your having a well located visible number on your premises if no-one else has. The report continues:

Incidentally, the police, St John, the fire services and Lions International are working on a proposal for uniform luminous number signs which house-holders will be able to buy. These will be easy to see from the road, and the group hopes the project will get off the ground before the end of the year.

I have not heard any more of the proposal mentioned there, but following some recent correspondence I had with the Marion City Council on the subject, I received this response to a letter that I wrote after an article appeared in the local *Guardian*. The letter reads:

Thank you for your letter of 24 January 1985, regarding problems experienced through inadequate house numbering. The article you refer to was placed in response to a circular letter from the Local Government Association urging councils to publicise the problems experienced.

So, this subject is still topical amongst local government: they are aware that there is a problem. The letter continues:

From time to time council staff receive complaints from emergency services and taxi operators about house numbers. They are usually because the numbers are obscured, not readily visible from the street or simply do not exist. As with many things, house numbers often seem unimportant until a property urgently needs to be identified. The problems are, of course—

as I pointed out earlier—

multiplied at night.

Mr Usher (the Town Clerk) further said:

You may be interested in the plastic house number I have enclosed with this letter. It is designed to fit on the splay—

this is a new word for my vocabulary—

where the kerb meets the driveway. A Geelong, Victoria, man invented them and several councils in that area applied for CEP funding to fit them in a major campaign.

An honourable member: We haven't got a driveway.

Mr TRAINER: I will come to that. The letter continues:

The application was unsuccessful as it did not provide sufficient training to improve job prospects. However, a local community committee concerned with youth unemployment undertook a project utilising short-term loans from the councils. Home owners were contacted and paid in advance for the numbers to be fitted. Several streets at a time were then treated. I understand the project was very successful, in that it resulted in the numbers being fitted outside many properties in a highly visible position while also creating jobs for young people.

The invention or gadget that I was shown is roughly to be described as a wedge shaped piece of plastic which fits on what I presume is the splay, namely, the area where a concrete driveway spreads out and meets the gutter. One locates that wedge shaped piece of plastic in the centre of the driveway so wheels do not touch it; unless one is awfully clumsy, they will be two or three feet on each side of it. The number is in reflective lettering on that wedge shaped piece of plastic, which I cannot display in the House because that would be in breach of Standing Orders, but if any members of the press want to look at it I can show them afterwards. I am not sure whether that is the complete answer or solution, because quite a few premises do not have driveways. Of course, it would not be much use for quite a lot of commercial premises for that same reason, but it is interesting to see that at least one group of people is actively working towards a solution to this problem. I quote further from the *Advertiser* article:

A final note of consolation—in Japan a country of 120 million people, it's even worse. In some areas, houses are still numbered according to their age, the first one in the street No. 1, the second built No. 2 . . . which means No. 1 can be next to No. 123.

Then the author makes some racist remark about it being 'tellibly confusing'. I do not necessarily agree with that slur. It is not so bad here, but it can be chaotic. I am pleased that the member for Mitcham has indicated that he will give some support to my amendment which will extend the motion to cover commercial premises.

Mr BAKER (Mitcham): I thank honourable members opposite for their contributions to the debate. I wholeheartedly endorse some of the observations that have been made in this regard and I know that, when the motion was publicised some months ago, I received a number of calls from emergency services people and taxi drivers, who have been mentioned here today. I am assured that I have total support from this House for this motion. I also believe that the addition of the amendment moved by the member for Ascot Park actually enhances it.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

SIGN POSTING

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Baker:

That, as part of the preparation for the sesquicentenary celebrations, a State campaign be organised in conjunction with all local government councils to implement a programme of clear and appropriate signposting of all highways, streets and roads by 1986.

(Continued from 31 October. Page 1676.).

Mr TRAINER (Ascot Park): An amendment has been circulated in the name of the Minister of Local Government, and on his behalf I move:

Leave out the words ', as part of the preparation for the sesquicentenary celebrations,' and insert before the figures '1986' the words ', if possible,'

As I mentioned in the previous resolution I have had some experience with taxis and house numbering and problems with street sign posting. I have had similar difficulties as a tourist trying to find my way around a strange place both here and overseas. We occasionally find that even where well intentioned efforts have been made they are often inadequate. We have, for example, the problem of placement of street signs. Some councils see fit to place them right down in the gutter, where they are probably quite good for leprechauns: they presume we are all from some part of Lilliput or, alternatively, giants of Brobdingnagian dimensions. One would have to be of Brobdingnagian dimensions to see at eye level the signs located high up on buildings.

Often the lettering is of a size illegible to motorists or pedestrians. At other times it is obscured by traffic lights, advertising, trees, and so on. Sometimes it is pointing in a direction where the motorist cannot read the sign for a turn-off until he has gone past it. Further down the road he then has to turn around and come back. The basic problem is that street signs and signs pointing to tourist areas are designed by people who know where they are going and, if tested, they are tested by other people from the locality who also know where they are going. For this reason they are useless to people, particularly tourists visiting the area, who do not know where they are going. A most difficult situation arises for a tourist who is in a foreign city and looking for a particular attraction. I was in that situation in Liverpool recently.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Or particular facilities.

Mr TRAINER: Yes, one could be urgently looking for a particular facility which I presume is what the Minister has in mind. Maybe he can explain later what facilities he does have in mind. I was not aware that he was Minister in charge of those facilities, but he may want to encourage tourists to spend a penny in one way or another. I was in Liverpool and looking for a museum. Every 200 or 300 yards was a signpost pointing to the attraction. I set off following the signs and suddenly the road split into a fork. I was not familiar with the traffic, was faced with a fork, had to turn left or right, with traffic behind me bearing down. In that situation one has a 50 per cent chance of being right. Unfortunately, I chose the other 50 per cent and several blocks down the road I noticed that the signs to the museum that had been appearing every 200 or 300 yards were no longer appearing. I made the decision to do a U turn, retraced my steps and headed back, took another turn but could not find the museum, as I could not locate another sign pointing in its direction. It is not difficult for one to give up altogether in that situation. The key point with street signs is that they need to be tested by strangers, or people who can empathise with strangers, who can put themselves into the position of someone who does not know their way around.

Similarly, one can encounter the problem in an unfamiliar suburb of coming out of a side street on to a main road and not knowing what main road one has come out on to. That does not happen whilst driving around one's own suburb. In my area I am familiar with every major street and have no problem, but when I find myself driving around a newer suburb in an outlying part of the metropolitan area I could come out on to a major two or four lane highway and not know what road it is. One will find almost without exception that councils do not put adequate street signs on corners where sidestreets meet a main road but take for granted that everyone knows that main road. Locals from my area know Marion, South and Cross Roads, but that does not apply to strangers visiting my district. They might come out of Ryan Avenue and know that street but not know that they have come on to Cross Road.

Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:

Mr TRAINER: I am sure that, along with most of us, the honourable member has had experiences of that nature. The problems are usually centred around the fact that street sign posting is not designed for those unfamiliar with the area and I call upon local authorities to consider that problem when this motion is carried by this House (as I am sure it will be) and comes to their attention.

Mr BAKER (Mitcham): I thank members for their support. I feel a little less comfortable with the amendment in this case because I wanted to see a clear commitment for a campaign that would start in 1985 and be rolling in 1986. I know that the Minister has indicated privately to me that it is in keeping with the sort of thing that has been talked about. I presume that a campaign will be launched. I feel less comfortable with the amendment than in the previous case, but having had discussions with the Minister I am assured that something will be done. I hope that we will be signalling that by 1986 something will be organised, a commitment will be made and we will see the first signs of our progress in this area. I thank honourable members for their concurrence.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

WINE INDUSTRY

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. P.B. Arnold:

That this House, recognising the depressed state of the wine industry, the plight of wine grape growers and their inability to meet mounting costs, condemns the Federal Government for imposing a 10 per cent sales tax on wine and calls on the Federal Government to withdraw the tax forthwith.

which the Minister of Education has moved to amend by leaving out all the words after the word 'recognising' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'the important issues facing the wine industry, commends the Federal Government for its decision to remove the excise on fortified wine and repay the excise collected and supports the decision of the Federal Government to establish a committee of inquiry into the wine industry in the 1984-85 Budget, following its announcement of a 10 per cent general sales tax on wine'.

(Continued from 14 November. Page 1903.)

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): The wine industry finds unbelievable the extent to which the South Australian Government will go to protect its Federal colleagues in supporting its action, which is absolutely contrary to the best interests of the wine industry. It is obvious from the amendment moved that either the Government in South Australia does not recognise the extent of the damage being done to the wine industry or it is so intent on supporting its Federal colleagues that it is prepared to abandon the wine industry, particularly in South Australia.

Since the wine industry is based predominantly in South Australia, it is a major source of income for this State and many people, directly and indirectly, are deriving their livelihoods from this industry. As a result of the last Federal Budget not only did the Federal Government impose a 10 per cent sales tax on wine but it reduced the duty on imported wine. That means that there is now a flood of imported wine coming into Australia at an unfair price, undercutting the Australian product and leaving the grapegrowers and the wine industry in desperate straits. Since the Federal Budget the volume of wine imported into Australia has increased to the extent of 29 per cent. That is a major increase and quite obviously will have enormous impact on the sale of Australian wine.

We could have had a situation in South Australia and throughout the wine industry in this country of a demand for wine grapes this financial year but, unfortunately, once again due to action taken by the Federal Government and not opposed by the State Government, we now have a situation where growers will be struggling once more in an over-supply situation to try to sell their product.

As I mentioned in this House last night, the growers are confronted with enormous increases in costs. The Government is applying pressure to those growers who are in arrears with their water rates and at the same time doing nothing to assist the growers in trying to meet their commitments to the Government. It is a disgrace that the Government is prepared to support its Federal colleagues to the extent that it is doing so, in direct opposition to a major industry in South Australia. I solidly oppose the amendment that has been proposed for and on behalf of the Government by the Minister of Education.

The House divided on the amendment:

Ayes (23)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold (teller), Bannon, M.J. Brown, Crafter, M.J. Evans, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Mayes, Payne, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (20)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold (teller), Ashenden, Baker, Becker, D.C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Ingerson, Lewis, Meier, Olsen, Oswald, Rodda, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pair—Aye—Mr Peterson. No—Mr Blacker.

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried; motion as amended carried.

ROXBY DOWNS BLOCKADE

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Gunn:

That in the opinion of this House, the Government should—

(a) give a clear undertaking that no further blockades or acts of vandalism by anti-uranium protesters will be tolerated at Olympic Dam or Andamooka;

(b) take the necessary action to protect the property, security and privacy of all citizens living at Olympic Dam and Andamooka as well as people using the roads in the area; and

(c) provide the necessary funds to compensate those whose properties have been damaged,

and further, this House condemns all those associated with the recent blockade.

(Continued from 14 November. Page 1896.)

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister for Environment and Planning): I ask the House to reject this motion. I have seriously considered the possibility of an amendment, because I do not lack sympathy with the honourable member in some of the things—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: —that have obviously influenced him to put this motion before the House. It is a matter that I lived with for quite some time because as Minister of Lands I had the custody of those lands that eventually were made over to the joint venturers of Roxby Downs as a miscellaneous lease, and as such it was obvious to me that, while an argument could be mounted that the people who were involved in the original vigil were trespassing on those pastoral lands, there could be little doubt at all that once those lands were converted to a miscellaneous lease and given over to the joint venturers as tenant a clear trade case of trespass could be made out. I notice that the honourable member is listening to this with a great deal of interest because he is aware, as I am, that there is a continuing problem in relation to access to pastoral lands.

He would be aware that at a meeting as recently as last Friday evening I gave a very firm commitment to the Range Lands Society meeting, as it was, at its annual meeting at the Newmarket Hotel that the Government would be legislating to put beyond doubt the problems of access and the legitimate fears that the lessees of pastoral lands have about the possibility of their being up for compensation where a person injured himself or herself in traversing those lands and things like that. I would hope that perhaps even before the end of this calendar year we would be in a position to legislate in relation to those matters. The fact that we feel that we have to legislate illustrates that there is a problem in relation to the rights of both the tenant on a pastoral lease and members of the general public who may happen to wander on to the lease. However, there was no doubt at all that once the miscellaneous lease was made available to the joint venturers a clear case of illegal occupation could be made out.

In the light of that, of course, the Government (at least the Police Force as the servants of the people) took action to remove the protesters from that area and, of course, the focus of activities occurred at Andamooka. I have never had put before me a clear picture of all that happened at that time. I believe that the protesters indulged in certain actions that obviously had the effect of inflaming the opinion of the local people against them. I believe that the local people were within their rights in being extremely annoyed at some of the actions that took place and, as the present anti Roxby crusade seems to centre around the whole question of water, the availability of water, and the rights or otherwise of the Roxby Downs project to be able to take water from the basin, it is a little ironic that apparently one of the major complaints that the townspeople of Andamooka had against the protesters was that they were doing certain things that would have ultimately had the effect of putting at a considerable risk the town water supply of Andamooka. I see the honourable member agreeing with me quite vigorously on that matter.

In those circumstances, the Government believes that the protesters reached the legitimate bounds of protest. The Labor Party has always maintained that there are rights of public protest which have to be safeguarded, even though from time to time those protesters will be protesting against Labor Governments and the sorts of things that we would want to do. The honourable member and other members only have merely to cast their minds back to the famous anti Vietnam demonstrations to know that many of those people who were involved in those demonstrations regarded the Labor Party as 'Social Fascists' and, in relation to at least a segment of that moratorium group, and so on, there was no real reason for the Labor Party to have any great love for them. Nonetheless, we believe that it was important that the boundaries of legitimate protest should be explored, and that ultimately, of course, led to a Royal Commission which set down certain guidelines which I think were quite historic in Australian terms in trying to define what is very difficult to define, that is, the boundaries of legitimate protest.

The Government would be prepared to give a commitment that, if there was a repetition of what happened at Andamooka, on the best evidence that we have available, indeed State action would be taken through the appropriate authorities to protect the interests of the local townspeople, wherever it might be. Obviously, it is a function of the State at all times to protect the property, security and privacy of citizens living at Unley or North Adelaide as much as it is at Olympic Dam and Andamooka. It could, however, be that to endorse the honourable member's motion in its full form would be interpreted in some areas as suggesting that the Government is trying to rein in the rights of the different protesters, and we would not want to be hung with that matter.

In relation to that part of the motion which asks that the Government provide the necessary funds to compensate those whose properties have been damaged, I have not had before me any specific information as to damage to properties—certainly no valuations as to what property damage might have amounted to. I am not aware that my colleague the Minister of Mines and Energy has been placed in that position or that the Premier—

Mr Gunn interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Had that been placed before any Minister of Government for evaluation, I would encourage the honourable member to speak to the constituent involved and to get some sort of valuation which can be looked at. Again, it is a difficult one. The Government faces this in all sorts of ways. It faces it when a slug of dirty water comes through a washing machine and someone finds their washing is ruined. The Minister of Water Resources then finds someone, perhaps the local member, writing to him.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Even sending the dirty shirt.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Yes. And then some sort of determination has to be provided as to the State's liability. Even when a child is injured in a school yard, to what extent do teachers have *in loco parentis* responsibility? So I would encourage the honourable member to bring forward that claim, but I think I would be failing in my duty if I were to suggest on behalf of the Government that this House should accept as part of this motion that we would provide the necessary funds to compensate those whose properties have been damaged without a full and proper assessment of the damage and the value thereby being made.

So speaking purely to the terms of this motion and not its wider implications for the limitations of public rights of protest, I do not think the honourable member and I are so far away from each other. Maybe I should have attempted some sort of amendment on which we could have some consensus. However, the automatic granting of compensation in these sorts of circumstances is one with which I would have some concern, but I would certainly encourage the honourable member to bring forward that claim in the way that I have indicated. I ask the House to reject the motion.

Mr S.G. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

COORONG BEACH

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. H. Allison:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should not close the Coorong coastal beach to vehicular access as recommended in the 1984 Coorong National Park and Game Reserve Draft Management Plan but instead should maintain all tracks in good order and ensure that the entire Coorong beach remains open at all times to the public including vehicular access.

(Continued from 31 October. Page 1673).

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister for Environment and Planning): The background to this matter is as follows: the Coorong National Park is one of 13 or 14 national parks that are the core of the National Parks and Wildlife Service park system throughout this State. It is probably one of the three or four most significant conservation areas in public ownership in the State. In fact, if one looks at those parts of the State which are so sensitive as to be somewhere in the league of world heritage status, this would be one of the very few areas that would possibly qualify. Obviously, we have significant areas in our parks system. We think of parts of Kangaroo Island (Flinders Chase, and so on) which are very significant indeed in State and international terms. They would be pushing, of course, for recognition for world heritage status. The Coorong is one which, I understand, has been considered from time to time for this level of listing. For this reason, it has attracted the attention of the Commonwealth authorities, and we have encouraged that attention.

Let me introduce the second theme of my remarks. Since the introduction of the National Parks and Wildlife Act it has been the aim of the Service that a management plan should be brought down for each of the areas under the care and control of the service. This has been a long process. It received some sort of a fillip under the Liberal Government when some additional resources were made available. Those resources have been maintained to ensure that the very long process of providing a management plan not only for those 13 or 14 national parks but also for the nearly 200 conservation reserves around the State should be properly addressed and proceeded with. Some areas, of course, perhaps do not need a management plan as closely as others because they are not subject to human access to the extent that others are. The management plan, although it is an inventory of the natural resources of the area, is less concerned with managing those natural resources, because nature does that for us, than it is with managing the human impacts on those natural resources, because that is when nature does not do the job quite so well—when we come in and interfere.

Some time ago an agreement was reached between the Commonwealth National Parks and Wildlife Service and the State that they would give assistance in the drawing up of the management plan for the Coorong National Park. I would hope that that arrangement will continue for other significant areas of the State. The document which has been subject to so much comment and which is the subject of the motion which the honourable member for Mount Gambier placed before us is the result of that process.

Again, I am afraid I must ask the House to reject this motion because I believe it is premature. A mechanism is laid down in the National Parks and Wildlife Act for the consideration of management plans. It is not simply a matter of the management plan being drawn up by my officers and that is the finish of it, nor is it simply a matter of the management plan being endorsed by me and that is the finish of it. There is a National Parks Advisory Committee which has various functions, including the review of these management plans.

Having fully reviewed the management plan, it is then in a position to make a recommendation to me as to whether the plan as drafted or as amended should be adopted as the official management plan for that park. That is a system that has been gone through in respect of all the management plans which have been the subject of those semi-glossy publications which I send to members from time to time. It is the process that is currently being worked through in relation to this plan. While, on the one hand, of course I would have to concede the right of the House of Assembly to be able to pass a resolution on anything, to have a point of view on any matter, I would resist the argument that in fact I, the Government or in particular the Reserves Advisory Committee should be subject to any instruction at this stage.

All the submissions that have been put forward in response to the draft management plan have been forwarded to the Reserves Advisory Committee. In making its final determination the Reserves Advisory Committee will have to consider all those submissions, together with the draft plan itself, and such other information as it can find of its own resources. The members of the Reserves Advisory Committee (and I think this is public knowledge) have determined that at some time in the very near future they will go to the area to directly collect information for themselves so that they will be in a better position to put a recommendation before me.

I believe that the passage of this motion would distort that process. I believe that the Reserves Advisory Committee members have a right to be able to make up their own minds in the light of whatever public submissions are placed before them, and by all means then, when there is a recommendation before me, if political considerations have to be taken into account obviously they will be. I can understand the honourable member speaking up on behalf of that proportion of his constituents who want to operate in this particular way. However, I believe that I have a wider responsibility not only to the whole of the park system throughout the State but to the mechanisms whereby we are endeavouring to identify those impacts which occur on the parks and how best to minimise our management. For those reasons I invite the House to reject the motion.

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): I rise briefly to refute the utterly ridiculous proposition that the Minister has just put. Just because those processes to which he has referred and which are quite legitimate are in train is no reason whatever why this Chamber should not express an opinion about the way in which it believes parks should be made available for public access. After all, surely parks are for people, especially parks such as the Coorong National Park. The formation of the park was to ensure the survival of that locality and to see that the area would remain an attractive recreational area in which activities compatible with the enduring long term existence of that natural environment could continue (I am referring to human impact of a kind capable of being sustained by that environmental infra-structure) in perpetuity. Anything that cannot be so sustained, such as trail bike riding, and so on, is quite inappropriate, and no-one here disputes that.

The thing that is disputed of course is that already, before this draft management plan has become the management plan, the Department, with the Minister's blessing or direction (I do not know which, but certainly with his full knowledge), is changing the way in which the public can get access. This House ought to be competent—members of this place ought to have the guts to be able to decide for themselves whether the action so taken is appropriate. If it is good enough to make changes while the draft management plan is being considered and developed, then it is good enough for this House to express opinions about that action.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): When the Minister released the report on the draft management plan for the Coorong National Park last year he triggered off, at least from the point of view of the South-East, an unprecedented storm of protest. Over 8 000 signatures have been submitted to my office and to that of the members for Mallee and Victoria. Also some 100 separate submissions were made to the Minister for Environment and Planning and his Director advising the Minister of the wishes of local

residents both to keep open the Coorong beach and the Coorong park and to improve access roads. Those submissions were not one sided by any means, because in the majority of them there was a written commitment on the part of the people who had put in the submissions to co-operate with the Government and to show that they could help keep a national park in good order. To that extent they were simply saying, 'Keep the park open and we will co-operate with you and show what we can do to help Government.'

The recommendation for closure was one of the most unpopular recommendations received in the South-East, and the local slogan 'Parks are for people' quickly emerged. We acknowledge that some of the more delicate parks in remoter areas of the State, where the climate is far more severe and where the rainfall is very light, might be more difficult to maintain open for a large number of people. However, I do not believe that the Coorong is one of them. Nor is the Coorong unique as far as world heritage is concerned. Only in Victoria there is another ninety mile beach with features very similar to those of the Coorong.

These are coasts of emergence, and no doubt the Minister would be aware that between the Coorong and Naracoorte there are five or six other coorongs which have emerged from the sea and which over the centuries have dried up to become swale, dune and dried lagoon areas. The Coorong itself is part of that relentless process of nature. The single factor most responsible for attrition is the sea itself which is pounding up yet one more coastal dune along the coast and which is responsible daily and nightly for cleansing the beach and removing almost all the evidence of any human habitation or visitation. The sea itself cleanses the beach on a twice daily basis.

Behind the dunes there is the more delicate area where human beings are responsible for the protection of the coast. We are not asking the Minister and the Government to do anything that the Liberal Party would not do. We are committed to keeping open the Coorong, to maintaining it in good order, and to maintaining the tracks in good order so that there is little need to leave those tracks and go into the more delicate dune area itself, which has been one cause of the complaints from the users. The tracks drift with sand and become difficult to make progress on.

In his response today the Minister made no mention of the vast numbers of petitioners. The Minister is also responsible for two rather confusing responses made over the past two or three months. A response made before Christmas last year was that there would be no Government action for at least 10 years. The second more recent response was that there would be a new draft plan and that submissions would be received, I believe until the end of March 1985. I am wondering whether the submissions that have already been received (over 100) will in fact be considered by the committee or whether those people will have to resubmit their submissions.

The Minister has acknowledged that he will accept those submissions; they will be considered, and that is one of the contentious points removed. I thank him for that. The storm of protest that the Minister received on this issue was not only relative to the Coorong but the people who petitioned felt that with the other national parks in the South-East the Minister had been advised by a limited number of people as to what was the best thing to do and they regarded this as the thin end of a State wedge to close not only the Coorong Park but many others almost completely to public access. That is the single strongest fear—

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Wheeled access.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: No. The people are fearful that this is just the beginning of a much broader, more sweeping closure. This is expressed and the Minister will read it in many of those petitions. I suggest that the Minister have his people respond to that and, if wheeled access is a problem, ensure that the tracks people move along are adequate and permanently maintained in good order.

I strongly recommend that the Minister should change his mind and accept this motion. The Liberal Party is firmly convinced that the Coorong is capable of being properly managed along with wheeled access to the beach. It is extremely difficult for those hundreds of fishermen who go along there to cover the 90 miles north and south simply by having a north-south and a 40-mile crossing entrance. To ask people to walk 30 or 40 miles from the centre of the Coorong or from the north or south of the Coorong is simply not on when they are carrying a lot of tackle. I ask the Minister to reconsider his decision and accept the motion.

Motion negatived.

MORPHETT ROAD

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Mathwin:

That in view of the congestion of traffic on the roads going north to Adelaide from the southern areas of Christies Beach, Noarlunga and Lonsdale, particularly on Brighton Road, and also because of the anticipated 10 year completion time of the recently announced new road to the south, this House urges the Government to reconsider its decision not to open and upgrade Morphett Road from Seacombe Road to Majors Road.

(Continued from 24 October. Page 1467.)

Mrs APPLEBY (Brighton): I wish to contribute to the debate on the motion moved by the member for Glenelg in the latter half of last year. In this motion the honourable member has sought to have Morphett Road (from Seacombe Road to Majors Road) opened to allow access to the north for southern commuters. Nobody denies that commuters from the south suffer difficulty in traversing Brighton Road and South Road, particularly at the Darlington bottleneck, as it has become known, at peak hours morning and afternoon on weekdays.

The future of Morphett Road, as the honourable member has requested, should be considered in two separate stages. The first is short term, the treatment which the member is requesting in his motion; the second is the construction of the announced third southern arterial. I will address the second point first. The Government's announcement to construct the third arterial is the ultimate solution for southern area people commuting north. Detailed design and construction planning is under way, and it would be hoped that construction could be under way in approximately five years, with completion in 10 years. I would like to take the opportunity at this time to express, on behalf of my constituents, their thanks to the officer at the Highways Department who has been handling public inquiries in relation to home acquisition and general information relating to the planned construction.

I will now turn to the short term proposition. I would like to put some facts to the House in relation to this motion. Morphett Road, between Gulfview Road and Majors Road, was legally closed in January 1983 and was physically closed in June 1983. The continuity of the existing sealed portion has been interrupted by a barrier at Moore Street, which is at the top of the steepest section. The existing Morphett Road is very steep, having a grade of 16 per cent over a distance of 260 metres. Whilst this is acceptable for a local road serving only residential property access, it would be extremely hazardous for large volumes of commuter traffic. Problems associated with steep grades on sub-arterial roads include the possibility of runaway vehicles downhill; hazardous access to properties; excessive downhill speeds; restricted sight distance near the crest; and hazardous

overtaking manoeuvres. These problems are greater for roads carrying large volumes of through traffic than for local residential streets, because residents are familiar with hazards of their local streets.

The chances of severe accidents occurring are greater when the road is being used by large volumes of unfamiliar traffic. Sir, to give members some idea of the problem faced in this motion I will give some comparisons of grades of the steepest arterial road section in Adelaide: on Shepherds Hill Road, 8 per cent over 480 metres gradient; Willunga Hill, 9.1 per cent over 270 metres; and Mount Barker Road, 9 per cent over 130 metres—

Mr S.G. Evans: Which part is that?

Mrs APPLEBY: At the steepest section. On Flagstaff Hill Road it is 12.8 per cent over 120 metres, and on Ocean Boulevard (in a similar locality to Morphett Road), 7 per cent over 1 000 metres. Most of the steepest sections on these roads have no side access from properties, thereby decreasing the hazard. Morphett Road, however, has direct property access from both sides over the whole of the steepest length. Other disadvantages of using the existing road for arterial purposes include on-street parking; environmental amenity—noise, dust and dangers to pedestrians and children; ESTA poles along one side creating the danger of collision; and the extreme narrowness of the pavement. Further, of course, the cost of constructing the suggested section from Gulfview Road to Majors Road would be approximately $500 000—no small consideration to be taken into account even if it was practical, with the evidence that I present.

The grade on Morphett Road could be reduced by providing a deep cutting through the hill. This would involve acquisition of many very expensive homes, estimated in excess of $100 000 each, and the destruction of what is presently a well established neighbourhood. The overall cost of such a scheme has not been estimated but would probably be over $2 million. In the short term, I put the following conclusions for consideration: it would not be safe to open the existing road to arterial commuter traffic because of the grades; the reconstruction of the road to a suitable grade would have major social, environmental and economic implications; and several connections to the third arterial road in the south are being examined for the long term treatment of traffic problems.

This Government has put into effect the following measures to alleviate some of the existing problems: the recently completed Ocean Boulevard line with Brighton Road; a speed discriminator at the Hove railway crossing—operative over the past two months; completion of Morphett Road approaches to the Oaklands crossing giving three south bound and two north bound roads over the crossing; work on the Flagstaff/South Road intersection and bridge widening works; Marion Road/South Road lane treatment designed and planned work to commence soon; Seacombe Road/South Road intersection planning in final stages prior to commencement; and, of course, the new third southern arterial.

I would refer now to several points the member for Glenelg made in his speech in the House last year. He said:

We have a minor alternative to ease the situation.

I believe there is a difference between his statement and the facts I have placed before the House today. He continued:

I would defy any engineer to look me in the eye and say that Morphett Road is far too steep and far too dangerous to be open.

I would be happy to refer the honourable member to my sources of information over the past few years. He further stated:

It is ridiculous that buses cannot get through there at all... Let me remind the House that buses coming up Seacombe Road from the Marion Shopping Centre travel three-quarters of the way up the steep hill before they turn around.

I suggest that if the honourable member has ridden in the bus he would understand why it does not go all the way to the barricade. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave ganted; debate adjourned.

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

CLASSIFICATION OF PUBLICATIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the recommendations of the conference.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE

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

That Mr Ferguson be appointed to the Committee in place of the Hon. Peter Duncan (resigned).

Motion carried.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN WASTE MANAGEMENT COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Local Government) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the South Australian Waste Management Commission Act, 1979. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill amends the South Australian Waste Management Commission Act, 1979, to provide the means whereby the Government's intention to adopt the New South Wales model for the Director/Chairman relationship of the Commission can be achieved. As indicated in the House of Assembly on 25 October 1984, the Government has approved the appointment of Mr R.G. Lewis, Deputy Director, Department of Local Government as the Executive Director/Chairman of the Commission but in doing so desires to retain the expertise of Dr Symes, the present Chairman, as a member of the Commission.

The principal amendment is to increase the membership of the Commission to ten (10) members by the inclusion of an additional member nominated by the Minister being a person with experience of the effects of waste management on public health. A further amendment increases the quorum required for a meeting of the Commission from four (4) to six (6) members.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 9 of the principal Act. New paragraph *(e)* of subsection (1) requires that the Minister nominate a person with experience of the effect of waste management on public health for appointment to the Commission. Clause 3 makes a consequential amendment to section 12 of the principal Act.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

LONG SERVICE LEAVE (BUILDING INDUSTRY) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 6 December. Page 2294.)

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): The Bill contains a number of provisions supported by the Opposition. We support the Bill to the second reading stage, as a number of matters in it have some merit. One of the more significant amendments supported by the Opposition is in relation to the handling of the Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Fund. The Bill proposes that the control of that fund, its administration, collection, and so on, should pass from the Commissioner of Stamps to the Board. That seems a sensible arrangement.

There has been some difficulty in administering the Act in terms of that fund, and it boils down to the fact that the Commissioner of Stamps is, in a sense, divorced from the day to day decision making in the operation of the Act, and that has created some problems. That is one of the major reasons for the appearance of this amending Bill. It contains a number of other provisions, some of which do not appear to be of great consequence and others about which I have considerable reservations. I have sought advice from those who would be most affected by the Bill and that advice is conflicting.

I will deal briefly with the areas of the Bill with which I do not have any query of the Minister as to the intent of the Government. To qualify for long service leave payments in this industry is difficult, as employees tend to move from employer to employer. It was an extension of the idea of what long service leave was all about initially. There is a period during which employees can be absent from the industry and that is not counted as discontinuity of service within the industry. If one accepts the original premise on which the Bill was based, namely, that the Act is designed to accommodate people who move from employer to employer, that is fair enough.

When this Bill was first introduced it seemed to many to be a departure from the original concept of long service leave. Certainly the view is held in some circles—that long service leave was to reward an employee for long and faithful service to one employer. When the Bill was first promoted in the middle 1970s during the time of the Dunstan Labor Government, when we were into pace setting in a big way, that principle, accepted by some, was modified to accommodate an industry wherein it was claimed that employees frequently changed jobs.

So, in due course, the Bill passed into law in about 1976 with the idea that, if an employee moved from one employer to another in this industry he would be eligible for long service leave. It seems that there is a push on for this idea to be extended further. Certainly, the Bill seeks to extend the classifications of people who will be involved in the operation of the Act. I will deal with that aspect in a moment.

Provisions exist in the Act for an employee absent from the industry for 18 months to have that period not counted as a disqualification against entitlement for long service leave. The Bill seeks to extend that period to 36 months. I guess there is no great argument with that when employment generally has been difficult, although the Labor Government tells us that the building industry is booming and that people involved in it should not have trouble finding work. There is a boom in some areas of building, certainly in the cottage industry due to an enormous infusion of public funds at taxpayers' expense.

The Government suggested (and I would not argue with its point) that a real problem exists in this State in terms of employment and a lot of people, including building workers, have had a hard time finding jobs. As I pointed out yesterday in this House, the Government's record in its efforts to improve employment in South Australia have been quite disastrous. In fact, there has been a deterioration in the employment situation in South Australia since the advent of the Bannon Government. We now have the worst record by far of any State in relation to long term unemployed, and I guess that some of them would be building workers.

So, we do not quarrel with the Government's desire to extend the period for which an employee can be absent from the industry without suffering a disqualification in terms of his entitlement to long service leave. I have some problems with the concept that has been accepted and passed into law, but one cannot turn back the clock. A provision also exists in the Bill whereby an employee who may be engaged on one of these job creation schemes—temporary employment—in the building industry will not have that service counted during the disqualifying period. That is an eminently reasonable suggestion. Nor will that period on a job creation scheme be counted as qualifying to add to his total accrued credit for long service leave. It will not apply there or apply as a disqualifying period. That is an eminently reasonable and fair proposal: I have no quarrel with that.

There are one or two other matters dealt with in the Bill. As I say, in my view, probably the most progressive provision in the Bill at the moment is in relation to the Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Board controlling the collection and distribution of the funds. It gives them a little more discretion. I felt this was also eminently sensible.

There is also in the Act a provision that an employee will not get his payout until a period of 12 months has elapsed after he has left the industry. It is suggested in the Government's explanation of the Bill that this may lead to some cases of hardship, and I can well believe that in this present employment climate where work is difficult to find, even though in some areas of the building industry it should not be difficult to find, but certainly in the major engineering and building sectors it is difficult, so there is no quarrel with that. A discretion is given to the Board to make that sort of payment.

There are a number of features of this Bill which appear to be quite desirable in giving the Board a little more flexibility to make what appear to be commonsense judgments in individual cases where there is some problem and, as I say, giving the collection and control of that fund to the Board appears to me to be sensible, because the Commissioner of Stamps has plenty of other things to do. He is not likely to have the time to handle problems with alacrity as they arise whereas that is what the Board is interested in and that appears to be a generally desirable position. I have not struck anybody who objects, nor do I see any objection to that at all. It seems sensible.

I cannot recall any other substantive measures in the Bill that we support wholeheartedly. There may be others, but there are two areas of the Bill over which I have one big question mark. The first is in relation to the wish of the Government to extend the scope of the Bill. The Government put up a case for extending its scope: in other words, to rope more people into the net whereby they will be liable for long service leave for people in this industry. As I understand it, at the moment the major exclusion in the Act is in relation to building work which is subsidiary to some other major activity of the employer. The Government, with some of its amendments to section 4 of the Act, in the name of equity seeks to strike that out.

Clause 3 of the amending Bill we are discussing now seeks to amend section 4 of the principal Act which deals with the range and operation of the Act in relation to employers

who have become liable. It is quite obvious that the Government wishes to widen the cast of the net on the grounds of equity, an argument which I think has some merit, but then one has to balance all this off against the sort of economic climate in which we find ourselves, and we have this eternal argument about whether we give people more benefits thereby jeopardising more jobs. We might say that this is peanuts, but the fact is, as I read the Bill, that the net can be cast extremely wide indeed. I can understand a union official's thinking (I guess in this case it is Mr Owens) that, if it is good enough for some, it is good enough for the lot. It is logical. I would not be surprised if that was the attitude he adopted.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: It applies to all the building industry.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: He is the fellow on the Board, I think, who is pushing for amendments in the first instance.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I think—

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I may be wrong. I understand he is on the Board. He is a union representative, and he would be the person who does the thinking and I can understand the position. If that were my job and my job was to push a point of view, I would push it, but that is not our job here. Our job here is to make decisions on the basis of what is best for the whole South Australian community. We know that there appear to be inequities. One has only to look at the campaign being undertaken at the present time by the Federal public servants, who believe they have been shabbily served by the Arbitration Commission and that the judgment handed down was unfair.

I guess at any point in time in the history of industrial relations in this State there will be some group that believes it is relatively badly done by, that it is disadvantaged, so someone is always catching up. Someone always thinks somebody else over the fence is better off. Of course, the end result in Australia, and South Australia in particular, is that we have priced a lot of people out of work. I do not care what the Government says in the name of equity, but the fact is that on costs in relation to employment in Australia and South Australia as much as anywhere else have priced people out of work, particularly young people, to a very significant degree. In my view, anybody who denies that is a fool. In my opinion, if we close our eyes to that we either lack judgment or we are fools, so one must look past sectional interests.

I can also understand the thinking of some employers and, as I say, opinions are divided. I can understand some employers who already have to pay into the fund thinking it would be good if the net could be cast wider and maybe their contributions could be reduced. They pay 2 per cent of pay-roll to the fund. The Liberal Government reduced that from 2½ per cent to 2 per cent. As I understand it, the last time I inquired there was about $11 million in the fund, building up at something like $1 million a year. I think the Minister tabled the report today, but as yet I have not seen it, so the fund is certainly quite healthy and it has built up quite significantly. There is no shortage of money in the fund. I can understand those employers who are presently compelled to contribute to the fund wanting the rest to be in it.

Mr Ferguson: Check if they are doing the same work.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Maybe they are not doing the same work. The way the Bill is drawn, as I see it, they have only to go on to the site in relation to the building (and it may not be their full-time occupation on that site), but they could be caught in the net. I will quote in a moment from two commentators who support that view.

To sum up what I am saying—and we are always accused of this—we say: when is the time right? When the Government was going to give a handout (and we were accused of this in the 1970s), when the Government was intent as it was on increasing the benefits under the general Long Service Leave Act, bringing in the pro rata Long Service Leave Act, we urged caution. We said, 'When is the time right?' Quite frankly, I do not think the time is right now, particularly in relation to small business. We have talked about this earlier, since the resumption of this session. There is no doubt that it is not Government which is the major employer, although every time the Government puts one person on the public pay-roll it jeopardises the jobs of more than one person in the private sector in terms of the taxes it has to levy. I attended the annual meeting of one of our major employers in the metal industry, I think in the middle of last year, and he brought out the figures indicating what Government imposts and taxes did to his ability to employ.

It was quite dramatic, and this is a fellow who I think gets on quite well with the present Administration because he is a very sensible bloke. I will not name him because I do not want to embarrass him. However, his firm is a major employer, but his employment figures have declined. He talked about the number of people employed in that industry in recent years and indicated that, like all employers, the only way to save costs is to cut back the numbers employed—to cut the labour force—and they are all doing it. If the Government does not realise that, it is not in touch with reality. All this business about redundancy payments worries them more, but that is a fact of life. They rationalise, put in machinery and the like, and spend capital: that is a risk. It is a bit of a bind whether they get a return on that, but that is what happens.

It is these on costs, as I say, that have escalated from a fairly modest percentage 10 years ago to upwards of 60 per cent on costs in some industries—very significant on costs. However, the point I make is this: that employer (who had every man and his dog there—even I was there, because he invited us, so I went down; it was very interesting) trotted out the figures. They are in his annual report; I do not know whether the Minister got it. The fact is that he went through an analysis of his ability to employ. Government imposts and charges went up and he referred to how many people he had to drop off to stay in business, and he has been doing it. So, this baloney (and it was in the employment brochure that came out with the Budget) that the Government is trotting out about if we put more people on the Government pay-roll we enhance our ability in the private sector by providing services and we enhance the ability for them to employ is just absolute malarkey. Everyone who goes on to the Government pay-roll has to be supported in the productive sector—productive in the sense that they are making something to sell—and that ability in the private sector to employ is diminished.

It is not a one for one ratio. For every person who goes on the public pay-roll, the ability to employ in the private sector diminishes by more than one: it is approaching two. We can get more precise figures if members opposite are interested, so do not for a moment—

Ms Lenehan interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: If they are not interested in it, well and good, but I am telling honourable members that that is fact, and I have that employer's sons to show what has happened in that industry and what increasing Government imposts were doing to him. Most employees are delighted to have a job if they are genuine, and the vast majority—certainly, parents who have kids looking for jobs—are delighted for them to have a job. Any legislation which comes before the House and which adds even in a miniscule way to the costs of employing people

in this State must in my judgment be ill considered legislation at this time. Again, they say, 'When is it right?' I am saying that I am darned sure that it is not right now, just as it was not right in the 1970s for a number of the initiatives of the Labor Government then.

In my judgment it is a question of facing reality. If one talks to people overseas as I did on my trip, one realises that they think that we live in a fools paradise in Australia. The Government can always point to somewhere around the world where these conditions obtain but, if one takes the sum total conditions that obtain in Australia and South Australia where we pride ourselves as being the pacesetters, they reckon that we are crazy. I talked to people in England about the sort of conditions that obtain in Australia.

Mr Ferguson: They are far worse than ours.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: What are you talking about?

Mr Ferguson: Industry in the UK under the Thatcher Government is far worse than ours.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: That is not a new phenomenon, I might say.

Mr Ferguson: I am not suggesting that it is.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: However, let me say this to the honourable member: I was greatly encouraged while I was in England by the attitude of some of the union leaders in that nation. In my judgment they had faced economic reality.

Mr Ferguson: Well, their industry is still going down, percentagewise.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: They have a major problem with the coal strike, and do not let anyone kid you: it is costing them billions.

Mr Ferguson: A sensible Government would have finished it long before now.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: That may be the honourable member's point of view, but if that economic war had been lost and the sort of thinking that is energising Mr Scargill, namely, that the Coal Board had no right to close down uneconomic pits, continued in England, that country would have had no future whatsoever in my judgment—none whatsoever.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do hope that we can get back to the Bill.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I was illustrating a point in relation to costs. The fact is that the clause to which I am referring in this Bill will impose added costs on a whole wide range of industry added costs; how significant they are depends on how wide the debts are. However, each added cost causes a problem to the employer. The honourable member talks about England, but let me finish this point by saying that I believe that the union leaders in the steel industry have come to grips with economic reality in Britain. I read some of the comments of the union leaders in the steel industry in Britain, although I forget their names. I read this in a paper when I was in Europe. I thought that these blokes had come to grips with economic reality in this day and age.

They were talking about the need to improve productivity, to improve output per man, and to be competitive with other nations. I thought, 'I have never heard a union boss in Australia talk like that in my life.' If they have talked like that, I have never heard it. In my 15 years in this place the fair sprinkling of union people who have graduated to this forum have never in my living experience expressed a view like that in little old South Australia. However, here are the leaders of the union movement in the steel industry in Britain not supporting the coal strike because they believe that there is a fallacy in saying that these coal mines and pits must stay open if they are losing money.

Someone else has to prop them up and, as the honourable member said, the British industry is struggling like hell. It is a life and death struggle, and the fact is that they could have been employers. The way that these fellows were talking illustrates the sort of economic viewpoint which one gets from employer groups in Australia. So, there is an harmonious realisation of a common purpose between the union leaders in the steel industry and the people who control it in Britain. I know that this Bill has been to IRAC. I know that we have consensus—that is a pretty smart strategy by the Minister. It is sensible. Of course he wants consensus, but who is involved in the consensus? When I was in Britain there was a very interesting article (and I brought it back) on this consensus bit. That fellow that Thatcher sacked—

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Are you suggesting that we would be better off without it?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: No, I am not saying that. Let me finish. This article was on the consensus bandwagon. However, the point he made, as I recall it, was this: he was commenting on a book written by a former Minister in the Thatcher Government who was saying that we must have this consenus across the board. Who is the consensus between? The consensus, of course, is between the powerful figures in the country. The consensus is between the captains of industry—the real big boys—and the really big boys in the union movement. They are the power brokers in most of these discussions. I do not for a moment deny that the big boys in industry have a viewpoint to which we ought to listen, but there is a hell of a lot of people in the middle who are not part of that consensus. That is the average bloke in the street, for instance. The captain of industry would agree to compulsory unionism because it ensures peace in his work place in a lot of instances.

An honourable member: Blackmail!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am just saying that this is the way in which the system works. One will get consensus between people who are in positions of economic power and one can wield great influence. The people who have got the clout in our Western democracies, not so much in America because the union movement does not have the same legal clout there—

An honourable member: It is much better.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Whatever the system is, it appears to have some advantages. The people that really run this country are those who have economic power and the ability to wield that power. Do not let us fool ourselves: it is the big people whom Governments tend to consult and the big people in the union movements who make the decisions. Those decisions may suit those people, but there is, as I say, a hell of a lot of people who are not party to that consensus, and it is usually the vast majority of taxpayers in this union. That was the sort of point—not quite in those terms—that this commentator was making in this article in one of the British papers, and I subscribe to that view. I am saying that they all have a legitimate point of view, but some of the groups have far more power and the ability to exercise that power. The majority of the population in the middle, in my view, have no power and are not part of that consensus. Their only power is at the ballot box and, of course, in a democracy that is where the ultimate decision is made. I must admit I have digressed in relation to this point—

The Hon. J.D. Wright: It's a nice, relaxed, subdued speech.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I get on well with the Minister now that we understand each other.

The SPEAKER: Order! Mutual congratulations aside, interjections are out of order.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: His politics are hopeless but as a fellow I get on well with him. We understand one another, I think, but the fact is that one has a respon-

sibility in this place to a wider view than that of the sectional interests. As I say, in some circumstances where something may appear to be unfair, because there is some inequity in the system, by attempting to right that one can create an even larger problem when one views the thing across the whole spectrum. The Opposition does not like the provisions to widen the scope of the Act.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: We are supporting it so far. We will see what happens with the amendments. We are not too happy about some aspects of the Bill.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Your mate just asked you to keep going a bit longer, but I don't know how much longer that is. The Premier wants to know.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: What is the rush? Does the Premier want to get home to bed or something? What is the tear? This is one of the few occasions when the Government has little to do this week; it has time. They cannot arrange a programme, and we are not allowed to talk.

We do not like clause 3 of the Bill. We do not like it; love to be generous! We all like to make good fellows of ourselves, like to splash around the bikkies in the name of equality, in the name of fairness, love to make good blokes of ourselves and love to buy votes! That is a great act, but we ain't got the dough, in plain Australian parlance!

In the present economic climate in South Australia where small business is involved (and it is my view that by the time the net of this Bill is really widened to catch them all, a lot of small businesses will be caught up) we will not be in it. The wider view is that if those in this State who are fortunate enough to be in a job do not tighten their belts and come to terms with it (and I am the first to admit that the impact of this Bill may in certain instances be minimal), the implications across the board could be major.

I return to the point that, if we do not make some fairly serious and vigorous attempts to become competitive, in the case of South Australia with the Eastern States and in the case of Australia with our neighbours and the people with whom we must compete in overseas markets (and, Lord help us, our record there is appalling), we will become, as Paul Johnson has suggested, the coolies of Asia—the poor people of Asia. We have slipped a mile compared to the OECD countries in relation to our standard of living in the adult part of my lifetime, or less than that. We have on the average slipped from near the top of standards of living to way down, with Italy and one or two others—Greece, I think it is—down with the people who do not traditionally, in the world view, enjoy a particularly high standard of living.

That is where Australia is, and, unless we take some fairly dramatic steps (without getting into the tariff argument) to improve our competitiveness in South Australia, *vis-a-vis* the other States, as we did during the post Second World War period, manufacturing will continue to shrink. I do not care what anybody says: this nation has been riding on our primary and mining industries in terms of our international balance of payments and in terms of what has propped up in the national economy. They are getting into trouble. The wheat farmers have had record crops, but their prices are down 20 per cent. They are running into trouble. If we are looking to the manufacturing sector to help this country, Lord help us. Mr Speaker, you have been very tolerant, as you always are.

Ms Lenehan: You don't always say that.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Everything is relative. The fact is that, unless we face these economic realities and apply them to this Bill, and to clause 3 of this Bill, we simply go further. I therefore intend to move an amendment to strike out what the Government seeks to do in relation to this part of the Bill. The other matters are relatively straightforward. The other area that I want to canvass is that of reciprocity between the States. I think it involves Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland, from memory.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: No, Queensland is off; it's the ACT.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: There were three of them. I do not think Tasmania is in your explanation, Minister.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: They came in late.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Let me say this: I do not believe that the immediate impact economically on the State would be severe. Let me acknowledge that. This idea of reciprocity between South Australia and the other States in the short haul would be quite minimal. But, there are some anomalies where the provisions in the Long Service Leave Act in the Eastern States differ from ours. I can see some minor problems there. Quite frankly, I do not like the way in which we are moving.

As I said initially, I understand that long service leave was a State responsibility where State Governments made judgments in relation to what was a reasonable thing in terms of bestowing benefits on employees in those States, and some fairly dramatic strides were made during the pace-setting 70s. In those heady days I can even remember Premier Dunstan fronting up to an election saying, 'We will have the best long service leave provisions in Australia; we will have the best Public Service superannuation scheme—as good as any in the nation', and then I think it was the Federal scheme. He said, 'We are going to have the best conditions in relation to this in Australia.' That is buying votes, and one can get away with it.

An honourable member: We are still paying for it.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: You can get away with it when the economy is reasonably buoyant, but all the credit which has been accumulated during the careful administration of the Playford regime has in my view dissipated during those years. Of course, I would not expect the Government to agree. But, in the name of equity, in the name of the good life, so that we could sit on the sidewalk under the brollies and sip our grog during the leisure hours, the community bought it.

Then, of course we had the explosion under the Whitlam Government when the Australian currency was so devalued, when the printing presses were working overtime and when unemployment and inflation really got cracking. However, that is past history. The thing that concerns me is that the same thinking still prevails in this day and age. In Australia we have not reached as low an ebb as they have reached in Britain where some of the people making decisions, the power brokers, the bosses of the union movement, have to come to terms with economic reality. Until that happens in an industrial system which gives those people such enormous power we will continue down the track, resulting in Australian workers becoming the coolies of Asia, as Paul Johnson described it, although I know that he is reviled by the Labor Party because he is a socialist who has seen the light. This idea of reciprocity is fine and dandy—

The Hon. J.D. Wright: We prefer to say that he saw the light and blew it out. His opinions are not very well respected throughout the world.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I read some of his stuff, and although he may tend to overstate his case there is a fair element of truth in what he says. From time to time he gets a guernsey in the *Bulletin* and it does not put in donkey stuff. He is a fairly respected journalist from time to time. He does sometimes overstate his case, as do most converts. If someone swaps religion they are usually the most zealous of the lot; if someone has a miraculous conversion that person tends to grab it with both hands and

both feet. Paul Johnson may be in that category, nevertheless he talks a lot of economic sense. People who take the time to read his material would have to agree with him.

Anyone who ignores what I was saying earlier about what is happening in Australia is not facing reality. The world is shrinking and becoming more competitive, particularly as Asia develops. As their productivity increases enormously it will put enormous pressure on us, and we cannot continue to protect ourselves in the way that we have done previously.

The idea of reciprocity between the States will not greatly damage our economy, but it is opening the door. If this idea is transposed into other industries, which is what I gather the Government is toying with, it would open the flood gates. I am told (and I assume it is correct) that the Government is undertaking an inquiry into long service leave and portability in the shearing industry, the cleaning industry and perhaps in the hospitality industry. I was made aware of this in recent weeks. I understand that the Victorian Government is undertaking an inquiry into the cleaning industry. So, the pressure is always there. The movement is always in one direction, which is why the standard of living in Australia is moving in one direction. Our productivity as a nation is not increasing and the value of our products is diminishing.

I have a big question mark over reciprocity. I say that not because it will have a dramatic impact in the first instance with this Bill but, if we open the door initially in the building industry in regard to long service leave as it applies to people who swap jobs and we extend that further and rope in the whole damn lot, we would then be opening the door to getting this scheme accepted nationally and being applied to all other industries that are being looked at in this respect. The repercussions of that would be absolutely enormous. The Minister is obviously enjoying my remarks: he has not been rude to me and he has a benign smile on his face. I shall finish my remarks with a quote from one commentator.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I'm smiling at how you've got away with murder tonight, because only about one-fifth of your remarks pertain to the Bill.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am referring to clauses 3 and 16. I shall quote the remarks of one commentator, who I think in fairness to him ought to remain anonymous, because reprisals are not unknown.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: You support anonymous letters?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: No, it is not anonymous: it is signed, but I am keeping it anonymous. I am not telling the Minister, because he might put the person's name in his little black book.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I do not have a black book.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: He had a black book today with the name in it of that fellow from the Police Department.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I keep it all in my mind.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will not put his name in that black book in the Minister's mind. The letter states:

> We are also concerned at the wider implications of this Bill. What we are seeing in Australia at the present time is a further breaking down of the original concept of reward for long service with one employer. The original building industry Long Service Leave Act embraced the concept of service to an industry in South Australia. Now we are seeing the extention of this to service in an industry, Australia wide. If this is good enough for building workers, why not apply it to all workers? The cost of course would be astronomical.

Mr Gregory: I'll be in that.

The SPEAKER: The member for Florey should not be interjecting when he is out of his seat.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It proves my point that ex-union leaders, for example, and union bosses have not seen the light in Australia, as I submit they have in some overseas industries. They have not seen the light and their kids and following generations will find themselves without a hope of getting a job. The letter continues:

> Yet we are seeing the development of this concept. There has recently been an inquiry in Victoria into long service leave in the cleaning industry. This is the first of a number of industries to be the subject of an inquiry in that State.

Reference is then made to the shearing, cleaning and hotel industries. The letter continues:

> In many of these industries, it is not the itinerant nature of the industry that causes employees to miss out on Long Service Leave under the State Act. Rather, it is the employment pattern established by employees for their own convenience.

I shall quote a further commentator who for obvious reasons should remain anonymous:

> The variation proposed to the definition of 'employer' in the South Australian Act will, in my view spread the tentacles of the Act to cover almost all our members in the—

I will not say which group it is, as that might identify this commentator. The letter continues:

> The proposed definition, as I comprehend it, will seek to cover any employee who is remotely involved with a building construction site. The deletion of the word 'or' after paragraph *(h)* 'any person or body of a prescribed class' in conjunction with the deletion of paragraph *(i)* which states 'any person or body where the activities of the kinds referred to in paragraphs *(a)* to *(c)* engaged in by the person or body are (taken together) subsidiary to other activities engaged in by that person or body' will undoubtedly be the death knell of many existing exemptions.

That is what I was talking about when I said that the Act at the moment operates in respect of companies whose major activity is building. I further quote:

> Furthermore, the deletion of subsection 3 of section 4 (of the principal Act) which states 'for the purposes of this Act in determining whether particular activities are subsidiary to other activities, regard shall be had to the number of persons engaged exclusively in the first mentioned activities and to the number of persons engaged in other activities (disregarding in both cases persons who are engaged wholly or principally in work of an administrative or clerical nature)' must automatically remove a considerable category of employees (and their employers) to be covered by the amended Act whose employment was previously determined as subsidiary to the building industry.

It is a bit convoluted, but it is the point I was making earlier, that the net will be widened dramatically and all or a major component of the work in the subsidiary building industry will be caught. I quote further:

> An extreme example, although I predict a typical example, could be in the pest control industry, whereby the pest controller who goes on to the building construction site for the purposes of fumigating timber could require to be registered under the amended Act. The scope of the amended Act will, I suggest, embrace other industries and/or trades hitherto not covered by the Act, i.e., furnishing trades, which encompass carpet layers or any other floor-covering specialists.

He may be right or wrong, but he says that, in his view, anybody who goes on to the building site could be caught under the Act. I quote further:

> The purposes of the Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Act when it came into force in 1977 was 'to provide a fund from which Long Service Leave payments will be made to declared workers engaged within the building industry' (Department of Labour and Industry Guide to Legislation No. 3/1976). While the proposed amendments do not seek to expand the definition of 'worker' or 'building worker', the removal of the 'subsidiary' considerations will cast a much broader net for the Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Board. The scope of the 'board' is unfettered should it decide, for example, that employees manufacturing concrete (off-site), building bricks, glass, pipes, etc. etc. are involved with the building industry.
>
> While it is not a cogent argument that some employers do not set aside actual amounts in a separate account to cover the incidence of their employees qualifying for Long Service Leave or pro rata payments (after seven years service) but rather rely on their ability to meet such outlays when the employee qualifies for such benefits, the fact remains that the taking on board of many employers by virtue of the amendments to the Act will require those employers to surrender to the Long Service Leave

(Building Industry) Board the funds (supposedly) set aside and presumably earning interest, in respect of the effective service that their employees have accrued with that employer.

I do not know whether or not that is a valid point, but what he is saying, as I read it, is that if somebody gets caught up with this fund and he has had someone in his employ for five to seven years he has to make a contribution to the fund to cover that period. That is what this commentator is suggesting—that he should put that money aside; he will be lumbered with that charge as soon as the Act becomes operative, and that will kill him financially (although I do not know that the commentator says quite that). He further states:

It is therefore a distinct possibility that many small businesses—

this worries me—

who will be roped in by the amended Act will experience financial hardship when required to transfer such funds, which most will not have set aside.

That is his commentary. I guess he knows what he is talking about, but even if he does not I still have major reservations about opening this door in respect of reciprocity which then (when some of these inquiries to which I refer, as they inevitably will under Labor Administration, come up with this recommendation and concept) will be extended to shearing, cleaning and hospitality, opening the flood gates. When people now complain about costs in the hospitality industry because of weekend work, one can just add another on cost so that the inevitable march of on-costs, which went from about 20 per cent in 1971-72 to, in many instances, about 60 per cent, will continue. So, we support the Bill in a number of respects, with serious reservations in two major areas. In due course we will make those reservations known to the House by seeking to change some aspects of this Bill.

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): I want to address myself to the two areas about which the Deputy Leader has already spoken and on which the Opposition opposes this Bill. Our difficulty tonight is that we have a Government introducing measures whose effect it does not realise when it spreads outside the building industry. I think that any members in this House who do not believe that this is the thin end of the wedge are kidding themselves.

There is no doubt at all that the Bill as it relates to the building area is purely and simply, if you like, a test case. Once it is adopted by this Parliament, I have no doubt at all that other unions will immediately see it as a test case, and will want to have the same conditions apply to their own employment. At the moment, we have a Government in which there is absolutely no-one who has had any business experience whatsoever, and that is why this Bill is before the House. It is a Bill that does not take account of the effects it will have on the business community in South Australia.

Let us look at why long service leave is supposed to be in existence: it is supposed to be, if you like, a reward for long service to one employer, an incentive to keep a person working with an employer for a long period and in this way to introduce stability into the work force—to produce stability of employment for the employee and to produce stability in the work force of the employer. That is why long service leave was introduced.

However, already the situation that is enjoyed by the work force in Australia is better than in many overseas countries. Let us take, for example, one of the countries with whose exports we are competing—the United States of America. I do not know whether or not members opposite know, but in the United States long service leave is something that they just do not understand, for the simple reason that it is not provided to employees. I know that, when I was working for a company that had at that time its ownership based in the United States, one of the very real difficulties that the executives had when either they visited our plant in Australia or whenever I went overseas to look at the plants in the United States was that they could not comprehend this business of long service leave.

The cost of the incentive offered to our employees here in terms of long service is one that adds to the very real cost of goods produced in Australia. The Deputy Leader addressed himself to the on costs that employers in this country are forced to bear. It is a wellknown fact that, for example, in the automotive industry cars cost approximately twice as much to produce here in Australia as they cost in the United States, and one of the reasons for this is the on costs that the Australian employers are forced to bear. The other, of course, is the fact that productivity in the automotive industry in the United States is far greater than it is here in Australia. For example, the production line at Tonsley Park as far as Chrysler (or Mitsubishi as it now is) is concerned is lucky to produce 300-plus cars a day: on a similar line in the United States it is not unusual for it to produce four times the number of vehicles.

The reason for this is that in the United States, as in Japan and other countries, they have far greater use of automatic systems, robots, etc. The other thing is that the American worker has a far higher degree of productivity than does the Australian worker. The main reason for this is not that the Australian worker is lazy. In fact, I have nothing but admiration for the attitude of most of the workforce in South Australia. However, unions interfere to such an extent that the productivity of those workers is reduced. Let us lay the blame fairly and squarely where it lies. Let us take most of the down days when plants are closed, certainly in the automotive industry. It is not because of any dispute between employer and employee or between union and employer but rather because of a dispute between unions—a demarcation dispute. That dispute never occurs in the US because they do not have trade unions, they have a more sensible system of industry unions. Those who are working in an automative plant belong to the one union. They are represented by one union, their interests are put to employers by that union and there is no fight between one union and another.

I will never forget the time in my previous employment when we had a strike that went for many days. The plant was closed down because of a union that had a total membership at that plant of 14 persons. That union could bring the plant to a halt. The fight that that union, representing 14 workers, had was not with the employer or company but with another union.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I rise on a point of order. I note that the honourable member is referring to some place where he worked, and talking about some unnamed union which had 14 members and which was able to stop work in that factory. The thought dawned on me that there is nothing in the Bill about the place where the honourable member worked, about 14 members or about stopping work. I wonder whether the honourable member has strayed a little too far.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Lenehan): I uphold the point of order and ask the member for Todd to come back to the subject of the Bill.

Mr ASHENDEN: I respect the Chair's ruling, but the matter we are addressing tonight is one of conditions of employment and the influence that unions in this country have had on those conditions. I have obviously touched a sensitive nerve as far as the Deputy Premier is concerned. I will go back to trying to explain the effect that the union movement is having on the cost of production in Australia.

Here we have brought before this House because of union pressure another measure which will result in additional

payment to unionists at the expense of employment in this country. I see the remarks as being connected. However, in view of the Deputy Premier's sensitivity, I will return to the situation whereby long service leave, and the meaning of that term, was first introduced to employment conditions in this country and is now being abused.

This Government wants to provide long service leave to an employee who changes from one employer to another and yet another. The Deputy Premier may say in his reply that this relates only to the building industry, which is unique. I make the point in support of the Deputy Leader that I do not see this condition of employment remaining with the building industry. It is a test case. If this is accepted by this Parliament and becomes a condition of employment in the building industry, it will not be many months before other trade unions will be seeking the same conditions of employment for their industries. We will then have the situation (I made the point earlier and the Deputy Premier did not like it) that a car in Australia costs twice as much to produce as does a similar car in the United States. If he does not believe me, the Minister should get figures from overseas which would show quite clearly that the point I am making is correct.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: They've got bigger runs in the United States.

Mr ASHENDEN: I accept the fact that they have bigger runs, but the Deputy Premier will not accept that the US, with a plant employing the same number of employees as employed on a production line here, produces about four times the number of cars that do we.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Its all done by automation.

Mr ASHENDEN: Exactly, because the unions in America do not have their heads buried in the sand and will allow companies to introduce automation into plants to remove the mundane and repetitive jobs. With union control in this country, companies are not able to introduce those measures to ensure that a car is produced in a much better manner in relation to quality control (and that is not a criticism of Australian workers). On the gateline in the production of cars, if automation is used, there will be far greater accuracy in the welding than if the gateline was operated by men. That is no criticism of people working on the gateline—it is just statement of fact.

As unions in Australia will not allow that to occur, it is pointless for the Deputy Premier to interject with something that is quite irrelevant. Of course, there is far greater automation in the U.S. than there is in Australia. That is a plus for the U.S. because it can produce a better vehicle at a lower cost. When we come to long service leave (to make the Deputy Premier happier), we find that it is not provided to employees in the U.S. but is an ongoing cost in Australia. If this new measure comes in even greater cost will be forced upon the employer. As soon as the employer is forced to bear those greater costs, there is less competitiveness between Australian goods and those manufactured overseas. It is no good our producing goods in Australia if we are not able to sell those goods either within our own country or overseas.

The interjections of members opposite show that they do not understand the facts of life in this world, namely, that if we cannot produce goods at a competitive price there will be greater unemployment.

Mr Mathwin: We will go out of business.

Mr ASHENDEN: Yes, as my colleague says, we will be out of business. Although the bigger companies may be able to absorb some of those on costs, the smaller businessman will not be able to do so. As the Deputy Leader said, small business in this country employs more people than does any other sector. If we force more small businesses to the wall, we will have greater unemployment, and any benefit to the presently employed person is at the cost of a potential job for an unemployed person. That point cannot be stressed enough.

The union movement in this country is interested only in persons who are already employed. It does not give two hoots about the unfortunate people who are unemployed. I have mentioned in this House before, and I will mention again tonight, that in my electorate we have one of the highest rates of youth unemplopyment not only in South Australia but in this country. Do they thank the unions for all the increases that they try to get for those who are already employed? Conditions of employment in this country are as good as, if not better than, those anywhere in the world but the union movement is purely going on with the adage of making the rich richer and the poor poorer, because it is looking after only those who are already in a job. It is making life and income better for those people. It is therefore only making the costs to the employer higher and making the employer's ability to emply others more difficult. So, this is yet another step and a typical example of union interference which is only prolonging and making worse the present unemployment situation.

The whole idea of long service leave was to encourage an employee to remain with his employer. What these moves will do is remove the incentive for an employee to remain with his or her employer. Employers will have to budget not only for those who do give them long and continued and good service but also for other emplyees coming into their employment from other employers. We already have small business being forced to the wall by the activities of this Government. Let us not kid ourselves: this will spread to other areas. We are talking not merely about the building industry. This is a typical union ploy: let us move into a sensitive industry and get what we want, and then we will spread it to the whole work-force. This attitude completely overlooks the fact, as I said, that we will have a workforce only as long as we have employers and we will have employers only as long as they can produce productively and are able to sell their goods competitively. That is what this Government cannot understand: that every added perk for the present employed makes life more difficult for the unemployed.

Again, it comes back to the point that there is no business expertise whatever on the benches opposite. They cannot appreciate the flow-on effect of the measure that they are bringing before the Parliament tonight, and that is the part that really concerns me. They have no comprehension of the costs of employment. As I said earlier, I acknowledge that this measure is given tacit support by the large building employers in this State. What it does not have is the support of the smaller employer in the building industry. I can assure members opposite that it certainly does not have the support of the small business community as a whole.

Mr Mathwin: They won't be able to keep in business.

Mr ASHENDEN: They, like me, are concerned that this will be yet another impost on their ability to be able to continue to employ. I am indeed pleased that the Deputy Leader is to introduce amendments in the two major areas with which Opposition disagrees with the Government. I can only hope that the Government, instead of kow-towing to its union masters, will look at the effect that this legislation will have on the economy of South Australia. I have no doubt at all that members opposite will get up and try to say, 'But this is only in relation to the building industry; it can afford it.' Again, I make the point that there is no way in the world in which this will stay within the building industry alone.

I can only again link my remarks to employment that I also had in the oil industry, where we saw only too well how the unions knew that they could easily force the oil

companies to provide higher pay, better conditions, etc.; and that, as soon as the oil industry obtained those benefits, other unions would immediately come in and say, 'Well, the oil industry has it; now we want it.' Then, of course, it would flow on to those unions, and the oil industry unions would then think that they had better get something else for their people. In that way, the whole vicious cycle went on and on. That is exactly what will happen with this legislation.

If the legislation is passed in its present form there is no doubt at all that it will flow on into other areas and the competitive position of South Australian industry will be reduced still further. Employment opportunities and the advancement of South Australia will also be reduced even further. I can only hope that the House will support the amendments to be moved by the Deputy Leader.

Mr BAKER (Mitcham): I believe that my two colleagues have been unduly statesmanlike in this whole debate. They have been very kind to the Minister. I know that on occasions they do feel kindly disposed towards him, as indeed on a number of occasions I do. However, on this occasion I will not make the same mistake. One must ask the Minister why he would introduce this Bill at this very time. By way of background we need only to look at the current industrial situation in relation to the Builders Labourers Federation. We all know that the builders labourers have caused an enormous amount of disruption to Australian industry. It has done more than any other union in this country to pull the country apart.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: The Bill was introduced on 6 December—

Mr BAKER: The Minister has referred to a Bill that was introduced on a previous occasion. The Minister is well aware that the Builders Labourers Federation, even to the Minister's observations, governs its conduct outside the realms of what we call acceptable behaviour. Quite simply, I am amazed that the Minister brought this Bill before the Parliament. The Minister has been asked to take action to deregister the builders labourers union. Indeed, people have pleaded with him to take such action.

Mr Mathwin: He is too timid.

Mr BAKER: He is very timid indeed. Why is he so timid? The Minister got it fixed.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: There are no bans on in South Australia.

Mr BAKER: The Minister might like to have chapter and verse on what is happening out there today in the industry. Very shortly the Minister will be informed, if he does not already know, of the bastardisation that is taking place in the industry today, but we will leave that to another day. I am talking about the principle of bringing forward a Bill which offers extra benefits in an industry which is being subjected to total disruption by a particular group, which benefits will advantage that group. The Minister can say, 'Well, this is not a pay-off; this is not a little bit of assistance to keep them quiet.' The Minister says that he introduced this bill some months ago. Let me inform the Minister that the builders labourers have been active for a number of years. He knows their track record, and I do not think even the Minister could condone some of the activities in which that federation indulges. So, it must be asked why at this time, when things are very sensitive in that industry, when the Builders Labourers Federation has done more to destroy the industry in New South Wales, to stop our exports getting overseas, to put people out of work, the Minister would bring this Bill before the Parliament.

Has the Minister, for example, looked at the log of claims that Mr Gallagher served on the building industry? Does he condone those actions? Does he condone the actions of these unions outside in the industry? I can only presume that his introduction of this Bill, which gives benefits to those people as well as others, must be some sort of pay-off along the lines of this being a little bit of help to his friends, so that perhaps things can be kept on the quiet. I can only presume that, because no-one in his right mind would provide additional benefits to a union that has conducted itself so disgustingly in the annals of Australian industrial history.

I now want to move to the basics of this Bill. The Minister can quite rightly claim that in 1975 a Bill was drafted to provide recognition to people in the building industry because of the itinerant nature of the industry itself. He may well claim, too, that the precedent was set there. I have heard a number of statements made before this House, particularly by the Minister of Education, who delights in saying, 'The member for Mitcham was not here in 1979 or 1980 when this measure was introduced, so he is not to blame.' By the same token, I can absolve myself by stating that we introduced this Bill in 1976 and it was proclaimed in 1977.

What I wish to raise before the House is a number of other aspects on long service leave that have not been canvassed, then talk about precedent and some of the provisions in the Bill. Everyone has said that long service leave is a provision of benefit for long service to a particular company. We all agree on that—I think that there are 47 members of this House who would probably closely agree on that definition. What it does not say, of course, is that if one keeps swapping employers one will get the benefit as well. No-one needs reminding in this House, because we have been told often enough, that Australia is the only country in the world that offers long service leave benefits.

Members interjecting.

Mr BAKER: I will not talk about the other benefits, but I have returned recently from a trip to Singapore and Hong Kong and one of the things that came forward then was that Australia has lost its competitive edge (if it ever had one) and is continuing to sell itself further down the proverbial economic drain. We seem to think that we can continue to give benefits at no cost. Let me assure honourable members that the rest of the world has not seen fit to provide long service leave. Why should Australia? I will leave that point aside because I want to say that long service leave is not an accepted means of reward in the industrialised world that we know today. It is an Australian aberration.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: Don't you think that people are entitled to it?

Mr BAKER: The thing about long service leave, of course, is that (and I do not know what year it was introduced into Australia: perhaps someone in this House could enlighten me on this subject) it is now part of our industrial award system. It is not within the province of Parliament to change that provision without the proverbial riot. All I am saying to the Minister is that, if we believe that the original provisions were to provide reward for service to a particular employee, why are we now departing from those principles in a climate in which we are becoming less competitive?

To take that point further (and this is the point that we made about precedent), the principle of long service leave does have some economic base. As an economist it is quite easy for me to explain to people in this House—even people on the other side of the House—that a person who gives valuable service to a company actually enhances the wealth of that company by his very presence over a long period of time because he has a learning curve with a company. By, we will say, industrious commitment to the company concerned, the person who spends 10 years in a company obviously gives far greater service than do two people who serve five years—there is no doubt.

In fact, the productivity of that worker, provided he puts in the amount of effort that is required, will actually enhance the company. Therefore, there is an economic basis for long service leave, even though no other country in the world has seen fit to provide it. I might add that at the end of it, of course, there is a downward slope to the earning curve after a number of years. It sort of goes under the heading of familiarity breeds contempt, or whatever. However, let us return to the provisions about long service leave. If we say that the economic contribution of a person is governed by one factor—and we will take this factor as service to the company—how can we in the same breath say that a person who changes his employer on a number of occasions is fulfilling that commitment and fitting in with that sort of economic reward system?

What the Minister wants to do in this Bill is widen the provisions, and I have looked at the provisions. I thought that I would try to understand what he is trying to do and I looked at the definition of 'employer' as it was made in 1982. What he has done is make the definition of 'employer' somewhat simpler. Instead of a list of A to I categories, he has now limited it to virtually two categories with a number of sub-categories. Then he has taken out subsection (3). I remind members of the amendment to section 4 in 1982, which added the following subsection (3):

> For the purposes of this Act, in determining whether particular activities are subsidiary to other activities, regard shall be had to the number of persons engaged exclusively in the firstmentioned activities—

and this is terrific legalese—

> and to the number of persons engaged in the other activities (disregarding in both cases persons who are engaged wholly or principally in work of an administrative or clerical nature).

What it means is that for the definition what was taken into account were those companies that were primarily involved in building. I can only assume that, because the definition has come out, the Minister will introduce some regulations or something of that nature, because by the removal of that definition he then creates a situation of what is associated with the building industry. On the one hand he said that quarry workers are (and I have not seen any quarry worker mentioned in this new definition—none whatsoever included). He has suddenly said that we are going to have quarry workers in here but we will not have those people who are in retail establishments and who are providing goods or services to the building industry. I am dumbfounded how he can make that determination on that set of words. Perhaps I have misread the drafting, but obviously—

Mr Mathwin: Perhaps the Minister will explain.

Mr BAKER: Perhaps he will, but then again he is not a lawyer and he may have some difficulty with it. My reading of that provision is that it still limits the legislation to the building industry. However, the Minister has assured us that it does not and if we have associated activities (he names quarrying) then they suddenly fit in with the definition. That means that there must be a whole range of other activities. How can he tell this House that on the one hand a carpenter who provides services to the building industry is not included, yet a quarry worker is? I want to ask: who is closest to the building industry—the person who crushes the stones or the person who provides the pieces of wood that make a house? As I said, I am at a loss. Perhaps when we debate this matter in Committee we will be able to clear up this particular anomaly.

That was my first observation about this Act. It seems that if the Minister's interpretation is correct and we can actually widen the definitions the question must be asked where that definition starts and ends. My colleagues have introduced the proposition that precedent will determine that a number of other industries will be affected in this way. I go back to the original determination of long service leave. Can we determine that a person's contribution in the retail industry, for example, or in the hotel industry and many other service industries is deserving of long service leave if he changed his employer three, four, five or six times?

I know that a special dispensation was given to the building industry because of its itinerant nature. Irrespective of whether a person determined to leave that industry of his own volition, irrespective of whether he changed the employer of his own volition, we in 1976 determined in our wisdom that they were a deserving case. How did we determine that? Who was in Parliament at that time? I am sure the members on my side opposed it and I know they did. How did the Parliament determine such a marvellous standard, saying, 'If you wander around the industry you are deserving of long service leave, even though it is outside the spirit of the original determination of long service leave?'

Now the Minister says, 'It is unfair. We have people working interstate and people who leave the industry for a longer term. They should receive special recognition.' The Minister suddenly says 'Yes, but we have reciprocity provisions in Victoria, New South Wales and the Australian Capital Territory' The Australian Capital Territory is only a Territory; it is not even a State, so he is pretty close, he is almost there. But when we look at the other States, in the majority of States it does not exist. What is the Minister on about? Does he believe, for example, on commonsense grounds that if a person who has gone to Queensland cannot get the benefits because Joh has no provision in his Act for reciprocity, he is any less deserving? I am wondering what the Minister's principle is. I am sure the Queensland Government would never agree to this provision. What is the Minister trying to determine with this reciprocity? Is it a matter of the State you land in that makes it all important or does he believe that the domestic South Australian builders are going to pick up the tab for all that lost time for the States that do not have reciprocity agreements? I would like an explanation some time. I am assured by my colleague the member for Glenelg that the Minister will answer it.

How stupid is South Australia in this circumstance? We know, for example, that during a period in the '70s Queensland managed to attract a large number of our building and construction workers, particularly on mining and development. We know, for example, that New South Wales enjoyed a period of the unprecedented growth before the Builders Labourers Federation and a few of their friends got to it. We know that workers flowed to New South Wales and Western Australia for a while. The Minister says 'Yes, but they are serving in the industry somewhere.' It might be an allied industry—crushing coal in Newcastle, for example—but they are suddenly going to be given long service leave because they have given long service to the industry. We do not know what the industry is because the Minister cannot define it; he has taken out that clause which determines what is the industry. How stupid can this Government be in taking a stance like that?

I am going to deal with the law of precedent which I was talking about earlier. We already have legislation in the Statutes and I cannot comment a great deal on what my predecessors might have done but I am appalled by the tenor of the legislation. Now we wish to take it further. My colleagues have canvassed all the other industries that are going to be affected and I can only say if you do it for the building industry, which is far more volatile in the way it operates, an industry in which we have far less check on where people work and where they fit within the building industry, it is certain that this measure is going to spread to other elements of industry where employment has been

far more certain, and where it is far easier to define whether a person remained in the industry or not. A number of industries have already been canvassed in regard to where it might spread, and one must ask the Minister what he thinks he is doing. It is the thin edge of the wedge and I can only cry 'Halt'.

A number of honourable members have been overseas and understand that Australia, as somebody once said, is becoming the poor white trash of Asia. People who have visited those countries understand that. Honourable members opposite who have been overseas and who have read a little more widely know this, yet they are going to support the measures which are going to place South Australia and Australia in a continuing position of disadvantage. Somewhere along the line either the brain cells are not working or they are committed to a process of destruction of our way of life. They do not have to be Rhodes scholars to suggest that we have priced ourselves out of the market; they do not have to be Rhodes scholars to talk to some of the officials overseas, our major future trading partners, when they say 'I do not like your industrial relations record very much; how can your members possibly go on strike all the time and destroy your export base?' We are not talking about industrial relations here; we are talking about the feeding of the wages inflation.

I am not going to condone any employer who supports this measure and I believe the basic thinking behind this Bill has been wrong. In 1977 Mr Dunstan must have been proud of himself with this extra piece of social legislation. I do not believe anybody should receive long service leave benefits if they have not continued to serve the same employer for the prescribed period of time. I also do not believe personally there should be a pro rata assessment after seven years but again, we already have it in the legislation. What I believe or do not believe is irrelevant to this process.

I can only reiterate that at some time in our lives we have to call a halt. Sometime in our lives we have to live up to the responsibilities that the people out there give us. The people out there want a number of things: they want employment and security and a bit of happiness, and any measure that reduces our competitiveness in this very competitive world means that whilst the short term benefits may flow to particular industries, the long term costs are disastrous. This is but a small measure and I know the former President of the United Trades and Labor Council will probably respond in kind and tell us how iniquitous it is for the building industry workers to be singled out for non benefits. Let me assure the honourable member if he does raise that issue there are many other members who change their jobs, who get thrown out of employment for a wide range of reasons, who leave because of pregnancy and sickness, and who never have long service leave available. It is an aberration to the Australian industrial community.

I will conclude by saying that, whilst it is a small measure before this House, and whilst I have my severe reservations about why it was introduced, given the background of our industrial relations in the building industry as it is today, I think the people of South Australia would smile very kindly on this House if it called a halt to proceedings and said that what it is doing is nonsensical (and I have pointed out some areas in the Bill which do need explanation), but also we are going to show South Australians that we do not need these measures because they will add to costs; if they flow to other industries, of course, it will mean that people will not be employed. As everybody knows, an injured worker cannot get another job. If you have long service leave provisions with credits forthcoming, employers will not give you employment, and I do not need to explain to members opposite about turnover and the average life of an employee in an industry to understand that long service leave provisions are not made fully for all workers but on the basis of a certain amount of turnover of people who will not last the seven or 10 years as required.

I am totally opposed to the provisions in this Bill. My colleague the Deputy Leader has signified his agreement with a number of other provisions in the Bill and I find most of those quite tenable. They seem to be taking the administration of this Act further along the track, and most of them are quite sensible. In conclusion, I am diametrically opposed to several provisions in this Legislation and it will be my pleasure to oppose this Bill.

Mr GREGORY (Florey): If the member for Mitcham's speech was as accurate as was his description of the office that I previously held in the United Trades and Labor Council, then his speech would have been totally wrong. I have never been the President of that organisation. I happened to be the Secretary of it for some time. I want to take up a few matters that he and other members raised. The first matter concerns this being a payoff. There are 13 000 workers currently registered by the Long Service Leave (Building Industries) Board. This covers people who work in the industry in various occupations. If the member were to look at the definition of worker in the current Act he would find that it refers to occupations covered by unions such as the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners, the Building Workers Industrial Union, the Plumbers and Gasfitters Employees Union, the Operative Plasterer and Plaster Workers Federation, the Operative Painters and Decorators Union and, of course, the Australian Building and Construction Workers Federation (BLF). They make up between 10 per cent and 12 per cent of employees in the organisation.

Applying the honourable member's technique of denying benefits to everyone because a small part of a group plays up means that such benefits are taken away from everyone. That is a wrong approach to take. The Government's approach to this matter is one of equity on the basis of work to the industry. The building industry provides only short term employment. Unless one happens to cop employment on projects like the Sydney Harbor Bridge, or the Opera House, and being able to get long service leave only after having worked for 10 years, one cannot obtain it. Most building jobs that I know of, particularly in South Australia, do not go for that long. If a job extends for more than two years a person is damned lucky. If a building worker can be there from the start to the finish of a job he is extremely fortunate.

Anyone with knowledge of planning and construction sites would know that there is a start-up period when groups of workers move in and do particular types of work. Workers doing the pile driving, for example, are builders labourers, but the contractor for whom they are working moves off the site after they have completed a job and builders labourers working for another company come in with the next contractor. If a contractor does not have work he stands the employees down. They do not have continuity of employment, and if they are stood down they must go and get work elsewhere. In the building industry they go from employer to employer, from job to job. It would be all right if every high rise building, for example, was built by the same contractor, but that is not so. We do not argue that there should not be competitive bidding by contractors, but we say that people working in the industry should receive benefits from working in it.

Why should not workers who work in the industry here in South Australia and who go and work in New South Wales or Victoria or anywhere else, where an agreement can be reached on reciprocity arrangements, benefit from

that? The South Australian employer is not paying for the time that those workers spend in New South Wales or Victoria—the employer over there is. The time that workers spend in the industry is lost. Therefore, if an equitable arrangement can be reached, why should that not be allowed to occur. If one happens to be a public servant, as the member for Mitcham previously was, that person can wander around working for various State Governments and the Commonwealth and his long service leave follows him. There is no reciprocity. That person could work for ETSA or the STA and like a very faithful little dog which he does not even have to feed his long service leave follows him. However, the honourable member wants to deny this to blue collar building workers, I suppose simply because he considers that they are in a lower class. One of the things that amazed me was the statement about the BLF stopping exports. I did not know that they made exports and I do not know how they could stop things for export.

Mr Baker: Haven't you heard of the little contracts that went bust because they couldn't provide? The honourable member should check his facts.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GREGORY: With the long bow you are drawing you would have to stand on top of the Sydney Harbor Bridge for the bottom to reach the water. The honourable member is showing his ignorance about long service leave. New Zealand has this provision. The reason why we have it is because when Government was introduced into Australia and New Zealand and they wanted top flight public servants out here they had to provide that after people had been out here for a while they could be given leave to go back home. It started with Government employees being provided with long service leave. Why should not other classes of workers have long service leave?

It was agreed after a long industrial campaign that workers should have long service leave after having worked for the same employer in the same industry. That is fair enough. In the metal trades industries they do not argue about portability of long service leave between employers because that fact is recognised. However, in the building industry people who are able to accumulate enough service to gain long service leave are a rarity and an oddity—you could count them on one hand.

Mention was made of the extension of the scope of the Act. As I said earlier, about 13 000 people are covered by it. It is estimated that about 200 or more employees will be dragged into this. I refer to references in the Act to classes of employment, referred to, in part, as follows:

(ii) structures (including tanks) for the storage or supply of water;
(iii) structures for the conveyance, treatment or disposal of sewage or effluent;
(iv) bridges, viaducts, aquaducts or tunnels;
(v) chimney stacks, cooling towers or silos, or the construction, improvement or alteration of docks, jetties, piers or wharves;

The only one of those things that has been built by private contractors lately was the wharf at Port Bonython and possibly the water storage facilities at Morgan and at a couple of other places. They were built by private enterprise for the Government (which should have been done by the Government). You would be lucky to drag in 200 people.

Who are we dragging in? We are dragging in a particular class of employee or worker who happens to be a 'builders labourer so classified in any award from time to time or having an agreement from time to time registered or being registered'. Reference is then made to a building worker performing work 'of the kind usually performed by an asbestos cement fixer, bricklayer, bridge and wharf carpenter, carpenter, decorator, drainer, electrical mechanic, gas fitter, glazier, joiner, painter, plasterer, plumber, roof tiler, sign-writer, sprinkler pipe fitter, slater, stonemason, terrazzo worker, tile layer, tuck-pointer or welder or by an apprentice', and so on. Reference is then made to 'prescribed employees'.

All that is happening is that a definition is being removed where employers have juggled their work force and included people not described so that they could avoid paying properly. Those employers doing the dodging will now have to pay. I see nothing wrong with people who are working in the industry and using the dodges being caught up with and made to pay. It is called equity, and I do not think anyone would disagree with that. Electrical contractors have a long service leave agreement of their own and pay their workers under another arrangement. They are covered by another Act.

A lot has been said about people who have been working but who have become sick and who have become ineligible. I just hope that when the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act amendments are considered in this place members opposite will support the measures contained therein to improve the health and safety of workers at work so that when they get injured or sick they will be able to stay around long enough to enjoy the benefits of this Act and other Acts that provide for long service leave and longevity in the work force.

The member for Todd had a bit to say about the automobile manufacturing industry in the United States of America on the basis that he worked for a company here prior to coming to this place. He spoke of their bewilderment at paying long service leave payments and not knowing what they were for. However, I suppose that when they spoke of the benefits that they had to pay to their employees and organisations in the United States of America the pay people here were also bewildered. The pay people here do not have to pay out the amounts for superannuation, medical expenses, unemployment money that is paid into funds, or a heap of other things that automobile manufacturers in America have to pay. I think it is a bit unfair, and untruthful, for a member to stand in this House and make comparisons on unlike matters.

Sure, we have long service leave in this country: it is a fact of life like pensions, weekly pay and annual leave. One could suggest that those payments be taken away, but of course one would not. The other matter mentioned was productivity in the motor vehicle industry. This is a matter involving what the employers are prepared to put in, because I am not aware of any move in the vehicle industry by the Vehicle Builders Employees Federation to stop the introduction of robots. If somebody was prepared to have a look around this industry they would be surprised at the number of numerically controlled machines and machines operated by micro chips and small computers which are in a way operating on a robotic style.

The member then talked about robots in the automobile industry. I can remember showing the Secretary of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry photographs I took in an automobile plant in Moscow in 1976. He was surprised at the modern equipment that they had in that plant, equipment that they had not seen in South Australia at General Motors where he worked, and where I worked with him, but in a different capacity. He advised me, because I had not worked for the General since 1968, that they had not installed any such machines up until 1976.

The real problem with the Australian industry today is that there is a lack of confidence among employers so they do not take proper investment decisions about getting equipment into their places so that they can increase their productivity and competitiveness with overseas countries. One only has to read between the lines when certain management groups talk to employers to see that the story comes through time after time that employers are not making

proper investment decisions. It is all right for the member to blame everything on the unions, but if they had as much power as the member for Todd says they have I think that Australia would be a lot better place to live. I know about the stand-downs he talks about in the vehicle industry in this State which did not have a high productivity. However, the only stand-downs I can remember during the whole of the time I worked for General Motors occurred on two occasions when they laid the workers off for 10 and 13 days respectively.

Productivity at that time was lousy in comparison with American plants because of the small production runs brought about by the small capacity of our automobile manufacturing industry and the number of models we tried to make with our limited tooling funds. It is estimated that at the moment the only way we can produce automobiles in competition with countries such as Japan, America and Europe, and as cheaply as they do, is to have one manufacturer producing only two or three models. We presently have five manufacturers and a number of assemblers here—that is a fact of life. It is no good trying to draw that comparison, because it is false and will not stand up to proper examination.

The latest stand-down and stoppage in the vehicle industry that I can recall was at Ford. The Vehicle Builders Employees Federation is the major union in that industry. I cannot speak for Ford, but I would say that between 85 and 90 per cent of its employees are members of that union. It was a blue between Vehicle Builders Federation members that caused those stand-downs. An allegation has been made that the union movement is not concerned with the problems of the unemployed. I resent that allegation because the union movement has demonstrated its support for the unemployed over a long period. However, one has to remember that the union has an obligation to do its best for its members, the people who pay its salaries. If they did not continue to do that it would mean that they would be derelict in their duty and could be properly criticised. Do not ever say that they do not do anything for the unemployed, because they do a lot. I am pleased that there is a difference of opinion here between the member for Todd and the member for Kavel.

The member for Kavel told us a while ago that our standard of living has dropped below those of Greece, Ireland and some other countries. The member for Todd told us that our standard of living is the best in the world. I wish those two colleagues opposite would get together and work out exactly where we are going. Great play has been made tonight about the effects of flow-on. We are debating amendments to one Bill which will expand the incomes of the recipients of this Bill by 1.5 per cent. The principal Act was assented to on 4 March 1976. That is how long it has been around. It is the only legislation of its type in this State.

Personally, I would like to see long service leave legislation applying to workers in other industries where there is no hope of workers receiving long service leave. I refer to the case of cleaners who work on contract for, say, BHP in the Education Department Building. Every two or three years cleaning contracts come up for renewal. Companies then bid and put in tenders. More than infrequently the contracts change. All that happens is that the workers have new supervisors and a new paymaster but, in fact, they are working for a different employer. They could work in one building cleaning for the next 20 years without receiving long service leave. That is an injustice which is not appreciated by honourable members opposite.

The member for Mitcham complained about the ability of oil industry employees to extract higher wages and better conditions from employers. In fact, he is complaining about their ability and effectiveness to obtain these things from employers. I hope that he believes in the teaching of Adam Smith, who developed the theory of capitalism, that the fit survive and the weak do not. In the oil industry the employers survive, and they are using the same forces and theory of capitalism. I do not know why he is complaining.

Mr Baker: I think that's a gross misinterpretation of the rules.

Mr GREGORY: The member for Mitcham should stop his whingeing. The member for Kavel and, I think, the member for Todd had a fair bit to say about the Industrial Relations Advisory Council. The member for Kavel made a point about employers and big boys in the unions getting together and reaching agreement with the Government, and somewhere out there a whole lot of people are left out. I do not know who advises the member for Kavel and the member for Todd, but I make the point that the Chamber of Commerce and Industry is registered in the South Australian Industrial Court because no employee organisation objected. If anyone wants to object to the registration of that organisation, they can apply to have it deregistered because it is not an organisation totally made up of employers—it is an organisation that includes the self employed. This is something that members opposite should understand. There are meetings of all sorts of groups within the association and it elects office bearers. Those office bearers are responsible to annual meetings and come up for re-election. I have yet to hear of a coup around there in its premises in Pirie Street (soon it is to move to Greenhill Road). They manage their affairs around there very well. So, I can only assume that the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, which has a seat on IRAC, is representative of all its constituent employers.

Take the Employers Federation of South Australia: it has a seat on that organisation; it is also made up of very small employers. Then we have the Master Builders Association, made up again of big and small building employers. We have the Retail Traders Association, which is made up of big and small retailers. They are employers. It is all right to talk about them as big: I suppose that it is fashionable to say that, but honourable members should realise that they are made up of constituents, small and big, and that those people represent all their constituents in that area because they report back.

I know that that is done in the union movement: the union representatives do consult with people who are concerned with anything it is dealing with. So, when they go and talk at that meeting, they represent the people who are affected by it because they take great pride in themselves in that when they say something they can back it up and they can deliver the goods afterwards. I can assure honourable members from my knowledge of those employers that they are of the same type. They are very well respected within their own communities.

In about 1980 we had a discussion which I referred to as the 1890s argument. It is an argument developed in 1890 on the basis of, 'We cannot afford to pay any more because if we do we will go broke.' That was said by employers every time the unions made a demand. If we had believed those demands we would not have an employer operating in Australia today.

It is true that there have been changes, but those changes have been brought about by changes on which wages could have no effect whatsoever. I will give honourable members an example: horses. If one paid blacksmiths—the people who built waggons and made harnesses—nothing, and the people who carted hay and grew it nothing for what they grew, do honourable members think that we would still have horses running up and down North Terrace? Of course, they would not be. People go for the more convenient thing.

Times, products and structures change. If one tries to stop that, the world goes by and we are left behind in the backwater.

The member for Kavel had a fair bit to say about what was happening in England. I have read articles similar to those that he has read about the steel industry in the United Kingdom, but great play was made there about the effect of unions on the economy. What has happened in the United Kingdom has been the result of economic circumstances. It is not something that has happened since the Second World War or the First World War. It was a process that was beginning to happen when the Boer War commenced. England was just starting to really show its industrial decline. Other countries were building up their industries, and they did not have the wit to reinvest in their manufacturing industry so that they could compete.

Honourable members will find that there has been an outflow of moneys in the reinvestment in their secondary and manufacturing industry, which has meant that it has been starved of capital, and consequently it has declined. That is the result of poor investment decisions, although it may have been that the investors thought that they were good investment decisions but they were decisions that were wrong for the country. The reaction of the workers in that country is to try to preserve and protect their jobs. It is wrong to complain about the trade union movement in this matter because the investment of the employers has caused that. I support this Bill because it will provide some equity where there has been no equity. It will ensure that a few workers who have been denied benefits will receive those benefits. Consequently, it is a just Bill and I support it for those reasons.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Fisher): I have promised that I will be very brief, because we would like to finish in reasonable time. The Opposition Liberal Party is conscious that the cost structure of our country is reaching the stage where other countries cannot support us and our standard of living. Whether we think that it is high enough or not does not matter: other countries cannot afford it. In particular in regard to the building trade the honourable member made the point that we can afford to give greater benefits to different sections of the building industry that are not receiving them now. He makes the point that only a small number of people percentagewise will receive the extra benefit. Every time we take another step down the cost structure road to increased costs, we place a burden upon the industry that many cannot afford.

This Parliament passed legislation to give guarantees to people to ensure that builders gave the guarantee. Local councils and others are now tied into it for six years. As a result there needs to be a change in the law to ensure that people can get consultant engineers' fees at a reasonable rate. The Government brings this sort of legislation to the Parliament to give an extra benefit to a group of workers, but does not alter the legislation or regulations, as it should, to give a benefit to those who buy homes. The people who pay those costs are taxed to the limit and we are adding yet another cost.

The member for Florey made the point that the manufacturing section of the business community did not have enough confidence to invest in a proper way for the long term benefit of the industry and the country. I can understand why manufacturers do not have confidence, because in this country now we cannot give a guarantee of delivery of goods, of departures of cargo vessels with goods we manufacture or goods we may need to import to carry out such manufacture. If we cannot give a guarantee to clients in other lands or even in our own land, what hope is there of re-investing large sums in the manufacturing industry?

The member for Florey made the point that trade union leaders and representatives truly work for the benefit of their members. I hope that he goes back and tells them to work also for the benefit of Australia as a whole. That is all I will say although I would like to have said more. I ask the Government to think about the extra taxes and burdens, costs and charges it is putting on South Australia because, if people in this country cannot afford it, people of other lands cannot afford to maintain what we are claiming is a standard of living to which we should be entitled. We are getting enough now and should stop and wait until some others can afford to pay for what we claim we should have.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier): One thing about my legislation is that it always promotes debate in this place. I suppose that that is healthy. We have noticed in recent times that we do not get many speakers on some legislation, but my legislation always promotes four, five or six speakers. I do not begrudge that as we get a variety of viewpoints. One thing that I have learnt tonight that interested me was that most speakers said that they liked me but did not like my legislation.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: That really made my night. The important part of this Bill is that it has the support of IRAC. Whether or not the Liberal Party likes IRAC, it is working well in this State and is the envy of many other States in the Commonwealth. I ask the Opposition spokesman, the Deputy Leader, to tell me at some stage whether, if by some chance his Party was re-elected to Government at the next election, it would abolish IRAC.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: We would keep it going but give it a different starting point.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The Opposition would not abolish it. It is prepared to stand aside and criticise, but is not prepared to abolish it.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The Opposition would not now be able to abolish IRAC if it tried. It is enshrined for all time in South Australian legislation and I am very proud of that fact. I am also proud of the people who serve it. Whether or not they would be the choice of the Opposition does not matter. The facts of the matter are that IRAC is working admirably. It is in good shape and will continue to be in good shape. The other two important factors about support for this legislation is that the trade unions involved support it—it is of benefit to them. The MBA also is very much in favour of this Bill.

The Deputy Leader spoke in this debate and it is only to his comments that I want to refer. The member for Florey adequately handled the contributions in the debate of the other two or three speakers. The Deputy Leader talked about the information that he had obtained being conflicting. Those are his words and not mine.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: I got varying advice from employer people.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: That is right, the honourable member got varying advice. Most people in the industry support this on the basis of equity. There may be people who are not covered in the scope area provisions who are opposed to the Bill. That would be my view regarding the places from which the honourable member got his conflicting information. Those people involved in it at the moment and who have recognised it since 1976 support this legis-

lation. One cannot turn back the clock, in any case. The legislation has been in force since 1976.

Indeed, I remind the House that the legislation came about through a Select Committee which examined this legislation when it was first introduced. In fact, it was an all-Party recommendation that brought the legislation into the House in the first place. From memory, the member for Davenport was on the Select Committee and, although I chaired it, I cannot remember who the other members were. However, it is important to remember that the legislation was the result of a Select Committee's deliberations. At the time there was strong opposition to it by the then Opposition. In the main, the lead speaker for the Opposition has supported the Bill but with two areas of dissension. I thank him for that support.

Also, I place on record my belief that the honourable member made a very subdued and long speech this evening. He traversed many countries. I would not say that he acted strictly in accordance with the rules of debate but, nevertheless, his contribution was a reasonable one. In most instances he could find some reason to support the majority of the Bill with, as I said, only two areas of dissension relating to scope. From my experience since the original legislation was introduced, I have had to police it on two occasions. The last time was when I was previously Minister and again now. People are missing out on coverage of this legislation who in my view and in the view of the Board, the MBA, IRAC and the trades unions involved, should not be missing out on it. The number of people not covered is not large. Let me make the point that in my view there is a maximum of between 200 and 300 workers. It is hard to put a figure on it, but I would guess that it is between 200 and 300.

Building employers going on building sites are currently escaping registration under the Act under section 4 *(c)* and section 4 (3). If we are talking about equity in these circumstances, I do not believe it is proper that we should give an advantage to some employers over others. If a employer working on a job site has to pay for his employees, any other employer working on that job site or a like job site ought to enter into the equity argument and pay in regard to his employees. That is common sense. True, it is the extension of a provision that has prevailed since 1976, and there is good reason for that.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Why has it applied since 1976?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: As I said, this Bill was the subject of a Select Committee, and agreement had to be reached to get the original Bill in. The Bill was new for South Australia; it was not new for Australia. Let me make that point to the honourable member as well. South Australia was not the leader so far as this legislation is concerned. South Australia was in fact the follower on this legislation. A very small State, Tasmania, was able to advise the South Australian Select Committee about how it set up its particular board, so Tasmania was in advance of South Australia in this regard.

Another area that is not functioning properly is Quarry Industries. It has builders labourers on site. I cannot say how many, but there has been evidence brought before the board and subsequently before me that builders labourers and such people employed by Quarry Industries are not covered. They are itinerant workers and we find they do not get any long service leave at all. Is it proper to have Quarry Industries working with its builders labourers and some other organisation that is roped in under this award working in and around the same site, with one covered and one not? Surely there is an equity argument again, and I think if the honourable member really reflected on his remarks in this area he would agree without argument.

Earth-moving contractors are in exactly the same position and this is because of paragraph *(c)* and section 4 (3) as well. I think it is totally accurate to say that in the main this Bill has a great deal of support.

The Hon. H. Allison: Of the builders labourers?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I did not want to get involved with interjections because of the time. The builders labourers would have 8 or 10 per cent of the work force in this industry. Of the 13 000 or 14 000 who are covered in this industry, only 1 500 are builders labourers. So it is a reflection on the honourable member to make the allegation that builders labourers are calling the tune on this, because they are not. This is applicable to all building workers right across the board.

Circumstances have been brought to our attention of people employed by electricians working on building sites alongside employees of the shop. They start in the shop, and they finish in the shop. A permanent employee is able to get long service leave provisions under the State Act, pro rata or an extension of the 10 years, whichever the case may be. An electrician who is employed on the building site has no coverage at all because under the current scope that particular employer cannot be covered. That is the sort of thing we are trying to correct and I believe clause 3 will cover that.

The other argument put forward by the honourable member is the reciprocity argument. Let me say that reciprocity provisions have already been made in Acts in Victoria, New South Wales, the Australian Capital Territory, Western Australia, and South Australia (when this Bill is passed). Tasmania has indicated it also wants to come into those provisions of reciprocity. In those circumstances, can South Australia afford to stay out of reciprocity arrangements? I simply do not believe in those circumstances it can stay out. Queensland, of course, has no such Act, but that is nothing new in Queensland.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: They are doing very well.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: They are doing very well in Queensland at present. They have no power; all the electricians have been sacked. That is the sort of industrial relations that I want to stay away from if I can. It is estimated that the reciprocity will affect between 30 and 50 workers annually.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: There is no economic cost to South Australia at all. The reciprocity would give a person who for whatever reason (either family, personal or work) travels interstate recognition; he could carry with him the credits that he has gained in a State. I believe that this reciprocity involves a fundamental principle and applies more in this industry than in any other industry that I know of because the workers are itinerant—they move about from State to State.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: What about the shearing industry?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: That is another industry in which workers move about, but not as much as in this industry. If this Bill is not passed unaltered, if it does not contain clause 36e, we will find that South Australian workers are disadvantaged. The other States have or are moving towards this provision. I do not believe that we can leave our position undone. I would like the honourable member to reconsider his position on this matter. He has informed me that he will oppose the measure, but I ask him to rethink his position. His philosophy would prevent him from extending the scope (and I understand that) but by opposing

reciprocity the honourable member is placing South Australian workers, who are already subject to a provision under an Act that has been operating since 1976 whereby they are equal to their counterparts in other States, at a disadvantage. That is a very unfair proposition and I ask the honourable member to reconsider his position.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier): I move:

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

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Definitions'.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I move:

Page 1, lines 26 to 34 and page 2, lines 1 to 13—Leave out paragraphs *(c)*, *(d)* and *(e)*.

I do not intend to canvass the arguments which I advanced and which my colleagues supported. Our position is quite clear. The Minister in the second reading explanation advanced the argument of equity. As I said, there is a stronger counter argument, in my view, in regard to where the nation is going economically and in regard to employment. I will not rehash the argument. I am absolutely convinced that this is the track that we in South Australia should be following.

Mr BAKER: The second reading explanation states:

In the first instance, the Bill seeks to amend the definition of 'employer' in the Act to give a wider coverage to building industry workers. At present, the definition excludes from the definition of 'employer' any person engaged in activities which would normally be encompassed by the Act, but which are subsidiary to other activities undertaken. For example, a quarrying company that employs a builders labourer who goes onto a building site will now have to register and pay contributions for that worker, which was the initial intent of the Act.

The Minister has given the example of the builders labourers who work for a quarry company and who must go on site for a very small period of time to actually deliver concrete and make sure that the—

The Hon. J.D. Wright interjecting:

Mr BAKER: This is the nature of my question and I am making a presumption that the person who is working for a quarry company would presumably spend very little time on the site. The Minister said that the person who enters on to the site (for example a builders labourer) becomes eligible because he does enter on a building site. I would like that particular position clarified.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: In response to the member for Mitcham the situation is this: the Quarry Industries employees working on the actual site in quarrying operations would in the main be permanent employees. Therefore, they will qualify for long service leave under the State provisions. When a builders labourer goes on site either to repair or to erect operations (they sometimes go on new sites being established) they are working for Quarry Industries, but because Quarry Industries is not cited under the provisions of the casual long service leave legislation those employees, whilst they are erecting, repairing or whatever job they are doing on the site as builders labourers, can be working alongside a quarry worker who has been recognised for long service leave under the State provisions and who is disqualified from receiving either the casual long service leave loadings or the benefits under the main State Act. When this scope is extended, Quarry Industries and other like employers (I am only using Quarry Industries as an example) will come under the scope of the Act and during the period of employment of builders labourers they will be given credited time for it.

Mr BAKER: I follow up that interpretation. Under the definitions of the construction, improvements, alterations, maintenance, repair or demolition, which is virtually the area of activity where these people will become eligible, there is no mention of or any reference to (that I can perceive from these instructions or provisions) a quarry or building associated with a quarry, whether it be facing the quarry or whether it be doing a number of other things in the quarry which are not actually putting a building on the site. I cannot see any provision there that states that a builders labourer who comes on to a quarry site is eligible under these provisions. Perhaps the Minister can explain. I ask the Minister to respond.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I have answered your question.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chair has no power to ask the Deputy Premier to answer anything.

Mr BAKER: I ask that the Minister respond because the explanation is not in keeping with the new provisions in the Act.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I am satisfied with the explanation I gave the honourable member.

Mr BAKER: A further question relates to why the Minister took out clause 3, which provides for the major part of the activity in the building industry, because once that provision is taken out it leaves the way open for almost any other associated industry to comply under the new provisions of the Act. There is no longer the constraint that was provided by section 3 *(h)*(3), which was enacted in 1982 and which states:

For the purposes of this Act, in determining whether particular activities are subsidiary to other activities, regard shall be had to the number of persons engaged exclusively in the firstmentioned activities and to the number of persons engaged in the other activities (disregarding in both cases persons who are engaged wholly or principally in work of an administrative or clerical nature).

Once the definition of 'subsidiary nature' is taken out of the Act, we then allow subsidiary activities to form a meaningful part of the particular industry. I shall further explain my question to the Minister: if, for example, a person changed their employment between an industry that services the building industry into the building industry, under the provisions they become eligible. The reverse does not occur when the building industry worker goes from the building industry into another industry. So, there is inequity in that provision. I will not argue the merits of the situation. Will the Minister explain why he has taken it out, because he has created another anomaly going back the other way?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I do not agree with that. It was necessary to take it out and replace it in order to take into consideration the very thing that I explained to the honourable member in the first place, that is, the subsidiary situation. We were using the analogy of Quarry Industries, but there are others I can use, for example, an electrical workshop that had subsidiary work outside. While that particular provision remained in the legislation one could not deal with the extension of the scope that the new clause now takes into consideration. That is the necessity to remove it.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes(21)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Becker, D.C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy (teller), Gunn, Ingerson, Lewis, Mathwin, Meier, Olsen, Oswald, Rodda, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (23)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon, Crafter, M.J. Evans, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McRae, Mayes, Payne, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright (teller).

Pair—Aye—Mr Blacker. No—Mr Peterson.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 4 to 15 passed.

Clause 16—'Reciprocal arrangements with other States and Territories.'

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: This clause gives the Minister the ability to negotiate reciprocity with the other States, and I have made quite clear earlier that I do not believe in this case there is economic impact of the same magnitude as was involved in the previous matter we have dealt with by amendment. However, the flow-on consequences of this principle if accepted further across the board could be quite enormous and all of measures of this nature bear the inevitable consequence in other industries. I have not found it necessary to rethink my stance as suggested by the Minister, and we oppose this clause.

Mr BAKER: In the Minister's speech of 6 December 1984, he said that reciprocity existed in Victoria, New South Wales and the Act. He enlightened us tonight by saying Western Australia and Tasmania were involved as well. Perhaps the Minister could say whether new information has come to hand or whether over the Christmas break new legislation has been introduced, but what he said is certainly different from the speech he gave earlier.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Western Australia does not have an Act now, but I am advised by the Minister that it will have and will be applying for entry into the reciprocity conditions. Tasmania has also indicated that it will be applying to enter into those reciprocity conditions, so the total will be South Australia, Victoria, New South Wales, the Australian Capital Territory, Tasmania and Western Australia. We will leave out the Northern Territory and Queensland. I am not sure whether the Northern Territory has an Act; I do not believe it has.

Mr BAKER: So I can confirm with the Minister that two States have not as yet enacted legislation. I ask the Minister whether the provisions of the South Australian Act as they relate to those States which already have reciprocity agreements, namely Victoria, New South Wales and the Australian Capital Territory, are compatible with those as expressed in this provision.

I meant to say something about the extended period of eligibility from 18 months to 36 months out of the industry. Can the Minister assure us that the provisions in this Act are completely compatible with the two States and one territory which currently had reciprocity conditions?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I have never said that. I have never given any guarantees either in my second reading explanation or when I replied to the debate. The conditions are inconsistent State by State. I think from memory New South Wales is probably 15 years for long service leave and 10 years for pro rata. I have an idea Victoria is the same. In South Australia it is 10 years for long service leave and seven years for pro rata. I do not see South Australia losing in those circumstances. In fact we will probably gain, I would think.

I do not want to leave the honourable member under a misapprehension in relation to Tasmania and Western Australia. Tasmania already has an Act and has considered itself as an applicant for the reciprocity provisions. Western Australia will introduce an Act later this year and already there have been indications that it will be making an application.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is quite obvious that the Government's will will prevail but we cannot envisage what will happen in another place at the moment. The point raised by the member for Mitcham is important. The conditions within the States are not the same.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I did not say they were.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am not saying that you did, but attention has been drawn to that significant fact. Of course, the BLF is one of the major troublemakers in the building industry across the nation. This highlights the point that I made earlier: it will be quite pointless for South Australia to enact laws to cover provisions that this Government thinks should apply in this State if we are going to fall into line with everything the other States do. There will be some anomalies if the Government's will prevails and this passes into law.

It was put to me earlier, and the member for Mitcham raised this valid point, that it becomes a bit of a dog's breakfast when a worker moves from this State to say, Victoria, where I have been told that the conditions are more generous than they are here. That maybe wrong.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: The Victorian provisions are more generous than here?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I think it is Victoria where they get pro rata benefits after five or seven years, or something like that. The point is still quite valid, namely, that there will be pay-outs in South Australia for a set of conditions for service in Victoria which are superior to those that apply in South Australia, or maybe vice versa. So, there is an anomaly. To suggest that we can design an equitable scheme to even things up around the States when different conditions exist in the States just shows how silly it is to try to legislate for conditions around Australia in this way in areas in which the States have peculiar and singular jurisdiction.

As I have said, one would expect the BLF to be right in this because it operates at the national level; it wants to get conditions uniform throughout Australia; and it wants to dictate its conditions to State Governments. The point raised by the member for Mitcham is valid, and in my view the Government needs to fine tune the arrangements. If its will prevails the Government needs to at least fine tune the arrangements in terms of pay-outs from the South Australian fund *vis-a-vis* funds in other States where the benefits under the long service provisions are significantly different.

Mr BAKER: I know that the Minister will probably provide further information to the House if I stand up long enough. I am opposed to this clause quite vehemently. I expressed a view during the debate about a number of aspects of these two key areas. Until the States can get their collective acts together and reach some agreement I think that it is quite foolhardly and out of keeping with good administration in this State to go ahead with any other arrangement with any other States in relation to this matter.

I do not know whether the Minister is aware how the 36 month provision will compare with interstate provisions. It has an impact in the building industry, as people are aware, and it could well be that under these reciprocal arrangements South Australia could be a net beneficiary or a net contributor to the building workers of other States. One does not have to be a mathematical genius or even to have a great knowledge of the industry to know that there is a very large movement of workers between States, depending on the amount of work done in each State. We had some large outflows from South Australia following the—

An honourable member interjecting.

Mr BAKER: Yes, indeed, following the 1975 to 1977 housing boom there was a massive outflow of workers to points further east and north-east.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: It was suggested that the Bill was brought in so that they wouldn't leave.

Mr BAKER: I am sure that they will not wait around for their long service leave. It will not sustain them for very long. Perhaps the Minister has further information and is in a position to answer my question.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Which question?

Mr BAKER: The question really relates to our responsibilities in relation to the differences involved and where South Australia fits into the spectrum of long service leave

provisions. Will it, in fact, disadvantage the State: first, through the net movement of funds either into or out of South Australia and, secondly, through the impact that the different provisions will have on workers?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: My first answer to the Leader of the Opposition has been verified as correct: that is, that in all the other States it is three months long service leave after 15 years and pro rata long service leave after 10 years. However, there are special circumstances in Victoria which does provide for an employee to receive it after five years, but that is in very special circumstances such as illness, death in the family or something like this I am told. Basically, I am correct. To answer the question asked by the member for Mitcham, when the agreement is finalised it will equate the degrees of recognition, so far as pro rata leave or the full qualification for leave are concerned, back to each particular State. It has been pointed out to me, and I think it is probably correct, that South Australia will probably be in a better position than the other States.

Take, as an example, a New South Welshman to whom reciprocity applies, who comes to South Australia and who has four years to his credit. He does not get any pro rata leave payment under New South Wales conditions until he has worked for 10 years, but the reverse would apply for the South Australian employee who is going across to New South Wales and Victoria. If he has a four year entitlement he will qualify for his pro rata rate for seven years. I cannot see South Australia disadvantaged in those circumstances, not that there will be very much movement. The Leader of the Opposition said in his second reading speech that there will be no great cost involved in this reciprocity situation. As I estimated when I replied to the debate, the number of people who are expected to receive reciprocity anyway would be somewhere between 30 and 50, so there is not a great deal of money or numbers in this.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (17 to 21) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.20 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 14 February at 2 p.m.