

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 6 August 1985

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

### SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make provision by Bill for defraying the salaries and other expenses of the Government of South Australia during the year ending 30 June 1986.

### STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

### PAY-ROLL TAX AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

### LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

### LIQUOR LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

### PETITIONS: UNSWORN STATEMENT

Petitions signed by 139 residents of South Australia praying that the House support the abolition of the unsworn statement were presented by the Hon. B.C. Eastick and Mr Meier.

Petitions received.

### PETITIONS: TEACHER POLICY ON HOMOSEXUALITY

Petitions signed by 90 residents of South Australia praying that the House oppose the South Australian Institute of Teachers policy on homosexuality within State schools were presented by the Hon. Michael Wilson and Mr Meier.

Petitions received.

### PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*

Australia—Rules and By-laws—National Trust of South Australia—Membership and Administration.

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*

Forestry Act, 1950—Proclamation—Forest Reserve Resumed, Hundred of Adelaide.

By the Minister of Education (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

Fisheries Act, 1982—Regulations—Size Limits and Definitions.

By the Minister of Community Welfare (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

Residential Tenancies Act, 1978—Regulations—Leigh Creek South Exemption.

Trustee Act, 1936—Regulations—Elder's Finance and Investment Co. Ltd.

Rules of Court—

Local Court—Local and District Criminal Courts Act, 1926—Court Proceedings.

Local and District Criminal Court—Motor Vehicles Act, 1959—Probationary Conditions Disqualification Appeal.

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*

Racing Act, 1976—Rules of Trotting—Two State Sire Registration.

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: FORESTRY RESERVE

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Forests): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: On the last day of sitting, in response to a proposed motion from the member for Fisher, I undertook to provide details of the Government's intention for this surplus Government property, described as section 665, hundred of Adelaide. Following a review of its land holdings, the Woods and Forests Department concluded that forest growth on this site was uneconomic. In addition, there are substantial problems associated with forest protection, maintenance and management, due to its urban location isolated from other forestry activities. As a result, the land has been deemed surplus to that Department's requirements, and action has been taken for its resumption as a forest reserve.

As the agency that deals with the disposal of Government property, the Department of Lands has advised that there is strong community interest in the future of this land, including its use in part for open space and recreation and the possible establishment of an independent primary school on a portion of the site. There are various options for the disposal of this land, which could include outright purchase by the City of Mitcham for open space and recreational purposes, or a variety of multi purpose uses of the site that could accommodate the elements I have just mentioned, including some residential development.

Considering the interests of adjacent land-holders and community groups and the concerns expressed by the member for Fisher, I intend to ask the co-operation of the City of Mitcham in setting up a small committee to investigate and report on the various options for future use of this land. This committee will have representatives of the Mitcham council, departmental officers and strong representation from community interests. I believe that in a reasonably short time the committee will be able to advise on an acceptable plan that is the result of community participation and consultation.

However, there is an immediate problem. In the opinion of the Country Fire Service and the Woods and Forests Department, a pine plantation on this land in its present

state represents a very high fire hazard and places surrounding urban development at risk. The Government is acutely aware of this advice and obviously must take the most effective action to reduce this hazard. As a result I have asked the Department to proceed with the removal of the majority of the plantation so as to ensure minimum fire risk in the coming season. I have instructed that where possible, barriers of three to four rows of pines be retained to preserve some of the visual aspects of the site without incurring any substantial fire risk. When final plans for the future of the site are decided, the retention of these screens of pine trees or substitute plantings of more appropriate species can be reviewed. This decision had to be taken now, to allow safe clearance of this fire hazard by the end of November this year. I am confident that these actions will enable a suitable development plan for this 20 hectare property to be agreed with all the parties concerned.

### PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr KLUNDER brought up the fortieth report of the Public Accounts Committee, containing the Treasurer's minutes and other comments on the eighth, eleventh, twenty-first and twenty-seventh reports.

Ordered that report be printed.

### NO CONFIDENCE MOTION: YOUTH EMPLOYMENT POLICY

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice forthwith.

Motion carried.

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

That the time allotted for this debate be until 4 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr OLSEN: I move:

That, because the Government has decided to abuse and misuse taxpayers' money for Party political purposes, in a blatant attempt to cover up the complete failure of its youth employment policy, this House has no confidence in the Government and, instead, endorses the youth employment policy announced by the Liberal Party as a genuine and responsible response to the unacceptably high level of unemployment amongst young South Australians.

In my possession I have a document marked 'strictly confidential'. It is a document about which the Premier does not want this Parliament or the public to know, although it is a document about which this House should be informed. It is a document about which the taxpayers of South Australia must know, because they are going to pay for what it proposes.

It is a document which exposes the deceitful lengths to which this desperate Government is prepared to go to seek re-election. It is a document which shows that, under this Government, South Australia is going back with a vengeance to the Dunstan days in the abuse and misuse of taxpayers' money for Party political purposes. This document highlights yet again that when opinion polls are down Labor governments will stop at nothing—and Labor is five points behind in the polls as we all know—and will spend about \$500 000 to refurbish its image.

It is also a document which exposes the complete failure of this Government's youth employment policy. It is a document which shows that the only response this Government has to the great human tragedy of youth unemployment is a self preservation, public relations campaign. Make no mistake about it: PR is now the top priority of this Government—'Political Rescue', funded by the taxpayers

of South Australia. Nothing is to be left to chance. No expense is to be spared. At least half-a-million taxpayers' dollars are being spent in the run-up to the election to give this Government a new image.

The Premier's involvement in the television advertising of the casino and the Grand Prix is one example. Another will be the taxpayer funded advertisements of tax cuts. The one I now expose, outlined in this document, is particularly blatant. This document is a brief to advertising agencies for a campaign to promote employment and training for young South Australians. It involves the Premier's own department—the Manager of State Promotions in the Premier's Department is named in the brief.

Now I make clear at the outset that my Party fully supports any genuine initiatives to help young South Australians to find work. But this is not a genuine initiative. It is a Party political initiative, to be funded by the taxpayers of South Australia. In some respects it is about programs not yet announced. It will cost at least \$150 000. That is the minimum cost foreshadowed in the brief. I understand that the final cost is likely to be at least double that; and it will be spent over the next three months, rather coincidentally—the next three months—during the election campaign which the Premier triggered yesterday.

Let me explain why this exercise can be regarded only as base Party politics. I can understand the agitation on the Government benches regarding the Labor Party's being identified as being about to spend taxpayers' money to shore up its own stocks. This exercise is being cobbled together in a great hurry. The three agencies selected to present a creative brief were advised by telephone 10 days ago. Coincidentally, that was after the release of the most recent Morgan poll, when the Premier, in a public statement, said, 'We have a communication job to do. We need to take a new direction in communicating with the electorate of South Australia.' He did not say that he was going to use hundreds of thousands of dollars of taxpayers' money to explain that new communication link. The advertising agencies were advised by telephone 10 days ago and told that they had to present their brief to the Government this Thursday.

Each of the three agencies will be paid a creative presentation fee of \$1 000. Next Monday the Government will advise the agency finally selected to prepare the campaign: very tight, very quick, and an unusual set of circumstances. The agency will then have just 18 days to develop the campaign, which is to be launched on 1 September. Here I ask honourable members to note that the brief says about the launch date, and I quote: 'This date is not negotiable.' It has to start on 1 September otherwise the election campaign may well bypass the advertising.

The Premier showed yesterday why that date is not negotiable. The release of his tax package has signified that we are now in the election countdown and this advertising will become part of the election campaign by courtesy of the taxpayers of South Australia. There can be no other explanation.

This Government has been in office for almost three years and now, within weeks of an election campaign, it is scrambling together this advertising campaign. The advertising agency to undertake it will have less than three weeks between selection and the launch date of the campaign. Young South Australians looking for work deserve far more consideration than that; they deserve better than to be made the pawns in an abuse of power by this Government. Let me prove, by quoting from the brief given to the advertising agencies, just how much of a political exercise this will be.

Mr Groom: Tell us about your youth policies.

Mr OLSEN: The honourable member will have every opportunity to sit and listen to a detailed submission of the Liberal Party's youth employment policy that was released

to the public weeks ago. It is a detailed and extensive policy which has a direction for South Australia to create job opportunities for young people, which is more than this Government has achieved in its three years administration of this State.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the honourable member for Albert Park to order.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I do not need any backup from the gentlemen on my left. I call the honourable member for Albert Park to order. As I indicated last week, the practice of barracking will stop. I do not care whether the practice emerges on my right or on my left. I ask all honourable members to note that, in calling the honourable member for Albert Park to order, I have just issued a calling to order to every member. That means there will be a warning and then the ultimate sanction. I trust that that is fully understood.

**Mr OLSEN:** The brief to the advertising agencies refers on page 3 to the stated aims of the campaign, summarised as two. The first is to demonstrate Government involvement and effort. That clearly is to have a higher priority than the second objective, which is to provide information for employers and provide avenues of employment for the unemployed. There are other statements in this brief which confirm its Party political nature. For example, it comments on the lack of knowledge of the work undertaken by the Government to alleviate the unemployment situation, so it admits that, it has failed in communication. It states:

The State Government has made substantial contributions to labour market programs, as well as individual support programs, without knowledge or recognition of its not insignificant resource commitments.

Page 1 of the brief lists four project objectives. Two of them are as follows:

To increase general community and specific group awareness of the role, structure and activities of the State Government in assistance to the unemployed.

Develop a high profile to show that unemployment is being really tackled and cut through the promotion of high profile schemes and success stories.

There can be only one reason for a campaign with objectives such as those: it is all to do with trying to save the Premier's political skin, and nothing to do with any genuine desire to help the unemployed. That is one alarming and scandalous aspect of this brief, but, there is another.

It is also tragic commentary on the failure of the Government to help the unemployed. For example, the brief states that knowledge of and participation in Government unemployment/employment programmes has been relatively poor. The Government acknowledges that participation in its programmes has been poor. Other comments in the brief include the following:

Findings from the desk sampling research confirm that the level of understanding within target audiences, and the community of the specific programmes available and the general efforts of the Government is limited. To date, there has been little easy to read and readily available visible printed material. There has not been a cohesive range of information which can back up advertising and other initiatives.

Now I remind honourable members that the Premier has often sought to make great capital of the many millions of dollars of Commonwealth and State taxes pumped into so-called job creation schemes. I understand that the figure during the past three years now amounts to more than \$100 million over those three years for the purpose of job creation schemes in this State—\$100 million of Commonwealth and State taxes.

Yet, here we have, in the Government's own brief, in its own words, an admission that knowledge of and participation in these programmes has been relatively poor, that

little is known about them. It is difficult to imagine a more devastating indictment of Government failure in management and communication. Quite clearly, little or no thought has been given to helping the unemployed. The Federal and State Labor Governments have simply taken the attitude that throwing money at the problem will resolve it. Not only have these programmes, by the Government's own admission, failed to reach their target; they have not in fact produced any improvement in youth employment.

Despite the spending of that \$100 million of State and Federal taxes on job creation schemes, latest figures show that the number of people aged between 15 and 24 years looking for work in South Australia on a three month average basis is 25 400, or 200 more than three years ago. The requirement in the brief to show that youth unemployment is 'being really tackled and cut' is certainly going to test the ingenuity of the advertising profession. These figures are further proof that this advertising is not going to be used to impart factual information, but rather to convey the impression that the Government has done a good job.

This is precisely the point at which the distinction must be drawn between the legitimate use of taxpayers' funds to inform the public and their illegitimate use in an exercise like this calculated only, as well the Premier knows, to assist his Government in its efforts to retain office. The combined cost of this exercise, the television advertising for the Grand Prix and the casino, the recent newspaper advertising for the Roxby Downs project and the grants funds for senior citizens, and the proposed newspaper advertising of the tax cuts, is likely to run into at least half a million dollars of taxpayers' money. In part, at least, all of these exercises are calculated to boost the Premier's image. That is why the Government needs to take a high profile in its advertising campaign.

But, unlike the Premier, when he was on this side of the House, we have taken a responsible attitude towards them. For example, we did not criticise the recent newspaper advertising, featuring the Premier's photograph, of the grants to senior citizens groups, even though, at the time the advertising appeared encouraging applications for grants, no forms were printed for people to make application; no administrative arrangements had been made to process the applications even if someone could get an application form to fill out in the first instance.

We did not criticise the newspaper advertising of the Roxby Downs project although it was surely tempting when the Premier, then Leader of the Opposition about two years ago, said that Roxby was nothing but a mirage in a desert. I am glad that the reality in regard to Roxby Downs has sunk in. What did the Premier say in 1982 about similar advertising by employer groups? In a press statement on 31 May 1982 the Premier called the campaign by the employers in support of Roxby Downs 'scurrilous, dishonest and quite deliberately political'.

In those days, in fact, the Premier appeared to be against any form of advertising whatsoever. When the former Government, in July 1981, purchased a page in the *Advertiser* to inform the public about some decisions it had taken the Premier called it 'straight out Party advertising'. That advertising was not undertaken in any election environment such as we have now—and its cost of just over \$11 000 was perhaps 20 times less than the amount that this Government is about to spend on its employment advertising, let alone the other campaigns to which I have referred. The Premier's decision to initiate this advertising is not only improper and dishonest: it reeks of hypocrisy. It is the most blatant example of misuse of taxpayers' funds for Party political propaganda purposes since the Government information films produced by the Dunstan Government. It means that the Government is to use Party political propaganda funded

by the taxpayer as a substitute for a youth employment policy which works. The Government has admitted that theirs does not work, and they will undertake an advertising campaign to try to mislead the public as to their intent and their offer.

If all the Government wants to do is communicate with the young unemployed about help that is available to them, why does it not write a letter to each of them? The cost would be about \$8 800, not \$300 000, for all the letters sent to the unemployed persons between the ages of 15 and 24 years. If the Premier wanted to communicate with these young people, why not write a letter, rather than embark on this advertising brief that will cost \$300 000? Of course, such a project would not achieve the electoral objective in the wider community for which this campaign brief has been designed.

Why does the Government need a three-month campaign taking in September, October and November—the period during which the election will be held? Why is it to be a broad community campaign, when all previous efforts have failed even to reach those most directly affected and in need of this information—the unemployed? Of course, the answers to these questions lie in the statements the Premier made when reshuffling his Cabinet last month. I quote from the *Advertiser* of 16 July, when the Premier said that the reshuffle would give the Government a fresher image. That was objective thinking! So much for the fresher image achieved by that reshuffle. The Premier admitted that the Government had failed to communicate effectively what it had been doing, and he said, 'That message will be sounded loud and clear over the next few months'. Little did we know at that time that the message would be sounded loud and clear with the spending of hundreds of thousands of dollars from taxpayers' funds being used to communicate with the electorate. However, we are now certainly finding out how that will be done.

The taxpayers are to foot much of the bill in this attempt to boost the Government's standing in the opinion polls. Imagery, public relations or political rescue and propaganda are to become the cover-up for some of the major failings of this Government in communication, policy development and the honouring of basic election promises. In youth employment, we have heard nothing from this Government in three years about education and training, about worker trainee courses, about youth wages, about permanent part-time work.

Six weeks ago I announced a comprehensive Liberal policy covering these vital issues. The shadow Minister will expand on those initiatives a little later. The emphasis throughout our policy is to prepare and train young people for work, rather than indulging in short-term political schemes. That is our objective—the underlying principle behind our youth employment policy.

Our policy is based on widespread consultation with the people most directly involved in the tragedy and waste of youth unemployment—the unemployed themselves and those organisations seeking to help them—principally helped by a youth unemployment phone-in that we held earlier this year. Our policy has received strong endorsement from many quarters. Yet, the only response from the Government has been some misleading and quite inane statements made a fortnight ago by the junior Minister.

It is all very well for the Deputy Premier to say that the only one who supported the youth employment policy was Telecom. I make no apology for the fact that we in the Liberal Party were prepared to sit down over two days and take calls from the general public as to their attitude to the Government's employment scheme, ascertaining where the difficulties were and what we ought to do about them. The

Liberal Party opened up its lines of communication, and we were prepared to listen to the electorate.

It would be a pity if this Government did not take the same course of action. If it did, it would not need market research to tell it that its policies were failing. It would not need to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars on an advertising campaign and establish a brief with an advertising agency, because it would have identified the fact that its policies were not working and ascertained how they should be changed and which direction those policies should be taking. We could have had the policies implemented six or nine months ago, and we could have had some meaningful tackling of youth unemployment in this State.

I repeat that the new Minister, Ms Wiese, made some inane statements about our policy. All she succeeded in doing was to highlight the fact that this Government has no credible policy on youth employment. This Government has taken no new training initiatives for young people, even though the Kirby Report and the OECD Report have recommended such a change. It will not move on issues like more flexible training systems and permanent part-time work because of trade union opposition. The Government's trade union bosses will not let it implement permanent part-time work. Yet the Government knows that the continuing high levels of youth unemployment are of major concern to many people in the community.

It knows that the Liberal Party's realistic and responsible policy has received strong and widespread support and endorsement in the community. So, as a cover up for its own inaction the Government is now to embark upon this advertising exercise in the hope that it will help its prospects and chances of re-election. This Government's lack of policy in this vital area is a fiasco, and its proposed response to the problem is now a farce: it is not even original. The proposed theme for the campaign involves the use of the letters YES and, as suggested in the brief, is a direct lift from the youth employment policy proposed by the Victorian Liberal Party at the State election in Victoria earlier this year.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr OLSEN:** The Government put in some initiative—it inserted 'SA' first, so that it reads 'SAYES', changing it just a little for the purpose of the advertising campaign. This clearly confirms just how much Liberals have been showing the way in this vital area of community concern, identifying some of the issues in the community and developing positive policy initiatives to address those issues. The Liberals in South Australia have developed a policy that will work and give our young people genuine opportunities for education and training. Our policy rejects the superficial, short-term approach of the Labor Party to this problem. The Liberals have taken action to advertise our youth employment policy. We have put it up for public debate and we are prepared for it to be analysed by people in the electorate and community groups directly affected by unemployment.

This House must reject this Government's attempts, which I have exposed today, to cover up its failure by abusing and misusing taxpayers' money for a blatant Party political advertising campaign to coincide with the election. Instead, I ask the House to endorse the policy of the Liberal Party as a genuine effort to come to grips with the problems of youth unemployment and to oppose and highlight for the electorate the blatant misuse of taxpayers' funds for the purpose of shoring up the stocks of a Government on the skids—the PR (political rescue) exercise that the taxpayers of South Australia are expected to support. I commend the motion to the House.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer):** The Leader of the Opposition spent most of the morning seeking a debate with me. I have said consistently that we will have the opportunity when the House assembles to have such a debate, and so it seems that we are having it. But it is quite extraordinary: the debate is being held, but it is certainly not on the topic that he was talking about this morning. We are dealing with the wrong subject. I shall, in a minute, get to what the Leader of the Opposition said, but it was quite clear from last Thursday what the Leader of the Opposition's question was all about: a demand that the Government announce what changes it will make to our taxation system, whether they will be made retrospective and as a matter of urgency, let us get it announced.

That was the question put to me by the Leader of the Opposition, and so, when that was put before him on Monday, much to the shock and horror of the Leader of the Opposition, he found himself in a very difficult position. The big debate that he was going to have in Parliament on Tuesday about taxes and charges—the big censure on the Government—had suddenly fallen flat. Where was it? What could the Leader do? What could he say? He said a number of things about the tax package. It began by being a 'con'; it was a complete con trick, he said. Then he had a think about it and decided it was not a con trick, it was what the Liberals were proposing—'It's what we were putting up. They've copied us and introduced our tax package.' Then he scratched his head again and thought, 'Wait a minute, that's not going too well; I know what it is—it's an election gimmick; we're going to have an election tomorrow. We are going to hear the Premier announce—'

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Yes, it has been extended now to 'a few weeks'. But it is all about a gimmick. If it is a gimmick today when it is being done, why was it not a gimmick on Thursday when the Leader was demanding that it be done? It is quite extraordinary. So, the Leader is going through this tortuous situation, and he has decided that perhaps the best thing would be to try to have a debate. He made an urgent demand that he debate the matter with me on talk-back radio. I can imagine the situation—'Jeremy, hello, it's John here, can I speak to Mr Bannon please?' Members laugh about that, but that has actually happened on 5DN. There was a call to the effect of, 'Yes it's John on the line here wanting to speak to the Premier, Mr Bannon.'

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Having done the rounds—and I think that the thing to notice—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I would have thought that a paid professional politician should not be interfering with the air time of ordinary members of the public who seek access to talk-back radio. The Leader was worried about the feed-back that I was getting, the positive response, and he wanted to get in there himself. Having done this little run-around this morning and a dozen somersaults over what really is his attitude to the tax package (and we are still waiting to hear what that is, but no doubt that will be revealed), when the opportunity came to debate the matter in the forum provided for such a debate, the Leader scuttled off in another direction and produced out of the box another issue, trying to drum that up.

That is great to see. It is interesting to see that the tax debate has been dropped; that is no longer an issue. We will not hear any more of the carping and whingeing from the Opposition about that, but now we have a new issue: it is apparently youth employment. That is the purpose of the motion—that is what we were told. Incidentally, there was no text provided. The Opposition was very coy indeed, as it cobbled together its motion for today, about letting us

know what it involves. We are told that it is about youth employment, but in fact, it is under the guise of an attack on the Government's promotions and publicity budget for the sort of programs that the Government is implementing.

I shall deal with both those issues—Government information and youth unemployment—in a minute. But I am told that one of the reasons we are doing this (and this great confidential document that the Leader has produced is the evidence) is our low standing in the polls. Well, there are polls and there are polls, and certainly there have been interesting trends. No-one denies that the situation has been close. It is unfortunate that the Leader chooses to flourish polls on this very day, because I notice in the *News* (page 4) that has just been delivered to us a report which states that the Liberal Party is going very well and that the Hawke Government would have lost an election, but it is different with two States: one being South Australia—

**Mr Olsen:** Sample sizing.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I see—this one is about sample sizing! In South Australia, it says—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The Leader will not even let me get the figures out, he is so concerned about the sample. The article states that in South Australia, where an election looms, voters gave the ALP 50 per cent, compared with 40 per cent for the Opposition and 10 per cent for the Australian Democrats. The article also states that the only other State where the Labor Party would have won is Tasmania. It is interesting that Tasmania is mentioned, where Labor is shown as being ahead 48 per cent to 47 per cent, because as part of his talk on the tax package this morning the Leader was telling us about the great work carried out by Robin Gray—Mr Dams of Tasmania—and what he had produced. Really, things are getting very desperate from members opposite.

What does this brief to advertising agencies prove? I suggest that it proves nothing of the sort that the Leader is suggesting. First, it is a proposal borne out of the fact, as the brief makes quite clear, that there are programs, schemes and activities available for young people; there are opportunities for employers to employ them and obtain support for so doing—and they are simply not known and perceived in the community. The strong advice to both the Federal and the State Governments is to get the message across.

In fact the Leader, in reading from the brief, skated over one important point that suggested that a lack of understanding is not simply apathetic according to research, but indeed is even antagonistic. Any kind of publicity that has been put around so far is perceived as a cheap electoral stunt. We know why that is, of course—because, in the interests of destroying these programs and of getting this economy down on its knees to give the Opposition a chance to creep back into Government, members opposite have made cheap political noises about these schemes. They have attacked job creation and the opportunities they have provided. They have attacked anything that the Government has done in these areas. By so doing they have helped create an atmosphere which makes it necessary to overcome even antagonistic views about those schemes. They have created antagonism to the very schemes that are attempting to assist these people.

The brief also states that many of the unemployed may regard it as negative that they are still unemployed—too right they do. They regard it as negative because they hear people saying that they are worthless, under trained, under skilled, that there are no opportunities for them, that nothing is being done about them and that nobody cares. Those negative views, which are promoted as vigorously as they can be in every area that they can be by the Opposition,

are seeping through to the unemployed and it is making them depressed and concerned.

What is needed is a positive presentation. The brief also states, 'It is essential, therefore, that the program be designed in a way to lessen this potential negative response because the underlying aim of the promotion is to assist the unemployed.' Unless the unemployed know what opportunities are available and employers know what is open to them, then nothing can be effectively done.

The Government has a responsibility to ensure that those schemes are known and understood. Certainly, we can write letters. Indeed, I think that the Leader made a useful suggestion, and we will do that, too. However, there is not just the unemployed themselves; there are the parents, friends, colleagues, and their peer group. There are employers with a negative attitude to young people in some instances because of the nonsense peddled by those opposite about dole bludgers and so on. All those factors have to be overcome and it is the Government's responsibility to do so. Mr Speaker, we will do so responsibly, not for electioneering purposes—not with those intentions—but to overcome the negative reaction that is abroad in our community.

Unless we do that, those schemes will fail. We are told that there is a policy from the Opposition: that is true, it is a long and turgid document full of clichés and statements of verities, but when you get down to it what has the Opposition told young people the solution to their problem is? It has been publicised that the plan of the Liberals is to lower youth pay. The Liberal Party is saying to these young people, 'If you get a job it does not matter whether you can do that job, how skilled you are, or whether you are making a contribution; you are going to do it on lower rates of pay and that is the solution to your problem.' That is the Liberal Party's policy: cut their rates of pay and get them in as cheap labour.

It so happens that that policy ignores a carefully constructed industrial award scheme. Over 80 per cent of awards which cover workers in this State provide for youth rates of pay. There is provision for rates of pay to increase year by year from age 16 to age 20, so when the Liberal Party says it is going to cut youth pay rates, what it is saying is, 'We are going to go beyond those proper industrial prescriptions that already provide reduced rates of pay for younger workers, except in those industries where it would be quite inappropriate to do so, and we are going to go further than that; we are going to find a special cheap rate. Whether we do it through legislation or arbitration does not matter. We want you young people to do a full day's work and we want you to do it on the cheap.' That is not good enough. Do you think that is going to raise the status of young people and their attitudes towards work and society? That is absolute nonsense; that is a program of absolute sterility.

We have done a number of things and the Minister of Education and Minister of Employment will be detailing a number of them, but let us start from the basic point. At this stage I will quote from the Liberal Party's policy (and this is something well worth remembering). It states:

Ultimately, the only solution to unemployment is to increase the total number of jobs available within our community and to ensure that young people are suitably trained and motivated for these jobs.

I agree that that must be the starting point for any youth employment policy. I also agree that, unless those things are attended to, we cannot realistically expect to see young people in employment. I also agree that this is a vital problem that has to be tackled.

That statement, in almost those very words, was contained in the policy document on youth employment which we presented before the last election, and since our election that is the basis upon which we have worked. We have

concentrated first on getting the economy revived, getting the number of jobs increased and we have had significant success in that area. As a consequence that has also improved the job prospects of young people. Indeed, if we compare the two year period from June 1983 to June 1985, that is, from towards the end of the recession to the latest figures available, there has been an increase of 9 700 of 15 to 19 year olds in employment. Although that is not good enough, it is still not bad. The Opposition suggests that nothing has been done, but those figures show that we have done something. In relation to 20 to 24 year olds for the same period, a further 14 000 young people are now employed who were not employed two years ago. That again shows that something is happening in that area and that is being reinforced by a number of initiatives we have taken on the second level of that basic approach to youth employment, which is training and skills. We have introduced comprehensive improvements and changes and there is more to come in that area. We have done it because we recognise that that is an essential to ensure that young people are employed.

These programs take time to have effect. We cannot do these things overnight. In the face of the almost total inactivity in the Tonkin years, which was a disastrous period for the young unemployed when youth unemployment in this State was on average well over 20 per cent and the highest in Australia, we have now decreased that percentage to approximately the Australian average. We have done something about our comparative position.

While all this was happening members opposite did nothing. There they sit again—yesterday's men and women. I imagine that the Chairman of the Liberal Opposition's Youth Employment Scheme is going to get up and lecture us about what the Liberals can do with youth employment. I remind the House that he was in charge of employment during a three year period in which devastation was wrought upon young people. The best that he could come up with was a shonky exemption scheme that did not work. Even when it was pointed out that it was not working, that was the only thing he could think of, and he kept repeating that that is what they were doing—absolutely nothing! We will hear from this individual.

Goodness me, I would have been so ashamed that I would have slunk away and hoped that no-one had mentioned youth unemployment in my presence and I would have got on with transport matters or such matters that he is involved in. Yet, he will have the hide to get up in this House and lecture us on youth unemployment. I repeat that these measures take some time to have effect. The effect is working, but it has to be speeded up. We have to get more programmes more comprehensively, we have to publicise those programmes, and we will do so. In the meantime, we have been running a community employment program. That is scoffed at and denounced by members opposite.

I would like members opposite to go to each and every community employment group that has benefited from the CEP and say that they should not have had that building, that piece of research, that programme or should not have had those young people. However, they do not have the guts to do so. They say in this place that job creation schemes are a terrible thing, but they will not speak to people in their electorates and districts and tell them not to be in it. On the contrary, how many members of the Ministry have had requests from members opposite to support CEP projects? One after another they write in and say that they would like support for this or that.

The Opposition's official line is that the CEP is no good. I point out that between October 1983, when this scheme came into operation, and June 1985, 2 365 under 25-year-olds were provided with jobs and/or training under the scheme. I am not suggesting that that is the answer to their

employment problems, and nobody ever told them that it would be. However, I would like to get people talking to those 2 365 young people to ask them if they thought that it was all a waste of time, especially those who have permanent employment based on the skills developed under the CEP.

So, the Opposition's sterile policy is to do away with what is in place, cut youth wages drastically and then we shall see a massive increase in youth employment. What about the effect of cutting youth wages? Who is supporting it, apart from the Liberal Party and people who have not looked into it properly? It is a fact that every major study, both here and overseas, that has looked at the question has rejected it and said that it would not work. The Kirby Commission was being praised a minute ago by the Leader of the Opposition, who stated that we have to introduce traineeships under this scheme. However, the Leader dismisses Kirby's remarks about youth wages and what should happen. That is a clear example of a rejection of this concept because it is a simplistic approach that simply cannot work. The figures are overwhelming. The studies of the OECD have reaffirmed this.

Here is another thing that should be remembered. When talking about youth unemployment, do not let us forget the mature age unemployed: people in their late 30s, 40s and 50s are being displaced from jobs and not being re-employed. Many of them have dependants relying on them. They must be thought of, too. One of the effects of a reduction in youth wages relative to adult wages, as found by a comprehensive OECD report, was that such reduction ran the major risk of displacing low wage adults, with the result that many of these people in unskilled occupations, on low wages and with dependants, would find themselves out of work so that a young person could be employed. I do not believe that employment policies should be directed to ensuring that one group is advantaged to the disadvantage of another group. Such employment schemes must be comprehensive and total; they must add incrementally to what is available and not just be selective.

On the subject of youth employment within the Government, we have pioneered a scheme to get young people employed and more than 670 now have permanent jobs under a school leaver recruitment programme. Incidentally, the Opposition says that it will slash public sector employment and that it does not believe in it, yet it spends a few pages of its youth policy saying how it will get young people into the public sector, even though it is to be slashed. In Government, the Liberal Party's record will stand up.

This Government has maximised first year apprentices and it has established a self-employment venture scheme. As many as 170 young people have been employed in local government employment and training programmes. Perhaps the Opposition will tell the Local Government Association to get out of that! Over 70 young women have been employed in pilot programmes in community organisations. There have been substantially increased resources to the Community Involvement Through Youth scheme. The CITY program has developed regional extensions for the first time in its history. In training, \$2.7 million has been allocated to prevocational courses and about 1 800 persons are benefiting from that. There is a whole range of TAFE and educational courses on which there is a major increase in resources. So I could go on.

I have nothing to be ashamed of regarding this Government's record in youth employment, although we recognise that the problem has not been solved and that we must do more. However, we also recognise that we must publicise what is going on and that we must tell people what is available so that they may come forward to take part. We will spend whatever money is necessary and reasonable in

order to ensure that our young people and those who are to employ them understand what is involved and take advantage of the opportunities available. I totally reject this ill conceived and useless motion, and I suggest that the Leader should have stuck to his guns of this morning and decided to have a debate about tax. At least that might have been more profitable.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport):** This Parliament has a responsibility to ensure that there is no misuse or abuse of public funds. Equally, it has a responsibility to ensure that South Australia has effective youth employment training policies. They are the very issues with which we are dealing this afternoon. Let me immediately cover the main points raised by the Premier. Apart from the fact that he ran from a debate on State taxation all morning, he does not this afternoon wish to debate youth employment either. He is a Premier in retreat and under threat. That is so apparent to the public of this State that it is not a joke. What has been the defence of the Premier this afternoon? He has ignored the document read by the Leader of the Opposition.

Instead, he has done three things. First, he claimed that his Government had succeeded in creating youth employment. He said that his Government had actually increased youth employment, but during the past two years the number of unemployed people in the 15 to 19 years range in this State has increased. Moreover, the period for which those people remain employed has increased. We have the longest term unemployed of any State, and that has increased under the Bannon Government. That is the record of this Government that he stands by. That is the record on which he claims that he has succeeded. However, I highlight the fact that the Premier was so desperate this afternoon—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable member to resume his seat. I must say two things. I hope that all members still recall that they are equally under warning and that they will give the honourable member for Davenport a fair hearing. The honourable member for Davenport.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I appreciate your calling the House to order. So desperate is the Premier this afternoon that he has actually claimed in his speech that the failure of his Government's policies to achieve increased employment, as promised, is to be blamed on the attacks made by the Liberal Opposition. So, the Bannon policy has failed because of Liberal Party attacks! That is the basis of his claim this afternoon. I find it incredible that the Premier is so desperate as to have to resort to such a claim.

Secondly, the Premier has suggested that the Liberal Party is the only group that is attacking the Commonwealth Employment Program. However, we are not attacking that program as providing community facilities. We have not said that at any stage. We have said that the CEP scheme has failed as an employment program. Not only do we say that, but Kirby has said it. In the very report which the Premier has said this afternoon we should follow, Kirby has said that the policy of the Commonwealth and State Labor Governments in pouring millions of dollars into such a program is taking the wrong direction.

Not only Kirby, a well established national authority, but the OECD, a group of overseas experts who came into Australia and looked at our youth employment and training programs, said that the present direction taken by the Labor Government throughout Australia is the wrong direction. Indeed, both Kirby and the OECD recommended that the CEP scheme be terminated and that the funds be redirected into the very types of program now covered by Liberal

Party policy. The Liberal Party in South Australia has been the leader of any other Party or Government in Australia in this area, because we put forward those very policies before the 1982 State election. Kirby is now recommending what this Liberal Party recommended in 1982.

Thirdly, the Premier followed the example set by the member for Hartley and the new Minister of Youth Affairs in misrepresenting the Liberal Party's youth employment policies. The Liberal Party has not advocated an across-the-board cut in youth wages: indeed, just the opposite. What the Premier said this afternoon and the sections that he quoted are quoted in the policy. Our policy concerning youth wages is simple: we will examine youth wages on an award by award basis.

**Mr Groom:** Which ones?

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** I will quote some for the honourable member. We will examine them award by award to see whether youth wages are too high. The State Building Industry Award requires that a 16 year old lad with no skills, working as an odd job man in the building yard, must be paid \$330 a week in this State. Despite that, the Government claims that everything is fair and just. Yesterday, at Tarpeena, two 16 year old lads were sacked because the employer was required to pay \$330 a week to those lads who were doing odd jobs in the building yard. That is the sort of policy that this Labor Government is trying to keep in place, whereas our policy is a realistic one that we have adopted to ensure that this sort of inequity does not continue any longer under a Liberal Government.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** Members opposite asked for examples. Well, I gave them an example and look at them now in retreat. This afternoon, the Leader of the Opposition has brought out the details of a document that does certain significant things. First, the document, which has been written by the Government itself, acknowledges that the Government has failed in the youth employment area. The Government acknowledges that in the secret and confidential document that has been sent to the advertising agencies. One need only look at page 2 of that document to see that the Government has acknowledged that it has failed. I quote again what the Leader of the Opposition said:

... acknowledge that the work undertaken by the Government to alleviate the youth employment policy needs to be bolstered. Secondly, there is the timing of this advertising campaign—not at the beginning of next year, when all the young people have left school and are out looking for jobs, but now, in the three months leading up to an election campaign.

Thirdly, it is basically immoral for a Government to use taxpayers' funds in such a manner. They are strong words, but let me substantiate that. The Government is not promoting policies already in place (although some of them are), but some policies that have been asked to be included in this advertising campaign have not even been announced by the Bannon Government: in other words, they are policies for the next election campaign, the traineeships referred to in the policy document.

Fourthly, it is interesting that the one major recommendation of every significant inquiry into youth employment in Australia has been the need for some sort of work trainee scheme. I know the scheme well: I amended it when I was Minister of Industrial Affairs. I scrapped the old Apprenticeship Act, which at the time was under the attack and threat of the trade union movement, which said that there would be blood in the streets of Adelaide before this new Act was proclaimed. It was interesting to see that when it came to this Parliament it was endorsed and passed without opposition.

Further, it is interesting that that new Act, which became the model Act for the rest of Australia and which is still

being adopted by other Labor States even to this day, provided for traineeships or work trainee positions. I announced in 1982 that the Liberal Government would implement that scheme. Unfortunately, we were defeated. This Government has had three years to implement traineeships within industry and it has not done a thing. It has not even announced its policy, yet that was the main thrust of the Kirby Report and the OECD Report, and certainly it was a major recommendation of the Blackburn Review in Victoria.

So, for three years South Australia has been deprived of the major employment initiative that is needed because of the election of a Labor Government which is found to be wanting and negligent. The youth of this State understand that: they have been extremely critical of it. One needed only to listen to the youth employment phone-in to hear the comments, cynicism and criticism of the present Federal and State Governments, to realise the extent to which the young unemployed people of this State are totally disillusioned. The Premier has claimed that they are on side and that they understand.

No wonder the Labor Party has to implement an advertising campaign to try to bolster its position and support in that age group! That age group gave a clear indication to the Liberal Party shadow Cabinet which bothered to take a weekend out to listen to their point of view. We got the clear message from that as to the types of programs that they wanted.

Our policy reflects that, but it is a sad reflection on this Government that after three years it still has not taken one small step towards that. That is because its trade union movement—its masters—are opposed to the implementation of that type of scheme. I know that, because I negotiated with the UTLC before the entirely new Act was introduced.

The other interesting thing that comes through from this document that was sent to the advertising agents is that the Government is to promote TAFE Participation and Equity Programs. I find it incredible that at least \$150 000, and possibly \$300 000, is being asked for to promote a campaign for which only two months ago the Federal Government cut half the funding.

People here realise that there are 1 000 people, mainly disadvantaged, disabled, Aboriginal, non-English speaking or the long-term unemployed, who cannot get training in TAFE colleges because funding for the TAFE Participation and Equity Program has been slashed in half by the Hawke Government, yet the Bannon Government in South Australia has the hide to spend possibly \$300 000 trying to go out and promote a campaign which has been cut in half. That is how desperate it is.

Where was the Minister of Education in his criticism of the Hawke Government for its slashing of those funds for that program? Neither I nor other members of the Opposition have heard a whimper from him, but he is now Minister of Employment in South Australia—the Minister who has failed to implement any training scheme for three years; the Minister who has let down industry because he has failed to improve the skills available within our industry for technological improvement or improvement in quality control and productivity. He has let down our industry: he has let down the young people of the State; and he has let down the State.

I would like to deal in some detail with the youth employment policy put forward by the Liberal Party. This policy evolved, first, from the youth employment phone-in which gave one clear message to the Liberal Party—that is, a new direction was needed from that in which the present Federal and State Governments were heading.

Secondly, fundamental changes needed to occur to ensure that young people were not caught in a catch 22 position,

such as they find themselves in today. It is fair to say that the scenario with the majority is this: the vast majority leave school before they have finished or even entered year 12. They have no work skills or experience. They go to an employer who turns them down saying that they fail to have work experience or skills needed to get a job. Because of restrictions imposed upon them by the Commonwealth Employment Service and the Department of Social Security those young unemployed people are unable to take on full time community work or full-time training to get the skills required. They are faced with only one alternative—to sit on the dole, to sit at home or to go out and enjoy themselves but not to improve their chances of getting a job until after six months.

At the six month point two significant things occur. First, we were told by a number of people that the CES takes the job application forms out of the active list and puts them into the hopeless cases, so that they are finished indefinitely. At the same time, the scheme suddenly allows them to take on some form of work training, work experience and community work, but unfortunately and sadly it is far too late. They have already been taken from the active list of those looking for a job or those who may get a job and have been put into the hopeless category. So, they face a 'no win' situation.

The policy we put forward first calls for a major new direction. It is interesting that that has now been endorsed by the Federal Council of the Liberal Party of Australia and I believe that it will become Liberal Party policy throughout the nation—the seeking of that new direction.

The new direction is that all our resources should go not into baby sitting programs for the unemployed or simply job interested programs for the unemployed, not into community activities, but into programs that give skills and experience to young people so that they can get a permanent job. That is the objective of our policies.

First, let me tackle it at the schooling level. In our policy we have recommended that there should be encouragement for people to stay on longer at school. Only 35 per cent of our school students stay on to complete year 12, yet in Japan that figure is about 95 per cent and in most other developed countries it is between 80 per cent and 90 per cent. In Australia it is 35 per cent!

Our first and main priority in the education area is to encourage people to stay at school, continuing not necessarily in the academic stream but perhaps by way of another alternative. The other alternative that we have suggested is the provision of at least one year of vocational training, which should ultimately be increased to two years. This would be an alternative option for students who cannot cope with the academic stream at high school. In the TAFE area we are recommending that 500 extra students be taken into vocational courses.

I might add that that was proposed before the Federal Government cut back of the equity and participation programme in TAFE. Perhaps we would now need to try to increase that even further, because under the policies of the State Bannon and Federal Hawke Governments we will see a slash of 1 000 positions in basic training in our TAFE colleges. Of course, that is a basic disappointment. In order to increase the number of people working in the private sector we have also suggested that the TAFE sector should adopt self-employment policies and provide training.

I now refer to what I think is the most important part of the policy, namely, the setting up of a work trainee scheme within industry. After all, industry does most of the training. The big deficiency in Australia (and this has been highlighted by both the Kirby and OECD Reports) is that we put all our resources for training into the top 30 per cent of young people going through the school system and vir-

tually nothing into the bottom 70 per cent. Yet, it is the bottom 70 per cent who comprise the target group for unemployment, those who leave school before they finish year 12. The work trainee scheme would be aimed specifically at that group. It is not that they will become engineers or even apprentices, but it would give them basic training in the many unskilled or semi-skilled jobs that exist in industry.

We have recommended (as have the Kirby and OECD Reports) that at least up to two years basic training should be provided, and that during that period a trainee wage should be paid. That wage would be similar to the first and second year apprenticeship wage, and therefore there would be a close correlation between what an apprentice and a trainee would receive.

I point out that all the legislative structure to allow this to occur has been set up in this State for four years. It was set up by the former Liberal Government, but the present Government has done nothing in this regard. I challenge the Minister of Education, who is the next speaker in this debate, to tell the House what the Government's policy is on traineeships. The Government has been mysteriously silent for three years: not one word has been said about what the Government intends to do about introducing trainee positions in this State, and yet the Liberal Party in South Australia has been quite open—in fact it has been a pioneer for the whole of Australia with this policy.

Of course, many people in the community are already unemployed and have been unemployed for a long time. What can be done for these people? In our policy we have recommended that the most important thing we can give those people is actual work experience. Anyone under the age of 25 who has been unemployed for less than six months and who was in full-time employment will be offered work experience with private employers and with the State Government. During that period of work experience with the State they will receive unemployment benefits plus a \$20 a week subsidy from the State Government. Such a scheme has already been tried on a pilot basis in South Australia with the workmate scheme in the Enfield area. There is no doubt that the results have been most encouraging. It has dealt with only something like 100 or 150 people, but we envisage the implementation of that policy throughout the whole of the State.

We believe that thousands of young people who have been unemployed can get the necessary work experience and, more importantly, the experience from workmate has shown that once an employer has been involved with a young person in giving that person work experience the employer is likely to keep that person on. The experience from workmate has been that the actual number of people employed, particularly by small employers, under the scheme, has increased.

We have also put forward a scheme or a guarantee that under a Liberal Government at least 1 000 work experience positions will be created for unemployed people. We have advocated that people should be specifically trained for major new industrial expansion in this State. That is something that has not been done by the present Government or any other Government in Australia. We are advocating that, with any company which intends to increase its employment by 20 or more, and where that company wishes to set up a specific training scheme to increase that employment, the State Government will negotiate with that company on, first, setting up the training scheme and, secondly, funding up to half the cost of that training scheme.

I believe that that is one of the most important industrial incentives that can be offered. A study in the United States indicates that any Government offering to pay training costs is providing a most important incentive for companies to

set up or expand in their particular location. It is interesting that that is the policy which has been used by the Singapore Government to attract high technology industry to its area. That Government pays 70 per cent of any training costs for any offshore company establishing in Singapore. One of our own South Australian companies used that scheme very successfully.

Again, the Liberal Party in this State has become pioneers in taking a unique step and putting forward a policy that would involve covering up to half the training costs of people in private industry where a significant lift in employment would result. I stress the importance of some of these policies in the manufacturing sector, where 8 300 jobs have been lost under the Bannon Government. The Premier this afternoon has tried to create the impression that all is well and that there is economic recovery in South Australia. Yet the manufacturing industry, which is the biggest employment sector of this State, has lost 8 300 jobs in the past two years alone—8 per cent of our employment in manufacturing has been lost. The Premier is trying to tell us that all is well and that we have economic recovery in South Australia, but we are far from it.

The Liberal Party has also put forward its important policy in relation to permanent part-time work, to encourage older people to phase themselves out of the work force and to create for young people new job opportunities that do not currently exist. Recently I was invited to go to a high school in the western suburbs to talk about our youth employment policy. The number of young people who attended that lunchtime discussion highlighted the fact that for several weeks they had been trying to obtain a commitment from the Labor Government in South Australia in relation to its policy on permanent part-time work. Those young people were absolutely disgusted, because they had not even received a reply. They had tried to telephone the office of the Minister of Labour to find out the Government's policy, and they were told that there was no such policy. Indeed, because of the total lack of youth employment policies of the Bannon Government, it has resorted to no other tactic than to try to misrepresent the Liberal Party policy on youth employment.

Of course, there has been no area where the Government has attempted to do that more than in relation to our policy on youth wages, and I have already covered that matter. I have also covered the point involving the Liberal Party's policy of giving a commitment to removing the barriers existing in industrial awards which are limiting youth employment opportunities in this State. I challenge the Minister of Education (also in his capacity as Minister of Employment and Minister for Technology) to tell us what he would do to alter the ratio between seniors and juniors which is so restrictive under so many awards, particularly the metal workers award. What is the Government going to do about that?

The Liberal Party has given a commitment to review those ratios, but so far the Government has been silent. The Liberal Party has put forward a range of youth employment policies which reflect the needs of Australian industry, which give a new direction for youth employment and which would redirect the misdirected money spent by both the State and Federal Governments, involving over \$100 million on CEP projects which both the Kirby Report and the OECD Report have indicated will fail.

We have taken up (and this is not a recent event) the need for work training positions within industry, because only through giving our young people the work experience and skills that they need will we have a chance of not only giving them permanent jobs, but also enlarging and expanding and giving permanency to our industrial and commercial work force of this State. I support the motion.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education):** There is an old saying that there are lies, damn lies and statistics, to which we can add a fourth and more hideous category, being the member for Davenport's contortions or the Leader of the Opposition's contradictions. We have heard some outrageous statements today from the Opposition in relation to youth employment. We have heard an indication that it is in fact choosing not to hear what the record says. It is choosing not to hear what statements are being made by this Government over the past three years and not to look at the figures that quite clearly indicate the work that this Government has done within these areas.

In a few moments I will talk about the apparent Liberal Party policy on youth affairs and youth employment matters. However, it is interesting to note that the suggestion to cut pay for young people, which matter I will deal with in more detail later, first reared its ugly head at the conference that the Liberal Party held at Thredbo, when they went skiing. Presumably, during the *apres-ski*, they decided what they could do for the young people of this nation and, when going downhill, they determined that they would cut the wages of young people.

The Opposition has asked what this Government has done in relation to youth employment matters. The implication could be detected that it was believed by the Leader of the Opposition and by the member for Davenport that this Government has not done anything about these matters. I will point out a few things which are pertinent benchmarks in relation to what this Government has done. They do not represent the total of what has happened because we do not have time for that, nor do they represent various other matters which are under consideration by the Government at this stage. I will use all the time I have under the agreement to outline as much as I can in relation to this matter.

First, let us follow what has happened with respect to prevocational training in South Australia. There have been significant increases in that area, and it has not been a case of relying on Commonwealth funds. There have been real increases in State money going into that arena. In 1983 there were 583 equivalent full-time students involved in prevocational courses. The figure of 1 022 for 1985 has nearly doubled the 1983 figure and I can assure honourable members that there will be even further increases in 1986. The Opposition says nothing has happened, but doubling the figure does not seem to be too bad.

Looking at the record for apprenticeships and basic trade equivalents, that figure has also risen. In 1983 there were 7 344 and in 1985 there were 7 639. The cumulative total between the apprenticeships and the prevocational courses shows an increase from 7 900 to 8 600. According to the Opposition those figures, including the near doubling of prevocational courses, is a nothing.

It was intriguing to note the total absence of comment from both the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Davenport in relation to youth income support and what needs to happen in terms of rationalising those issues. It is South Australia more than any other State which has taken the national lead in that area in promoting that as an issue which needs national resolution. I have stood in this House on many occasions, as the former Deputy Premier (Hon. Jack Wright) did before me, indicating that fact. We take the credit for getting that issue moving as a national focus at the Canberra Conference of Youth Affairs Ministers in 1983. We have been pushing that strongly ever since. We hope that at long last the Federal Government will pick up some of those points and make announcements this year. It is South Australia and more particularly the former Deputy Premier of this State that got the ball rolling. That is a critical area for improvement of training and education

opportunities for young people, and that was not mentioned by the Opposition in the debate this afternoon.

I will canvass some of the problems that exist there. I believe that there are about 37 schemes available to young people where they can obtain some income: either from unemployment benefits or from training schemes of one sort or another. There is in fact a 38th, which means they get nothing. We believed that that was causing confusion and disenchantment amongst young people, and it had to be rationalised. We have pushed for that. When that happens we believe we can take a very big bow.

The fact is that there have been disincentives in relation to education and training for young people because of the mess that these schemes have been in. That must be rationalised and addressed if there are to be improvements in training and education opportunities. We have taken that on. Nowhere has the Opposition—in its press statements or in what it has said today—chosen to address that.

The Opposition spoke at great length about Kirby traineeships and asked what this Government was doing about them. Again, the Opposition chooses only to hear what it wants to hear and read what it wants to read. When the Kirby Report came down last year and was released early this year it was immediately examined by this Government. Some months ago we stated that we supported the concept in principle. We then set in motion work to discuss within the framework of the State Government what we would do to pick them up. We also set in motion discussions with the Commonwealth Government. Indeed, the last meetings occurred last Thursday when we discussed the joint funding arrangements that need to apply.

You cannot come out and say what is actually going to happen until those issues have all been tidied up, the t's have been crossed and the i's dotted. As late as Thursday of last week we were still conducting those discussions. There have been active discussions in recent months. We have come out and said that we support in principle those policies, with some very minor amendments.

I now turn to a rather discursive part of the member for Davenport's speech when he clearly began to run out of steam and became, as I say, discursive (and, I might say, that was early in his contribution). He began talking about the need for senior secondary course changes and retention rates. He said that the retention rate in Australia—not South Australia—was 35 per cent at year 12. The member for Davenport has done so much homework that he could not give us the South Australian figure—or perhaps he chose not to give us the South Australian figure. I will take this opportunity to advise the honourable member of the South Australian figure.

I take the point that those figures do not indicate that they are perfect or that they are good enough—further improvement is certainly needed. That point is taken. However, if we are to have an educated debate about an issue such as this, it behoves all members to have done a bit of homework in relation to the real situation and the changes in recent years. In South Australia at the start of 1982 the retention rate for year 12 students was 38.6 per cent (which I guess is not far off the 35 per cent quoted by the honourable member for Australia); the next year it rose to 44 per cent; in 1984 it rose to 48.9 per cent; and at the beginning of this year we topped the 50 per cent mark with 50.8 per cent. That is significantly different from the figure mentioned by the honourable member. Therefore, the Opposition does not take account of the real facts. Instead, it chooses to create other images.

When comparing our retention rate with other countries (and I support further improvements in the retention rate) we need to take into account the large package of people in education and training opportunities within the age cohort.

That is why the figure between Japan and Australia is not absolutely comparable. If one takes into account those involved in training programs (for example, those within TAFE), the figure is much closer indeed to the equivalent Japanese figure. That research has not been done by the Opposition, either. That retention rate has been achieved under the aegis of this Government. I do not suggest that this Government can claim full credit for the improvement in retention rates, because it has been a national trend. However, the figures have improved more in this State than has been the case in most other States of this country. I now turn to senior secondary courses and making senior secondary more relevant to senior secondary students.

I agree with that policy. That was being recommended back in 1978, and numerous reports stated we had to make what was happening in the senior secondary area relevant to the opportunities that would face young people. That was in 1978. We then had a three year interregnum from 1979 to 1982 and, on the death knock of the former Government, it brought in legislation to try to do something about it—the PEASA legislation as it was known. We picked that up and changed it in a number of significant ways, building on the work done by the former Government. We created the Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia, which everyone in this State acknowledges has done tremendous work, a great job, and is seeing real changes in its offering for students in this State.

What about new courses? As a result of the creation of SSABSA and as a result of real extra money put into SSABSA by the State Government, new courses are being added to the list that will increase the relevance of senior secondary education to students in this State. To give some idea of the new courses on offer for 1986, they include small business management, basic word processing, community studies, financial management, industrial technology, computing studies and technology studies. They are new courses which did not exist before. They already exist as courses and will be available to students in this State next year through resources committed by this State Government.

Another point mentioned by the Premier which needs rementioning as it is so important is that of the Public Service employment programme for young people and the number of people who have had opportunities from it. The Opposition seeks to cut back the Public Service in a way that would not make such schemes viable—whatever else it wants to say. We have local government training programmes and vocational education training projects. I can mention one example of that programme that has already started in schools in the northern area. It is a 20 week programme involving students studying at high school and TAFE—doing courses at both—and getting course awards in vocational education and the like. It is funded from State Government money, is already up and running and is mirrored by other courses elsewhere. One can go on with so many other examples of that.

The member for Davenport asked about part-time opportunities. It is a fact that a number of schools in South Australia, with the concurrence of the Government, have changed the hours that students go to school and, accordingly, the staffing to provide for that. This requires resource dedication, so that students can participate in part-time work whilst at the same time undertaking further studies at the senior secondary level. In the TAFE arena there have been significant improvements in real terms involving State Government money, a significant proportion of which has been dedicated to young people. I mentioned figures which show what the increases have resulted in. They are not the figures that the Opposition wants to know about or to quote.

We then come to issues of unemployment, figures and statistics. The member for Davenport quoted some figures

and said that things had got worse. I believe he owed it to this House to quote some other figures. As a result of his failure to do so, I will quote those other figures. They come from the Australian Bureau of Statistics and not from a figment of the imagination of the member for Davenport. They tell us that in South Australia, in just under two years (and the Premier mentioned these figures also), for 15 to 19 year olds there was an increase in employment of 10 000 and for 20 to 24 year olds an increase of 15 700.

Let us take that analysis one step further, because one could ask how, as that was part of the national upturn, we could claim some credit for that in terms of creating a better climate and getting the economy back on its feet again. The way in which one can analyse that is to compare South Australia with what has happened nationwide. It is true that there have been some improvements in the employment level of young people Australia wide, and that is good. However, the fact is that the overall growth rate in this State has exceeded what has happened in the rest of the country. The overall growth in employment of 15 to 19 year olds in South Australia in the 12 months to June 1985 improved 9 per cent. The national average was an improvement of 2.7 per cent—about one-third of the figure that we achieved here in South Australia.

Likewise in the 12 months to June 1985 the unemployment rate for 15 to 19 year olds decreased 5.1 per cent to 18.4 per cent. We have all acknowledged that those figures are still depressing because the social cost of figures such as that is immense. That is why something must be done. The facts are that the figures show that the position of South Australia has improved compared to the position in other parts of the world.

The member for Davenport chose to use a number of other figures and to make a number of statements. When it suited him he decided to bring in Kirby and the OECD and said that he liked what they had said. However, when he did not like what they said, he chose to ignore their findings. Before I analyse Kirby and the OECD reports, I remind members opposite that a number of years ago the OECD undertook a study on job creation programs and their effects. It was found in earlier reports (if members opposite choose to be interested in such things) that job creation programs have a record of improving the employability of those who take part in them. Surely that is a significant point.

One of the problems in relation to global figures, and in the recognition that youth unemployment is as disastrously high as 18.1 per cent, is that we overlook the fact that the unemployment rate for some subgroups and special groups in the community in that age cohort is much higher still. There is not the disastrous rate of 18.1 per cent applying to them but a rate of 30 per cent or 40 per cent. Very often job creation has helped to target in on those groups, and improved their prospective chances in the competition for those jobs that may be available. However, that was not mentioned by the member for Davenport. Clearly, when things do not help your case, you forget about them! That is the Liberal Party's policy on youth unemployment.

There are other interesting examples, to which I must refer but which the Leader of the Opposition chose to overlook. The Leader cited an advertisement that was used by the previous Government (the present Opposition) listing apparent achievements. If members want some comic reading, they should look at that list—it was pretty comic, but we do not have time to have a bit of a joke session now. There are other examples of what I believe to be quite outrageous misuse of Government funds at that time. Members should cast their mind back to 1981, to the ancillary staff issue, for example, and to the full page advertisements that appeared in the paper purporting to report facts when

those 'facts' were nothing of the sort. I cannot say what they were, but they were absolute misrepresentations of truth.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Malicious mendacities, as the honourable member says: that is quite correct. The member for Davenport quoted from the Liberal Party youth policy, but I indicated where the real genesis of that document took place—between courses in the banqueting at Thredbo. However, members opposite claim that it was brushed up as a result of their phone-in. It might have been interesting had they listened to the issues put forward by the people who called in, because what members opposite are saying does not reflect the existing needs. Some of the things said are reasonable; they are okay because they have already been done. They refer to what we have been saying. I refer, for example, to improvements in senior secondary schooling so that there can be different emphases. This Government not only made the process changes required; we also committed the resources so that that could take place. Members opposite refer to vocational training, and so on. I have cited figures on prevocational training, and I have said where we are at regarding Kirby traineeships.

Honourable members refer to TAFE funding. This Government has increased TAFE funding in real terms since it has been in office. State Government money has been dedicated to that area. Members opposite also refer to other nice things, which reflect what has been happening in any case. They say that, through the Industrial Commission, they would ensure that youth award rates would not price young people out of jobs. I would like to know how the Opposition lines up its policy with the Kirby and the OECD Reports on these matters.

Much convolution has taken place here this afternoon. The honourable member did not cover the policy: he covered up the policy by saying that it did not mean what we thought it meant and that it meant all sorts of other things. It will be one of those mercurial sorts of policy that never means what the group in front of you fears it might mean. It will mean what sounds nicest to the group in front of you. That is the sort of policy that it will shape up to be. There needs to be a reconciliation of the Opposition policy on youth award rates with the statements of Kirby or those in the OECD report. Those two reports have already said that that issue is not a relevant way of handling the important problems of youth unemployment. I hope that in the time available to the member for Torrens, who I understand is to be the next speaker in this debate, he tells the House how that reconciliation will take place.

Mention was made of the advertising brief and it was stated that the brief aims to promote Government involvement and effort in this area and to inform employers. The Premier has spelt out how negative impressions exist in the minds of young people as to what Governments can do. It is important that young people be told that they can receive support from the Government in meeting their aspirations. The member for Davenport says, 'Ha, ha! There's something cynical here. The Government is to start the program in September. Why not start it at the beginning of 1986, when the kids leave school?' What an amazing statement! The honourable member expects that the students, having left school at the end of this year, will find out as late as January what faces them in the future and then they will have to start off in the new year when it is too late to make decisions because enrolments will have closed for courses at many levels of education and apprenticeship opportunities will have gone. He says that that is when we should tell young people what might have been available to them. That would be a case of shutting the door after the horse has bolted. Such a reprehensible course of action would be

nothing more than patting oneself on the back because we had a scheme, whereas such a scheme would be of no service to young people. Yet that is what the honourable member proposes that we should do.

The honourable member talks about opportunities for new industrial development and gets excited about short-term training courses being made available to industry so that they can provide upgraded training in trades and skills. However, it might have been useful, for the edification of this House, had the honourable member first spoken to his colleague the member for Mount Gambier, a former Minister of Education, about the action that has been taken by TAFE for years (and it has been increasing) to provide short-term courses so that industry can offer them for the retraining of employees.

The honourable member would suggest that there is no State Government money behind such courses, but there is. Indeed, it is an area of growth where over the years, as technological change impinges on society, much more will have to be done. The honourable member then said that we had done nothing regarding technological education, but I have read out some of the courses now being offered in the senior education sector. There have been changes in the course structure of TAFE and, because of the climate in this State, we now have significant developments such as the plastics and rubber technology centre, which is changing courses, based here in South Australia.

If one wants to make a real comparison between the policies of the Opposition, which is bereft of action, and those of this Government, which has policies in action in this area, let me cite one example, which is a good illustration of what the Opposition did and what the Government did with the same issue. Having beguiled an investor to come to South Australia in the hope of getting support, the previous Liberal Government got CAD/CAM Bureau here and left it to languish. At the time of the 1982 election, that firm was thinking of returning to New South Wales because the promises that had been made to it had not been lived up to.

It took this Government to act quickly upon that matter. We kept them here in South Australia by offering them rent free facilities at TAFE and other maintenance support agreements. The outcome was that we achieved access to considerable amounts of technological equipment for training purposes, and that equipment has been used for training purposes. We now have graduates coming out of the TAFE colleges at Regency Park skilled in CAD/CAM technology. This is an example of what the former Government did compared to what this Government did about that one issue, comparison that I say makes a telling and pertinent point. There is an agreement that I do not speak beyond 3.55 p.m., so, although I have other points I could raise to easily refute the Leader's remarks, I will sit down to allow further speakers to participate in the debate.

**Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition):** Neither the Premier nor the Minister of Education has addressed the central issue of the debate before us today. That central issue, which was totally ignored by the Premier in his response, related to the misuse of taxpayers' funds. He sought to discuss a number of other matters that were irrelevant to the motion. But the core of the motion is clear. Because of this Government's track record in relation to past performances, that certainly did not surprise me.

Let me pick up one or two points that the Premier made about a debate today on taxes. The Premier well knows that I received an invitation to go with him to 5AA this morning to talk in the studio about the tax performance of this Government. The Premier and I arrived at the studio, but the Premier's adviser said that the Premier would not go

into the studio with the Leader of the Opposition and that he would not debate the matter with the Leader publicly. That is the first point. I did not initiate it; I was invited.

I then went to 5DN, where I was invited by the producer to go on the open line with the Premier between 9.45 and 10 a.m. I made myself available to 5DN, but when the Premier was told by Jeremy Cordeaux that I was on the line he said that he would not have a discussion with me, and that he did not intend to have discussions with the Leader of the Opposition. My only disappointment is that those words of the Premier were not put to air. He was ducking for cover today and was not prepared to front up. I can well understand that.

The fact is that the 'positive response' the Premier got on radio this morning was an absolute bath. Anybody who listened to the talk back radio programme saw the Premier's tax cuts for exactly what they were: a cynical exercise in vote buying weeks before the next State election. We understand why he did not want to debate: what he has returned to ETSA of its turnover tax is a one off. What about ETSA price rises next year? We are getting to round two of this Premier's promises to the electorate, and his performance in the other direction immediately after the election.

However, his performance immediately following an election is known and the electors of South Australia will not buy it the second time around—well he knows that! The back bench members well know it, too, particularly those who have been doing some door knocking during the recess. No doubt they have got the message loud and clear, and that is why this Government is prepared to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars of taxpayers' funds in a last ditch attempt to shore up its stocks. Its back is to the wall! We have seen Labor Governments do this before, and this Government is no exception. It is the same as the Dunstan Government, resorting to the same tactics as that Government: that is, it is prepared to spend with an open cheque book in an attempt (and it will be a vain attempt) to buy back power.

In relation to the tax debate, I remind the House that we have a Supply Bill before us tomorrow and the Government's tax measures before us on Thursday. That is the time to have a debate and we will take the Premier on in that context. We will see what his performance is like on that day. The Premier derided youth unemployment and employment as not an important issue. When he rose to speak today, he said that this issue is not the important issue. There are 25 400 young people who cannot get a job in this State today, a State that has the largest number of long-term unemployed in South Australia so, if this Government thinks that it is not an issue that Parliament should be addressing, I think that it has its priorities wrong.

I have absolutely no doubt that out there in the electorate those young people who cannot get a job and, in addition, those parents and other people who recognise that we have a major unemployment problem that we need to address in this community will clearly identify that this Government has got its priorities and directions wrong.

Indeed, the Premier has left the Chamber again. That is the second time in the no-confidence motion today that he has not been prepared to sit in the House. Not once in three years has this Government addressed itself to trainee schemes. Instead of waiting for someone else to do something, it is about time it acted. I commend the motion to the House.

The House divided on the motion:

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

Noes (21)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon (teller), M.J. Brown, Crafter, M.J. Evans, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Mayes, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, and Whitten.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs P.B. Arnold, Goldsworthy, and Meier. Noes—Messrs Keneally, Payne, and Wright.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

### SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to apply, out of Consolidated Account, the sum of \$485 million for the Public Service of the State for the financial year ending on 30 June 1986. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

The Bill provides \$485 million to enable the public service to carry out its normal functions until assent is received to the Appropriation Bill.

Members will recall that it is usual for the Government to introduce two Supply Bills each year. The earlier Bill was for \$440 million and was designed to cover expenditure for about the first two months of the year. The Bill now before the House is for \$485 million, which is expected to be sufficient to cover expenditure until early November, by which time debate on the Appropriation Bill is expected to be complete and assent received.

Members will notice that this Bill provides for an amount significantly greater than the \$390 million provided by the second Supply Act last year. However, approximately \$65 million of the increase is explained by the effect of three accounting changes:

- First, as from 1 July 1985, the Government has decided to change the basis upon which departments are charged for superannuation costs. Under present arrangements, departmental accounts show the Government's portion of pensions paid during that year in respect of staff previously employed. The new system will involve departmental accounts showing each year an estimate of the superannuation liability incurred as a consequence of employing staff in that year.

Further, it has been decided that departments should be charged for these costs by requiring them to make regular superannuation payments to Treasury. To achieve this, additional appropriation will need to be provided to each department. This approach has only minimal net effect upon the Consolidated Account, for the Government still pays pensions only when they fall due.

- Second, certain Commonwealth Government health grants which previously were handled outside Consolidated Account are now channelled through that account to the South Australian Health Commission.
- Third, additional interest payments (offset by equivalent receipts) have resulted from debt rearrangements with Government financial institutions which took place at the end of 1983-84. These rearrangements, which have no net effect on the interest commitments of the public sector, were referred to in the Second Report of the South Australian Government Financing Authority.

I commend the Bill to the House. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the issue and application of up to

\$485 million. Clause 3 imposes limitations on the issue and application of this amount.

Mr OLSEN secured the adjournment of the debate.

### SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council notified its appointment of sessional committees.

### ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier) brought up the following report of the committee appointed to prepare the draft Address in Reply to the speech of His Excellency the Governor:

1. We, the members of the House of Assembly, express our thanks for the speech with which Your Excellency was pleased to open Parliament.
2. We assure Your Excellency that we will give our best attention to the matters placed before us.
3. We earnestly join in Your Excellency's prayer for the Divine blessing on the proceedings of the session.

Mr WHITTEN (Price): I move:

That the draft Address in Reply as read be adopted.

In so moving, I wish to convey my condolences to the relatives and friends of the late Les Hunkin, who was a member of this House from 1921 to 1927, and of the late Jack Clark, who died on 10 November 1984, having been the member for Gawler from 1952 to 1970 and then the first member for Elizabeth, from 1970 to 1973. I did not know Les Hunkin well although I spoke to him several times. However, I knew Jack Clark extremely well, and I am sure that several members still here also knew him well. He was liked on both sides of the House, and in fact two prominent members of the Opposition attended his funeral, while others who spoke to me later expressed their regret at his passing.

It is rather coincidental that I am moving this motion today for the adoption of the Address in Reply, because on 7 August 1975—just 10 years ago—I moved an identical motion.

Mr Max Brown: And very capably too.

Mr WHITTEN: I thank the member for Whyalla. It is not often that members get the opportunity to twice move the adoption of the Address in Reply, and I am particularly pleased to have the opportunity on this occasion. Anyone who has read the Governor's Speech (and I am sure it has been well read now) must realise what a great job the Government has done and intends to do. In fact, His Excellency stated (in paragraph 3):

The recovery of our regional economy has continued and my Government has been pleased to note that confidence and economic activity have strengthened in the year past . . .

At the same time, unemployment, while still unacceptably high, has fallen. Indications for future employment growth are also good, with job vacancies 30 per cent higher at the end of the financial year just completed than at the same point in 1984.

I am very pleased about the Governor's reference in the next paragraph to work undertaken for which my friend and colleague the Minister of Housing and Construction is responsible. His Excellency states:

The Australian Bureau of Statistics has recorded that the number of new public sector building approvals in the financial year to June 1985 reached its highest total for 20 years.

That is mainly due to the efforts of my friend, who has just walked into the Chamber, the Minister of Housing and Construction. Members will recall that last year I spoke at great length on just what the Minister of Housing and

Construction had been doing in the field of housing. I attended a meeting on Sunday and was pleased to hear an announcement that in my electorate (and members would know that there are many Housing Trust homes in that area) there will be no further increase in Housing Trust home rentals for those who are paying full tote odds for their houses. For the people in my electorate, which is one of the more under privileged areas, that means that they will have an opportunity of obtaining some of the better things in life instead of paying out all their money for housing. We know what the cost of private rental housing is now, and I am a great supporter of Housing Trust development. In the life of the present Government we have had a significant lift in housing construction, particularly involving the Housing Trust. I believe that most of the credit should go to the present Minister of Housing and Construction who has done an extremely good job, and I want to record my appreciation for that.

In his speech the Governor referred to some of the major projects being undertaken in South Australia, as follows:

Major construction projects, such as the redevelopment of Adelaide Railway Station, are continuing to provide an immediate stimulus to our economy.

I recall that, not very long ago when discussing matters concerning a casino and its possible benefits to South Australia, many mealy mouthed members expressed the view that they were afraid that people would be corrupted. It was much the same attitude as that adopted by a former Premier for whom I had a fair regard.

*The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:*

**Mr WHITTEN:** I did not intend to name people, and I want to avoid that on this occasion. However, members will recall that, in relation to the introduction of a State lottery, the honourable gentleman (Sir Thomas Playford) said that it would be terrible and that we would be putting poison in the hands of children. That was his view, and that was the attitude to the casino. However, when all that money is rolling in for the State, people will agree that members of the Government were right.

I want to refer to some of the good things that are happening down at the Port and to some future projects. As a result of the election and re-election of a Federal Labor Government (and luckily we have a State Labor Government here in South Australia) a lot of work and effort has gone into attracting people who are interested in the submarine project.

I hope that after the feasibility study is completed Kockums of Sweden and the HPW company of West Germany will come to the conclusion that the best location to build submarines is where Eglo Engineering is now situated near the Port River. However, as all members are aware, this will be a political decision, and South Australia in the federal sphere may not have a great deal of political clout. If South Australia does not win the contract to build the submarines we will contribute about 35 per cent of the project because no other place in Australia has the potential to carry out work associated with electronic equipment.

I pay a tribute to the Minister for Technology in relation to what he has been doing for technology in this State. He is doing a great job. Paragraph 7 of the Governor's speech states:

My Government believes that all South Australians should benefit from renewed economic growth. The revenues of the State depend heavily on activity within our regional economy. The improvement during the past two years has considerably strengthened our State's financial base and complemented the very necessary and responsible measures my Government took in 1983 to correct the serious imbalance that had developed in the State's accounts. Consequently, my Government believes that it is now in a position where it can return directly to the community the benefits of recovery. Legislation will be put before you to provide tax concessions in areas of greatest priority.

Today the Premier introduced Bills to put this into effect. South Australia's taxes will be lowered, not as they were between 1979 and 1982 when Ocker the Knocker ran down the finances of our great State to such a degree that when the Labor Party was elected to Government this State was financially bankrupt. I am pleased that the Premier has given this matter sufficient thought. The Leader of the Opposition claims that lowering the taxes is only for electoral benefit. Of course, it is for electoral benefit. South Australians will now be able to see that a Labor Government is able to lower electricity charges, not as occurred in 1982 just six days before the election when the now shadow Minister of Mines and Energy, who had responsibility for the generation of electricity, signed a contract that detrimentally committed this State to exceptionally high prices for gas when the matter could have gone to arbitration and had a different outcome. In New South Wales AGL was much wiser than the then Minister of Mines and Energy and went to arbitration. Therefore, New South Wales gas prices are lower than ours.

However, that did not concern the then Minister of Mines and Energy. He knew that the people had woken up to the Liberal Government and were going to give it the big heave-ho—and that is what it got. I am pleased that during the 10 years I have been in Parliament I have only had to suffer three years of Liberal rule. An election is coming up sometime before March which will ensure that the Australian Labor Party again wins office for another term, and I suggest it will be a four year period.

There will be another four years this time and then it will continue on. Many of the benefits enjoyed by this State have flowed from the good industrial relations prevailing in South Australia. I pay a tribute to the previous Minister of Labour and Deputy Premier, Mr Jack Wright. The present member for Adelaide is a personal friend of mine and I was looking forward to his representing the District of Price, which is a working class district with a great deal of industry. Since Jack Wright became the Minister of Labour, relations between industry and Government have been very good and that has contributed to the industrial relations enjoyed by South Australia. Jack Wright is known throughout South Australia as the best industrial relations person in Australia, and I say that without fear or favour. I regret that, due to ill health, Jack Wright will not be able to sit as the member for Price in the next Parliament.

I am disappointed that the present member for Adelaide will not be present when major reforms relating to workers compensation will be introduced. That is not to say that those reforms will not be introduced, but it will make it a little more difficult for any Minister other than the present member for Adelaide to conduct discussions in that area.

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** Jack is not here today; it is his offside.

**Mr WHITTEN:** Unfortunately, because of the member for Adelaide's ill health, he will not be able to attend Parliament this week, but I feel sure that when we introduce legislation to amend the Workers Compensation Act members on both sides of the House will refer to the present member for Adelaide in relation to the work he performed regarding workers compensation legislation which will benefit the worker, industry and those insurance companies which participate in the workers compensation area. The Governor made reference to that in paragraph 7.

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** Do you think that the community at large will be able to afford the next round?

**Mr WHITTEN:** I am one of those persons who should have received compensation relating to industrial deafness. I do not always pick up some of the interjections, so I am not able to answer all of them. Some of them are inane interjections, but I do not think the last one was. I cannot

answer that interjection. I have not received any compensation and I have not purchased a hearing aid, but, after working as a boilermaker for some 30 years, I lost some hearing due to my employment. Any person who performs that sort of work loses some hearing.

*The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:*

**Mr WHITTEN:** I heard that interjection from the member for Alexandra and we will get his support. In some areas he is bigoted but in other areas he is a reasonably fair minded chap. He does not know a great deal about industrial matters, but he knows a little about finance. I saw him in Tasmania and, when I was in his company, I was sure he understood finances very well.

The other person to whom I wish to pay a tribute is my other great friend, the Minister of Marine, for what he has done for South Australia in attracting the direct link between the Port of Adelaide and Japan. That is going to save South Australian industry millions of dollars. I intend to get from the Minister a list of the benefits that will be obtained from that link. Captain Murdock, the captain of the *Ariake*, which arrived last Friday week with a large load of containers, praised our port facilities and our industrial relations in South Australia. Therefore, we can be really pleased about two things in particular in South Australia: the first is the member for Adelaide and his achievements in industrial relations, and the second is the achievements of the Minister of Marine.

I now wish to emphasise some of the good things that have happened at Port Adelaide, which is where I am based, over the past 10 years. If one compares Port Adelaide of today with 10 years ago one can see remarkable differences. We now have a proper home for the Department of Marine and Harbors. The Port Mall has replaced the dingy, old, dirty and dark shops with a modern complex. We also have the Port Market where people can buy fresh fruit and vegetables any day of the week in an environment that we can be really proud of. If people wish to go to Port Adelaide to buy their fruit and vegetables, or anything else, they will find that these things are much cheaper than anywhere else. The Housing Trust has also done a hell of a good job at Port Adelaide. Last year I visited the 50 000th house to be built by the trust in the area. It was built in Queenstown, which is right in the heart of my district. On that day I complimented the Minister of Housing and do so again today because he has done a great job at Port Adelaide.

The renewal of housing at Port Adelaide is really happening. The old, barren and swampy land at Ethelton now has quality housing at a price people can afford. That is very good. The Housing Trust has built many houses at Port Adelaide, Queenstown and Ethelton. I suppose the most pleasing thing to me in relation to housing is the Portside Complex, where 250 houses have been built. It has been built on land where old houses have been demolished. The Myer company paid a lot of money for that land and received a lot back when it sold it. There is now three times as much housing there as was the case previously. Most of those 250 houses are now occupied.

Another great thing for the people of Port Adelaide is the accommodation for the Department for Community Welfare and the SGIC. People can now pay their motor vehicle registration, boat registration or insurance and can obtain assistance from the Community Welfare Department at the one building. I think that what has happened there is great. Maritime Park is on its way, as is the Maritime Museum. In fact, the Maritime Museum Public Works referral recommendation was tabled in this House last Thursday and I am very pleased about that. Also, we have the bypass road—a unique road as one of its kind has not been built for more than 20 years—the Grand Junction Road bypass.

Members will recall that when I first came into this Parliament I expressed my concern about the large number of semi trailers and tankers that went around the Black Diamond Corner. I said at that time that there were often three or four nose to tail going around that corner and that I was afraid that if one went over the whole of the Port would be engulfed in flame. A bypass to enable those semi trailers to go down from Grand Junction Road to the extension of Bower Road and come around the back of the Port has been built. It is a concrete dual highway. It is the first pure concrete road built for more than 20 years. It is cheap if we compare the cost of resurfacing bitumen every few years.

Another matter about which I am very pleased is the community health centre that has been established at the Port. It is well on the way now. It is all in the one section, one street back from St Vincent Street. It is very accessible for people and will be a great addition to Port Adelaide. We have St Ives recreation centre as well as the one at Woodville. We have a great place in Port Adelaide and much of it has happened in the past 10 years.

I want to refer also to what the Bannon Government has done in the past three years and how proud I am to be associated with some of it. Recently in a lift out from the *News* of 15 February, a comprehensive list showed what is happening in real estate that has and will create many hundreds of jobs in South Australia. In last week's *Port Messenger* was a headline stating '\$32 million Port Project'. It is not something new to me or to the member for Semaphore, as he and I attended a luncheon at Lipson House some time back. The complex, announced then, will house Coles and K Mart and there will also be a new CES building, a social security building and an office for the Minister of State, Mick Young.

I refer to a few of the things that have happened and are about to happen in South Australia as per the announcement in the *News* in February, as follows: an \$8 million hotel and convention centre at Goolwa; a \$19 million mail exchange in Grenfell Street; a \$38 million Commonwealth Government centre in Currie Street; a \$17 million carpark at Topham Street; and, an SGIC building in the Pirie Plaza complex on the corner of Pirie Street and Gawler Place. The complex is only small—\$2 million—but I think of the 16 year old youths to whom the member for Davenport referred. He did not say that they were youth labourers working under BLF award conditions. There are no junior rates or sweated labour rates under BLF awards. That is why that person may be getting \$360. However, it is news to me. I know that the award rate in my own trade is about \$300, but, if a person is good and has a certificate, he can earn up to \$380 a week. That is about \$40 more than the going rate.

There was approval for a \$4 million conservatory in the Botanic Gardens; and Citicom is developing four low-rise buildings in the plaza located on the eastern side of Hindmarsh Square at an estimated cost of \$10 million. Of course, the member for Victoria will well remember the \$18.7 million remand centre in Currie Street. That development might have caused him some concern, when the previous Government proposed that the centre be located at Hindmarsh. There is now total acceptance from the traders in Currie Street for that site, but there was no acceptance from the people in Hindmarsh. That site would have been further out of town, whereas the Currie Street site is closer to the courts. There was mention in the news of the North Adelaide Swimming Centre.

I refer also to an office building in Pirie Street worth \$5.5 million; home units in Archer Street, North Adelaide, at a cost of \$1 million; a \$10 million office building on South Terrace; apartments on South Terrace valued at \$2 million;

more than \$1 million to be spent on upgrading offices in North Terrace; a carpark in Bent Street worth more than \$1 million; an office building in Flinders Street costing \$7.5 million; a \$2 million office building in Light Square; flats worth about \$1.2 million in Brougham Place; Currie Street office upgrading worth \$5 million; another office building in Pirie Street valued at \$4 million; and a recent major project at Glenelg at a cost of \$223 million. All those projects benefit South Australia and provide a great deal of work. I could refer to a lot more projects, but I do not intend to list them all.

I take the view that Address in Reply debates should be altered. I propose that there should be a 30 minute limit. I have spoken for 31 minutes already, and I have a lot of material. I wanted to make a major speech because this will probably be the last time I will make a speech; it will certainly be the last time I will speak in an Address in Reply debate. I believe that the procedures of Parliament especially relating to this debate should be amended. Members speak for an hour, not because they have something to say but because they like to hear the sound of their own voice. They do not impart any knowledge whatsoever for the benefit of the State.

Many members have talked about late night sittings: that has never worried me, but I believe that a brake should be applied. Repetition keeps us here for hours and hours when we do not need to be here. After all, Governments must pass legislation. Oppositions say that it is their job to oppose, but that should not be the case. Oppositions should oppose if the issue merits opposition. Members know full well that a lot of comments made here are not relevant and, as occurs in America, members filibuster.

There is a Bill before the Congress in America at present that would help the United Nations, Australia, France and a lot of other countries in their dealings with South Africa, but, because a few members of the conservative forces over there have a lot of money invested, particularly in gold, in Johannesburg, they will not allow that Bill to pass and are filibustering because they have unlimited time to speak on Bills. Members opposite may say that Labor members have been guilty of this. I remember Lloyd Hughes, the member for Wallaroo, once speaking for a long time. However, that is not my intention now.

A matter that concerns me greatly, about which I had made many notes, is the Auditor-General's Report on the Public Works Standing Committee. I was disappointed that, in his report to the Parliament, the Auditor-General did not mention the things that that committee has done in the years between 1970 and last year. However, I hope that those things will appear in the report to be tabled in this Chamber in August or September. We have suggested that there should be better control by Ministers of their departments and by the Auditor-General who has criticised this committee.

I am Chairman of the Public Works Standing Committee and am proud of the committee and its members. There are two members on the other side of the Chamber who are members of that committee and who will bear out what I say: at no time has politics entered into the deliberations of that committee. Every project is looked at, and indeed reported on, on its merits. I am proud of that committee, which does a good honest job. However, the committee was criticised by the Auditor-General in relation to two out of three projects. Tom Sheridan is a good bloke, but he should have done more than he did in relation to this matter.

The consciences of all Public Works Standing Committee members are clear. I refer to the Port Augusta Netball Association courts. They were good courts, but the State Government and the Commonwealth Government wanted to use them for an extension to the TAFE college. By

shifting the netball courts to another site we saved the State and Federal Governments a lot of money. The girls involved in the netball club did not have to shift, as this was dedicated land, and those girls could have remained there and said that, because there were no facilities for a TAFE college in Port Augusta, two sites would be needed. However, that would have cost a lot of money.

Because of the co-operation of that netball club, they now have two new courts and clubrooms comparable to the ones that they left. I am disappointed that the Auditor-General reported in the way that he did in relation to this matter and that some Opposition members used certain matters to criticise the Public Works Standing Committee, which has done a great job over many years and which has been in operation since 1927. However, the committee needs updating and needs a new Act.

*The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:*

**Mr WHITTEN:** I am pleased to hear that.

**Mr Mathwin:** It is a senior committee.

**Mr WHITTEN:** It is the senior committee of the Parliament and a responsible one that has always reported to the Parliament in conformity with its charter under the Act since 1927. We are not doing all that we should: we are restricted. Some projects that come to it need not come to the committee for approval, because \$500 000 is too low a figure. It could be increased. However, statutory authorities are dealing with taxpayers' money. We must remember that.

**Mr Mathwin:** We are the watchdogs.

**Mr WHITTEN:** We are the watchdogs as the member for Glenelg, who is also a member of the committee, has said.

**Mr Mathwin:** And a good one!

**Mr WHITTEN:** I will not comment on that. I have said that all members do a great job: I will not go any further than that. The day after its tabling in the House I received a copy of the Auditor-General's Report. Also I received all the *Hansard* pulls whilst I was away sick. However, I was disappointed with what happened and with the comment that we have more access to private consultants. Let us remember that one of the projects about which we were criticised was put up by private consultants, and I do not think that they were crook! I am sure that the builders are first rate and that they are doing a great job, but I am disappointed that my committee was criticised as it was.

I began by saying that the Address in Reply debate is too long. Although I would like to say a lot more about the Public Works Standing Committee, I will not. However, I thank those persons who have stayed to listen to me. I am sure that the Whip who will follow me will say something about debates and procedures of Parliament. I do not think we are far apart in our thinking, but I emphasise that it is about time that we got away from the old idea of the member for Price, for instance, being able to speak for an hour. I have spoken for 40 minutes, 10 minutes longer than I wanted to. Therefore, I conclude my remarks.

**Mr TRAINER (Ascot Park):** I regret that the member for Adelaide, the Hon. J.D. Wright, is unable because of illness to be present today to second the motion of the Address in Reply. I am sure that we all regret his absence and, particularly, that he has to retire at the next election and that he has had to stand down from the position of Deputy Premier and as a member of the Labor Cabinet of John Bannon. I hold Jack Wright in the highest regard, as I am sure do all his colleagues. He is very popular in the community.

The new electorate of Walsh, which I expect to represent after the next election, incorporates a large slice of Jack Wright's old electorate of Adelaide. I hope that I can rep-

resent those constituents in the northern part of what will be Walsh as well as they were represented by Jack Wright.

However, I stand here as a member of that mythical committee of five which is charged with drafting an Address in Reply to His Excellency, and I speak in place of the Hon. Jack Wright in seconding this motion. We heard the Governor's address last Thursday in which he outlined the Labor Government's program over the next few months—an excellent program, too, based on an already good record over the previous 2½ years. Although the program outlined by the Governor did not make detailed reference to it, it was nevertheless a precursor to the announcement yesterday of an unprecedented \$41 million in tax cuts announced by the Premier.

It is the responsibility placed on most members of this House now to respond to His Excellency in the traditional Address in Reply. However, I certainly would not like to impose all our speeches on His Excellency. I am not sure whether or not they are physically conveyed to him but, if so, I doubt whether they would be received with great glee, because the Address in Reply is not one of the most enlightened of those debates that takes place within the august surroundings of this Chamber.

*The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:*

**Mr TRAINER:** The Minister of Housing and Construction is trying to apply a little bit of flattery by implying that I am some sort of exception to this, but by the time members have heard me out over the next 30 or 40 minutes, with the rather dry exposition that I am about to deliver, they may disagree with him.

On this occasion I am one of the first to participate in the Address in Reply debate because I am standing in for the member for Adelaide. Over the past three such annual debates I have made it a particular point, as Whip, to be the last person to speak in the Address in Reply debate because on each occasion I had this sort of forlorn hope that the House eventually might get its affairs in order and reform the procedures that we follow. By being the last on each of those occasions I had hoped to attain the symbolic position of being the last to speak in the Address in Reply debate under its traditional format.

I compliment the member for Price on the remarks that he made preceding me, particularly on his thoughts on the member for Adelaide. Particularly I compliment him on his thoughts about the Address in Reply debate, which, as I have pointed out on many occasions, is not the best of our Parliamentary procedures. I have commented on this on six of the past seven occasions on which we have had the debate.

**An honourable member:** You are persistent.

**Mr TRAINER:** I am persistent. Hope springs eternal in the Government Whip's breast, one might say, but I have been a little disappointed until now. On the first occasion on which I participated after joining this Parliament in 1979, I did not comment adversely on the concept of the Address in Reply debate, but I have on the six occasions since then: in 1980, 1981, 1982, twice in 1983, and last year in 1984. I say 'twice in 1983', because in one year this Parliament had the dubious privilege of having two series of Address in Reply debates because we still had some contributions that were held over from the debate of late 1982, following the election of the new Government. Then we had the usual one later in 1983, in August, as part of the Budget debates after the opening of the Parliament.

I will not make any exception, as members can see, on this occasion. In the next few minutes I will quote some of the remarks that I have made on previous occasions for the sake of collecting them together on the record. I quote first from my speech in March 1983, when I said:

When I first came into this Chamber in 1979 I did not comment on it: I dutifully followed tradition and spoke for an hour on a subject that I have long since forgotten. It was recorded in *Hansard* at great expense to the taxpayer, but what purpose did that one hour contribution that I made in October 1979 serve? It was not reported by the press. Very few people would have read it in *Hansard*. Hardly anybody was in the Chamber listening to it, and I do not blame them, because if I cannot remember what the speech was about it could not have been a particularly good one.

I may have been unduly harsh on myself because it was not that terrible, although I would not claim that it was one of those brilliant speeches that would last for all time when I spoke on technological change. I may have been a little harsh on myself, but it is interesting that I commented at that time on the paucity of audience that one has on these occasions. A few seem to have drifted back into the Chamber in the past few minutes.

**Mr S.G. Evans:** I went and got them for you.

**Mr TRAINER:** In that case I am greatly indebted to the Opposition Whip for having carried out that unexpected part of his duties. I was not aware that it was the Opposition Whip's responsibility to provide an audience for the Government Whip, but I will try to return a suitable favour at some later date. I notice, however, that something strange appears to have happened on the front bench opposite inasmuch as we do not have any of the shadow Cabinet present. Perhaps there has been another spill, of which I was not aware and had not read any media reports, which has put the member for Victoria back on the front bench after several years absence. If that is so, I offer him, through you, Sir, my heartfelt congratulations. It could not have happened to a nicer man, particularly because he is a good Redlegs supporter. That, of course would now get me offside with my colleagues the member for Price and the member for Albert Park.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr TRAINER:** I am sorry, Mr Speaker, but there appears to be a little bit of byplay going back and forth that I do not quite understand. I think it originated with the member for Goyder, who is obviously trying to get the job of understudy in *Some mothers do 'ave em*.

I return to those earlier occasions on which I spoke about the Address in Reply. In August 1982 I described it as being a form of initiation for a new member. I said:

Although it was not my maiden speech, it was something new and special to be called upon by one's Parliamentary colleagues on both sides of the House to make a one-hour speech without being permitted to read it, although one could use what are euphemistically termed copious notes—

or, as on this occasion, one could use copious quantities of one's previous copious notes in the way of recycling parts of old *Hansards*. I then said:

For a new member it serves as some sort of initiation rite, an ordeal to be undergone to prove that one is adequate as a Parliamentarian, by speaking for an hour.

I just wonder what is really achieved by this ceremony that we go through of having so many members speaking for one hour—mainly, it would appear, for the sake of speaking for one hour. On 27 August 1980, I said:

It is time consuming to have most of the members in this Chamber committed to the task of each delivering a one-hour monologue in this fashion.

I quoted at that time the number of days that had already gone by on that particular exercise. In August 1980 we used the 5th, 6th and 7th, and, in the following week, the 12th and 14th. I am not quite sure what happened to the 13th. Then we used the 19th, 20th and 21st and carried through into the fourth week to the 26th. That was a lot of days to be taken up by one part of parliamentary procedure. In that second Address in Reply in which I took part, after having been a member of this place for all of 11 months, I was bold enough to make some adverse comments about this

particular procedure and suggest how we could perhaps use our time a little more wisely. On that occasion I said:

Could not members, other than those who are newly sworn in, forgo these 60-minute trials by ordure and gain rights instead to additional 10-minute grievance debates?

I believe that, apart from when we are actually dealing with specific Bills or Question Time, the most valuable parts of parliamentary procedure are those grievance debates when people have to be short and concise in their remarks. I said:

Apart from the cut and thrust of Question Time, the liveliest contributions are usually those speeches which occur as part of the adjournment debate. Unfortunately, these are often late at night and, therefore, the effect is lost: the press has gone to bed and so have the journalists; members are dispersed around the building, poised ready to go home in that last half hour.

Furthermore, those occasions do not happen as frequently as they should. Every time Parliament goes past the proper adjournment time, those debates do not appear on the programme; they are lost. I commented:

Could not additional grievance debates, perhaps, be slotted in after Question Time when the House is still in a state of ferment, when most members are present, the press is present, and there are people in the public gallery? Brief 10-minute grievance debates produce better speeches; they are better for the speaker and easier on the listener.

I then said:

It would be more beneficial for a speaker to have a 10-minute opportunity every two weeks or so than to have an annual or bi-annual 60-minute marathon. Topics can actually be topical, but with infrequent and lengthy speaking periods, an issue may have long since passed from topicality by the time an opportunity arises to discuss it.

If a member needs more than 10 minutes to debate certain issues, he may be able to cover the subject in two 10-minute speeches a couple of weeks apart, or perhaps he could come to an arrangement with another member who may be willing to pass up his 10 minutes or make some sort of exchange.

The total number of hours used in regard to my proposal—the briefer speeches—in a Parliament would probably be on a par with the time taken by the 35 hours or so of Address in Reply contributions, with the major difference being that they would be spread out over the year rather than jammed into one long, boring session. The contributions could be livelier, less rambling, more topical and, most importantly, they would be briefer. Some members in this House deliver only two kinds of speech—long boring speeches and short boring speeches. Given the choice, I would rather be subject to the latter lesser evil.

I had in mind members opposite, of course, in that respect. Having participated so many times in the Address in Reply in order to make adverse comments about it and having referred to the fact that members tend to use their full hour, over the past few years remarks have frequently been made by way of interjection that, if I felt so badly about it, why take part in it? There may be a certain amount of logic in that sort of interjection, but I think regard should be given to the fact that, if I do not use the allotted 60 minutes, or at least some part of that time (and this would apply to many other members), I shall not get that time at a later date. If members do not use the time made available for the Address in Reply program, they are not presented with that time on some later occasion, unless, of course, we reform the procedures.

Like most of my colleagues, I have used these Address in Reply opportunities when they have arisen, simply because, if one does not use them, opportunities are not available at some other time. Yet, a week or several weeks from now there will be occasions when constituents come to me (and I am sure that all my colleagues have shared this experience) and ask me to raise a matter in the House. Out there in the electorate people are not familiar with parliamentary procedures and I do not think that they should be expected to be familiar with them. They probably think that it is a little like what they see in the movies, where a member, suddenly seized with an idea, rises to his feet, opens his mouth and utters brilliant words. People in the

community do not accept the fact that, with 47 *prima donnas*, as there are in a place like this, there must be a set procedure so that everyone can take a turn. A member cannot just leap to his feet and speak on any subject when he feels like it.

Unfortunately, the opportunities presented to members to raise matters of concern do not come frequently enough. Because of the lack of opportunities for more frequent grievance debates, I believe that back-benchers are not given the chance that they should be given to participate in the work of Parliament in that respect. The media certainly pay very little attention to back-benchers unless what they say has some element of sensation or is attached to some sort of gimmick. The media's main interest, understandably perhaps, tends to be limited to what the front-benchers on both sides of the House have to say. That is rather a pity because the back-bencher, as I will point out later, plays an extremely important part in Parliament.

We tend to use a great deal of time for the Address in Reply. In August 1983 I tabled some statistical material related to this, on which I will not attempt to draw too heavily on this occasion. Anyone who is interested can find that material published in *Hansard* of 30 August 1983. The average number of sitting days devoted to the Address in Reply each year tends to vary. The time taken covers some two weeks, sometimes three or four weeks. The Address in Reply seems to take about nine or 10 parliamentary working days, although on a couple of occasions it has covered some seven or eight working days. But certainly, as a percentage of the total time of Parliament in one year, the Address in Reply consumes a disproportionate amount of time—somewhere between a tenth and an eighth. In other words, 10 or 12 per cent of the time is used for the Address in Reply. The total number of adjournment debates in the course of one year, in contrast, account for some 2 or 3 per cent of the parliamentary sitting time for a year.

The amount of time available for grievance debates could easily be doubled by imposing some sort of restriction on the Address in Reply debate. I would not even consider the suggestion that the Address in Reply debate should be abolished, but there is a whole range of options available to facilitate my suggestion. For example, we could have just a mover and a seconder each time being entitled to an hour, as well as perhaps those who are making their maiden speeches; and we could still get by if the time for everyone else was reduced to 20 minutes or half an hour. That amount of time would then be available to increase vastly the amount of time available to back-benchers to raise matters of urgency.

Each day, in addition to the adjournment debate, when we close down the House at night, regular issues of public importance could be raised during what could be described as peak time in the House—straight after Question Time or a time similar to that.

I think that I will be immediately followed by the member for Flinders. I do not suggest that his contribution will not be an earnest one but, on the other hand, I would be surprised if what he had to say over the next hour or so—if he were to use his full 60 minutes—could not just as easily be said as part of six 10 minute contributions, covering six individual topics at times when he would perhaps achieve more impact from making those contributions. I have pleasure in supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

**Mr BLACKER (Flinders):** I support the motion and commend His Excellency on the way in which he opened Parliament last Thursday. I join with other members in expressing my condolences to the families of the late Leslie Claude Hunkin and the late John Stephen Clark. I think I briefly met both those gentlemen but really did not know

them to any great degree. However, from what I have heard from other members, both of those gentlemen made very valuable contributions to this place and are no doubt remembered by many members with whom they worked.

Comments were made about my being fortunate enough to take No. 1 position on this side of the Chamber in this debate. It is fair to say that that occurred by ballot, and I was lucky enough for my name to be the first drawn. Even then, it would not normally have been the case, because the Leader of the Opposition would have spoken first and the Deputy Leader second. I think that all members would share with the Deputy Leader his loss on the death of his mother, and my condolences go to the Deputy and his family.

This debate was opened by the member for Price, who said that it would be his last Address in Reply speech. I wish him well in his future retirement and hope that he has a speedy recovery to good health. Indeed, I express a similar hope in respect of all other members of this House who are not enjoying the best of health at present. A gentleman who has not been mentioned in this House is the late A.T. Hooper. Art Hooper was the first senior adviser in the Rural Youth Movement in South Australia and was known to many thousands of young people between the ages of 16 and 25 years at that time. He was a senior adviser for many years, and I regret that I have not been able to put together a list of his achievements and contributions to the Rural Youth Movement over that period. Art Hooper probably worked for the Rural Youth Movement for some 25 years. He was well known on a Statewide basis and commanded the highest respect from all of us who were Rural Youth Movement members who had had the pleasure of meeting him and sharing in their contributions to that worthwhile organisation.

After Art Hooper retired from the Department of Agriculture, we saw a scaling down of the Rural Youth Movement, and I believe that that is most unfortunate. Although the movement is surviving—and 'surviving' is the operative word—much more could be achieved for the young people of today if the movement were reinstated to the same status it held some 10 to 15 years ago.

I hope that one day we will see Government support for the Rural Youth Movement similar to the support it received in the past. There are members of the House who have been fortunate enough to come up through the Rural Youth Movement, and we can only give that organisation our highest commendation. I, and I am sure other Rural Youth members of this House, would be only too happy to see that organisation reinstated to its original status.

To the family of the late Art Hooper, or A.T. as he was affectionately known, I express my sincere condolences. I would like to see some of the other organisations, particularly the newspapers, give due recognition to this man's valuable contribution to the young people of this State.

One of the most crucial issues facing country people at this time is fuel. I do not know how one can get this message across, but the cost of fuel is astronomical. In country areas it is now costing approximately \$40 to fill a tank with fuel. When many people are required to use more than one tank of fuel in a day, their cost of living is becoming exorbitant. I find that people are now not as mobile as they used to be, because the cost of fuel keeps them home, whereas a few years ago they would hop in the car and go to the neighbouring town for, say, sport and recreation. I think it is totally unreasonable to have price differences in super grade petrol of up to 16c a litre within the boundaries of South Australia. I do not believe that a Government can tolerate that sort of difference. It is unreasonable that it should occur and it is something concerning which this or any future Government must take a stronger stand. Nobody

in their right mind would accept that that is a fair and reasonable thing.

This inequity can be attributed to a number of factors, but the main area that this Government should be looking at is a State fuel equalisation scheme, because until the controlling authorities who regulate fuel prices can do a better job than they are doing at the moment it is time for the State to treat the supply of petroleum products as an essential service in this State.

We have seen an abuse of the fuel situation. We have seen Federal and State Governments receive their cut off the top of fuel prices, all at the expense of those people who live further out and who need to use petroleum products for their day-to-day existence. When I see petrol prices that up until a few days ago have been around 44 to 45c a litre while some people in my electorate have been paying up to 61.5c a litre, obviously that causes me a great deal of concern. Under the Australian Bicentenary Road Development Program, which was originally introduced by the Hon. Ralph Hunt when he was Minister for Transport, 1c per litre was targeted specifically for ABRD projects. That scheme was a good one and I believe that it had the support of all sides of Parliament. The idea was that by 1988, the bicentenary year, that 1c per litre would automatically be removed from the Statutes.

During the intervening period there was a collection mechanism to provide additional funds specifically targeted for roads. However, the present Government has come in and has extended the ABRD road program, but it has not targeted the extra money for roads. The ABRD program is a collection agency: it is collecting road moneys that are partly directed towards roads, while the other part is going into general revenue. Whether we get that money back from general revenue is another matter. Most people would believe that we do not receive back all the money that is collected under the ABRD program. However, that is only part of the story because the situation in relation to the off road use of petroleum products collected under the guise of ABRD funding is totally inequitable.

Funds are collected from the fishing industry, which normally operates at sea, for roads. Any fisherman has just cause to complain that fishermen do not use their boats on the roads, and some of these vessels use massive amounts of fuel. In fact, most fishermen in the trawling and tuna fisheries use more fuel in a week than do farmers in a year. Fishermen are using fuel at up to \$75 per hour, and in many cases it takes them 12 to 16 hours to reach a fishing patch, so one can understand the concern about even one or two cents per litre collected under the ABRD program.

I believe that this Government owes it to the fishing industry to get in there and lobby very hard for at least an exemption for those people who must use fuel on the seaways in their fishing enterprise. That in itself is totally unjust and inequitable. Surely no member would believe that it is fair and reasonable for money to be collected from the fishing industry under the guise of it being for roads. As I have said, it costs \$75 per hour for fuel alone to run a fishing vessel. That is a tremendous cost to those people. Unless they can obtain some relief, we will find that many of those in the fishing industry will be driven to the wall.

Not only do we have that 2.5 cents problem under the ABRD programme, we also have a problem in primary industry where the Federal Government is collecting over 9 cents excise on fuel used on farms, and I am referring to off-road usage. It has been traditional for decades that petroleum products—in particular, diesel fuel used for tractors and headers for the production of grain and livestock—used off-road have been regarded as excise exempt. Under recent changes to the Act a rebate system was introduced whereby the rebate was parallel to the excise taken. At that

time I think that both the excise and the rebate were 7.13 cents.

However, under the present Government there has been a change in excise. The excise has crept up by about 2 cents, but the rebate has not. The Government is now collecting over 9 cents in excise, but it is only refunding 7 cents. Again, the Federal Government is collecting 2 cents a litre and putting it into the Treasury coffers. We also have the well head tax problem, where the Federal Government has added additional taxation to the cost of fuel.

It brings us back to the argument about world parity. There was considerable debate some years ago when the then coalition Opposition introduced world parity pricing to the fuel industry. I believe good reason exists to explain what it was in aid of at that time. It must be remembered that in the coalition Government prior to the Whitlam era some 53 oil rigs were drilling for oil in Australia. Within 18 months of the Whitlam Government we had three oil rigs left in Australia drilling for oil. The Government of the day was faced with the problem of how to encourage oil search in Australia. It either had to get in and pay to do it itself or had at least to be able to say to potential exploration companies that if they found oil in Australia they were entitled to get world parity pricing. It was no good saying to oil exploration companies that, if they found oil in Australia, they would have to take it at considerably below world parity price. Obviously, nobody would come to look for oil in Australia unless they could get the price that they would get in other countries when putting up risk capital.

So, world parity pricing was introduced at that time. I believe that in the existing circumstances of the time it was the right and proper thing to do; otherwise, the Government had to become involved in oil exploration. I am sure we would have some trouble accepting that the Government, through its taxation measures, should finance a risk enterprise such as that. So, world parity pricing was introduced. We have now gone beyond that, because the Government has introduced the well head tax on top of that again and we are paying far more than world parity pricing for the oil. If we could get back to world parity pricing and do the fair and proper thing with ABRD programmes and give those people involved in primary production—be it on the land or sea—exemption from excise, some realistic fuel pricing arrangements could be achieved. To that end this Government has a part to play.

Whilst mentioning world parity pricing, well head tax, ABRD programmes and excise, which all come under the umbrella of Federal pricing, I point out that the State Government can play a role in fuel equalisation. I have made approaches to both this and the previous Government to implement such a scheme. Both Governments have been frightened to handle it, because they believed, with some justification, that if we were going to have a fuel equalisation scheme it would be best done on an Australia wide basis. I would like to see it done on such a basis but, as the Federal Government is collecting too much at the moment for its general coffers, obviously it will not take it on. However, if the State Government could get in and show that it has a will to serve the people of the State, South Australia could be seen as a leader in the fuel crisis and would be seen by other States to be a pattern which they could follow.

When I asked the question of the Premier on about 9 May he answered in a very responsible way. He recognised that a problem existed in the community and recognised that it was unjust and unfair that citizens in this State should be paying such a wide disparity of price for fuel. He said that he would refer the matter to the Attorney-General to obtain a report. I subsequently received that report but, regrettably, it indicated that the Government was not prepared to take on such a challenge. I hope that in the lead

up to the election one side or the other (hopefully both) will give a commitment to the people of this State that they will support some scheme to bring about an equality of fuel prices.

It is unjust that the people out in the bush, through their taxation, are subsidising a highly subsidised public transport scheme, which still has discounted fuel prices at far below realistic levels. People in the country are unable to enjoy any advantages of competition, because they do not have public transport of any kind, let alone subsidised public transport. They should not be asked to pay those cost differences.

Obviously, the people in the non-metropolitan areas are subsidising the lower prices in the metropolitan area. That situation must be brought to an end sooner or later because, if it is not, the producing sectors of this State will go to the wall. Let us face it: with the present drought in some areas, the income to both State and Federal Governments through the primary producing sector of this State will obviously be lower.

I was pleased to note that there was some reference in His Excellency's speech to the primary producing sector. The Government recognised that primary industries made a significant contribution to the recovery and the renewed prosperity of this State, following the drought and the fires of 1983. I would think that that is an elementary and obvious deduction. It is equally elementary and obvious that, unless primary producers have a bumper year this year, the State Government and Federal Government will find it difficult to balance their budgets as they did in good years for the primary producers. I acknowledge that it has recognised that, but I trust that the Government will give greater consideration to the needs of the rural areas than has occurred in the past.

I refer now to the efforts of the Minister of Agriculture, who seems to be more against agriculture than for it. I have yet to find a person in the industry who is able to say a kind word for our Minister and the way in which he has handled the dilemmas that crop up from time to time. More particularly, the Minister treated with contempt the 15 000 or 16 000 farmers who marched down King William Street to Elder Park. That was a flagrant abuse of the Ministerial position with which he has been entrusted. I do not believe that any Minister should treat people with that sort of contempt, but that is what the Minister did—he stirred and provoked the farmers. He did not offer one word of constructive advice. I thought that the Minister could have said, 'We have done this, this and this and we have tried to help out in some areas,' but he chose not even to do that. It was that aspect that was a bitter pill for the farmers to swallow—for them to hear the person who is allegedly representing them speak in such a way to them.

I refer briefly now to the potential drought. I must say that there have been reasonably good rains, even in the past 24 hours, which might have assisted recovery in certain areas. To that end, some farmers hope to get their seed back, and some might get a little more than that, but generally the drier wet lands or rain land areas still have a long way to go. While the rains might appear to be good (and anyone not involved in agriculture might think that the farmers have been saved), I should point out that we are now in the first week of August; in the areas to which I refer, farmers usually have their crops in and growing by May, June at the latest.

By normal standards those crops should be half a metre high, stooling and looking to forming grain. However, in many of those areas the farmers have not even sown. It is fairly unlikely that there will be a set of circumstances which will be conducive to the proper development and ripening of grain and thus for a crop to succeed at this late time of

the year. We need a lot of luck. We need more than just average rainfall: we need a season which, in effect, is running three months behind normal.

We need finishing rains at the appropriate time. Although this present rain is bringing a smile to the face of the farmer, it might in many cases be only a temporary smile because unless we get an unusual and later finish to the year, which one would not normally expect, the chance of those people getting good crops is remote.

In many of the wetter areas of the State, particularly in my electorate on the southern part of Eyre Peninsula and along a little of the western coastline, where it is normally too wet, things are looking quite good at the moment, but those areas comprise a small percentage of the whole acreage involved. I understand that many areas of the South-East that, likewise, are normally too wet are looking good at the moment and that the farmers would like the rain to stop temporarily.

I was goaded a little earlier in relation to Sims farm. I will talk about it at length at a future date because it is a saga (as many people have been calling it) of great concern to me, because I believe that it involves a matter of morality. As many people would know, Sims farm was a bequest to the South Australian Government from the late Gordon Sims, I think in 1960. The farm, in the Cleve hills area, is on undulating country within four kilometres of Cleve. For the past few years the Cleve Area School has been using a small portion of this farm as a training ground. In the past two or three years 109 hectares of the farm has been transferred to the school.

The Sims farm saga has been made a political matter by some people. It has been bounced around in all directions, in political terms. Without going into the contents of the many letters that I have received stretching back to 1981, I totally and absolutely support the retention of this farm, and have done so right from the word 'go'. Many people who have not given this matter the same support are now making noises about it. Had they been supportive in relation to this matter when it was raised with this Government or the previous Government, we would not perhaps be facing the dilemma that we are now facing in relation to this matter.

I will not go through all the press clippings that I have relating to this matter because that would take a long time, but the present situation stems from the fact that the Cleve community believes that the Government is morally wrong in selling this farm, which was bequeathed to the State to be used for agricultural research or educational purposes. Suggestions were made about what the property should be called.

The farm was entrusted to the Department of Agriculture, a few members of which were able to convince the Minister that he should sell this farm and allegedly use the proceeds for agricultural research elsewhere. That is in total conflict with the terms of the will and its intent. The late Gordon Sims has many descendants in the Cleve area. I have asked this question many times before in this place, and I ask it again. If one section of the Government cannot comply with the terms of the will relating to this farm and another section can do so, why should the farm not be handed to that second department free of charge? I find it incredible that there is in this State a department that can say that it has a right to money gained from the sale of this property and that the Government has agreed and said that the Minister of Agriculture can have the proceeds from the sale of that farm and that, if the Minister of Education wants it for his department, he must buy it—

**An honourable member:** It was given to the State.

**Mr BLACKER:** Yes. The options offered by the Minister to the people of the area were incredible. I will come to

that in a moment, but how can any clear thinking person believe that is a fair and reasonable assessment?

One could apply the same analogy to the Waite Institute and compare it with what has occurred at Sims farm. Then, where would we be? The Government could say, as it is sitting on \$40 million or \$50 million worth of a real estate asset, 'Let's sell it and buy the best farm in South Australia for \$20 million and set up another research centre, putting the rest in our pocket.' That is the very principle involved in this exercise.

The real crunch came when the Minister of Agriculture found himself in something of a bind, obviously attracting attention all across the State. People from the South-East contacted me because they wanted a young farmer training scheme, an agricultural residential college, or something like that, in their area. After all, there are five or so such places in New South Wales and six in Queensland. The Eastern States have numerous colleges of this type, but South Australia does not have one. When the Minister was in that dilemma he put forward certain proposals which were widely published in the press. I quote from his letter dated 1 July 1985:

I wish to advise you of two alternative proposals to the sale of the remaining portion of Sims farm. If either proposal is acceptable to farmers on Eyre Peninsula, I will ask Cabinet to reverse its decision to sell the remaining portion of Sims farm, and instead hand over this land to the Education Department without charge.

The two proposals are based on my understanding that farmers on Eyre Peninsula would prefer Sims farm to be used for training purposes, rather than the resources available through the sale of the farm being directed into further agricultural research.

The proposals are:

- (a) That farmers on Eyre Peninsula, through the UF&S zones 1 and 2 and the Agricultural Bureaux in the region (eastern, central, far west zones), agree to the following statement: Farmers on Eyre Peninsula do not wish the Department of Agriculture to sell the remaining portion of Sims farm, purchase land in the dune swale country near Minnipa with the proceeds of that sale, and conduct agricultural research programs on such land. Farmers on Eyre Peninsula agree to forgo the benefits from such research and will not pursue any claim for loss of that opportunity for additional agricultural research, either now or in the future. or
- (b) That if farmers on Eyre Peninsula wish to expand the area of land used for agricultural research purposes on Eyre Peninsula by giving land to the Department of Agriculture, then
  1. Such land must be given without encumbrance.

The Minister said that he would 'flog off the land' that had already been given to him, and telling the farmers that they had to buy back a comparative piece of land and give it to the Government. Frankly, the Government cannot be entrusted with a thing! My recommendation to anyone thinking of bequeathing anything to this State would be to think again, because this Government has demonstrated that it is not capable of honouring the intent of a will. The letter continues:

2. Such land should be equal in value to the portion of Sims farm now proposed to be sold by tender.

Not only is the Minister saying that they should give back the land, but he is setting down conditions on the type of land that should be given back. The letter continues:

3. Such land fully meets the requirements of the Department of Agriculture—

it must be a suitable piece of land—

particularly in relation to its proximity to the Minnipa Research Centre.

Obviously he wants the best land around. Finally, the Minister states:

I am advising United Farmers and Stockowners zones 1 and 2, and the eastern, central and far west zones of the Agricultural Bureaux of these proposals.

I understand these five groups are well placed to present the views of farmers on Eyre Peninsula to me on this matter. I will

need the support of the five groups before I ask Cabinet to reconsider the sale of the remaining portion of Sims farm.

I understand that the UF&S and the three Agricultural Bureau zones will be meeting before 19 July, and I would like your response by 22 July.

Obviously, that letter went to the two respective UF&S districts through the Agricultural Bureaux regions.

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** What is the current position?

**Mr BLACKER:** I do not know, because it is changing day by day and it is hard to keep up with it. I am sure that many other people have found it difficult. At the moment, the Government lacks credibility. It has certainly shown that it will dishonour the intent of the will. It has demonstrated that in some cases there is political, scurrilous intent by some persons involved.

I said that I would not relate all the Sims farm saga because it would go on for a long time, but it needs to be said that certain departmental officers, in the Department of Agriculture and I believe in the Minister of Education's office, have been actively campaigning for the sale of this farm because it interferes with their little bureaucratic empire. I am happy to take that further at a later date because I believe that it is the case.

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** They tried it on me when we were in Government.

**Mr BLACKER:** The member for Alexandra, who was formerly the Minister, said that they tried it on him. So, let us face facts. What is going on? Is this Government being dictated to by bureaucratic officers and internal pressures and not listening to the young people of that area for whose benefit this property has been left?

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** Those bureaucracies have been dictating for years. It is just a matter of whether the Governments are weak enough to buckle under to them.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Appleby):** Order! Who is making this speech? Is it the member for Alexandra or is it the member for Flinders?

**Mr BLACKER:** Thank you, Madam Acting Speaker. The point has been well explained that it is my considered opinion that departmental officers have a lot to answer for. More particularly, a letter has been circulating, designed to influence Cabinet Ministers, to the effect that that portion of Sims farm that was under the care and control of the Cleve Area School has been suspect. That is nothing short of scurrilous because the property, as conducted by the Cleve Area School through its agricultural studies course, has been excellently managed, to the complete satisfaction of everyone I know of, and every observer of that area would offer nothing but the highest praise for it.

So, when, out of the blue, we find that a letter is filtering through the Ministers just prior to a Cabinet meeting, that is of very grave concern to me because, if this is the case, how can we be sure that Ministers of the Crown are hearing the truth? The Minister of Education, in response to a question from me in about October or November of last year, said that he would send the preliminary results of a report back for further questioning, and he detailed a list of questions that needed to be answered. I know that those questions did not go from this House back to that committee. If they did, they did not go to all the committee members, because one of the committee members happened to see a copy of *Hansard*, saw the Minister's reply to my question and wondered what was going on, two months after the Minister had uttered the words in this House.

To my mind, that is a very clear and deliberate attempt to keep the Minister in the dark concerning many of the issues. That worries me because if we have a Cabinet, the members of which are not being properly informed with a total balance of the whole exercise, what hope have the Cabinet and the Minister of making a fair and rational

decision? I hope that, if the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Education themselves cannot sit down and rationally put it together, the Premier should become involved and at least show that common sense can prevail. It is not a matter of cheap politics or of flippant comments made by this one or that: it is a matter of principle, of whether a bequeathed estate is to be handled properly. It is more particularly a matter of principle of whether the young people of Eyre Peninsula, boys and girls, from farm lands and cities—there are at least four students from Whyalla boarding at Cleve now—should be given the opportunity. That was the very intent of the will of Gordon Sims. I can quote a copy of a statutory declaration from Mr Joseph William Rehn, of 17 Fifth Street, Cleve:

I, Joseph William Rehn of 17 Fifth Street, Cleve hereby declare: that in September 1960 I was a patient in the Cleve District Hospital and occupied a ward jointly with Gordon Sims who expired during my time in hospital. As I had purchased land in Hundred of Boothby prior to this time we naturally talked about land and associated matters. When I mentioned his farm 'Dingley Dell' and any possibility of purchasing same his reaction was quite agitated and his own words as recalled by me were, 'There will be no squabbles regarding the sale of my farm. I have left it to the Government.' signed J.W. Rehn, witnessed by H. Price, J.P.

I believe that there are many such statutory declarations of people who knew Gordon Sims in 1960, who knew what the intent of his will was and who know full well that this Government is flagrantly abusing the intent of that will. That is the position with which this Government, in its conscience, has to deal.

I mentioned about Ministers not being properly informed. After the five meetings on Eyre Peninsula—the two UF&S meetings and the three Agricultural Bureau regional conferences—there was a clear and decisive vote by the farmers that Sims farm should be retained. I believe the meeting at Ceduna was unanimous. I was present at the meeting at Port Kenny, which was unanimous. I was not at the meeting at Rudall, but I believe there was only one person, of all those present, who actually spoke and voted against the proposal. Out of a total of well over 300 farmers, only one voice was opposed to it. I would have thought that 300 to 1 was a fairly convincing argument. I believe that the same situation applied to the UF&S. I understand that the wording of the motions varied slightly but the intent was the same.

When I rang the Minister of Agriculture's office, to a degree I was stonewalled and could not get any information at all; but I did get information secondhand from a member of the Agricultural Advisory Board who had met the Minister the day before, and his belief was that the report to Cabinet was going to be negative. I kept ringing and was able to ascertain from one department or another—I cannot remember which, because I rang several—that the report to Cabinet was going to be negative, because not one of the farmers meetings agreed to the Minister's request. When I said that that was blatantly untrue, they said, 'What do you mean?' So I read out the front page of the *Eyre Peninsula Tribune*, which was the first paper after those meetings. Under the headline, 'Keep Sims Farm—farmers,' it states:

Eyre Peninsula farmers have voted to retain Sims farm, 4 km from Cleve, for education.

At Agricultural Bureau zone meetings held in Ceduna, Port Kenny and Rudall last week an overwhelming majority of members voted that the land not be sold to private concerns and that it should be transferred to the control of the Cleve Area School Council. Although the wording of motions from each conference varied slightly, spokesman for the Cleve Action Group, Mr Rod Herde, said it was clear at each meeting that farmers felt the Sims farm issue should not be confused with the issue of rural research.

Earlier this month the Minister of Agriculture, Mr Frank Blevins outlined a proposal to guarantee the retention of Sims farm for education if farmers agreed to forego the benefits of additional agricultural research. Alternately the farm would be retained if

suitable land was given to the Department of Agriculture near the Minnipa research centre to enable the department to carry out research. A spokesman for Mr Blevins said this week that the Minister would now look at the farmers' responses to the proposals, and would more than likely take the matter back to State Cabinet.

The article refers to tenders and, further on, states:

The member for Flinders, Mr Peter Blacker, said he was most appreciative of the support the farmers had given to fight to retain Sims farm.

My biggest concern is that it gets into the hands of the Minister of Education as soon as possible, he said.

The students need to be educated in the best possible way in view of the tighter economic circumstances likely to confront them. I never doubted for one moment that the primary producers of Eyre Peninsula would back the retention of Sims farm in this way, however I am disappointed that they have been forced to compromise their position and forgo new research in the area.

I trust that future Governments will reconsider the position and give due recognition to the farmers on Eyre Peninsula who have contributed so much to the economy of this State. I trust now that with the farmers' will known to the Minister of Agriculture, he will now convince his Ministerial colleagues of the need to retain Sims farm in compliance with the intention of Gordon Sims' will.

I have read out the Minister's letter, or challenge, if you like, that he put to the farmers. That challenge was taken up and was responded to in a positive way. Yet the Government is still procrastinating on the issue. The Government should be exposed on that very aspect.

I was challenged to comment on the latest state of play. I understand that the Government is trying to proceed with its tendering. However, I find it incredible that the Minister has become personally involved in the tendering negotiations. It is incredible for any individual, Government, or otherwise to go over and above the Supply and Tender Board or the Lands Department, or whoever is charged with the responsibility for the tenders, and to negotiate personally with an individual, when it was known that a number of tenders were involved—I think it was seven. Not only that, but the allegedly successful tenderer has been offered a 33½ per cent reduction. For the tenderer to be told, 'Yes, just drop the tender by \$110 000 and you can have it,' I find incredible. I do not know at what stage that negotiation is, but the Government cannot hold up its head. I see this as being a scurrilous activity on the part of the Minister and some of his departmental officers. I intend to pursue this subject further at a later time.

I trust that the Government will abide by what is fair and reasonable and will ensure that the intent of the will is complied with. The Government's action so far indicates that it is doing everything possible to ensure that it is not complied with. If the Government continues to do that, what hope has this State got? The Government, and in particular the Minister, will not be able to be entrusted with anything.

I have some sympathy for the Minister of Education in relation to this matter from the point of view only that I do not believe that he or his Department should be obliged to find \$334 000 (that was the figure, although somewhere it seems to have decreased to \$220 000 as a result of a couple of telephone calls), or whatever the figure is, because part of the estate of the late Gordon Sims was bequeathed to the Government. Unless that situation can be honoured, the Government's actions will be seen for what they are.

I want to speak about numerous issues, and I shall do so. I note that the member for Eyre has again given notice of motion that he intends to introduce a private member's Bill in relation to the 10 per cent ETSA levy that applies to certain residents of South Australia. This is an abuse of people living in the wider areas of the State, who, in most cases, have had to pay for power facilities themselves and who still have to pay not only the normal rates but an extra 10 per cent for the privilege of living in the outer regions.

No other citizens of the State are required to pay this levy, but the Government continues to hound these people. I trust that the member for Eyre's Bill will succeed. The honourable member will certainly have my absolute backing for it, as many of the areas involved are within my electorate. I am aware of the difficulties that people in those areas have to endure. A further levy of another 10 per cent is wrong, particularly when the Government is now saying that it will reduce ETSA rates by 2 per cent. I think now is the time for the Government to lift that 10 per cent levy which is imposed on a small section of the community which is least able to afford it.

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

**Mr BLACKER:** I will use the few minutes I have left to mention the reference that His Excellency made in his opening speech to the vegetation clearance proposals being talked about by the Government. I welcome the initiative to introduce a new Bill to deal with this matter. While I have no idea what might be in the Bill, for the first time members will have an opportunity to debate on the floor of this House such a controversial matter. Members will be aware that the controversial vegetation clearance regulations were introduced as regulations attached to the previous Government's Planning Bill. Because the matter came in by way of regulations it was not debated on the floor of the House.

An attempt was made to have the matter debated on the floor of the House by moving motions for the disallowance of the regulations. Of course, those motions were lost on Party lines. However, that was the only way that the matter could be debated. The introduction of the new Bill will give members of Parliament an opportunity to debate this matter on the floor of the House. The introduction of the new Bill is to be commended and I look forward to seeing it. I think that every member has indicated that there should be some form of vegetation clearance control. I, and many other country members, have said that if a State heritage is involved—and we all agree there is—then the cost should be borne not by a handful of people throughout the State but equally by all people in the State because, after all, we are endeavouring to retain State assets. The proposed introduction of the Bill is to be commended, and I look forward to it.

His Excellency referred to a number of other matters to which I will refer later. I now draw the attention of the House to a press release of the Marriage Guidance Council. I heard of the contents of this press release at a meeting at Port Lincoln, and the facts and figures in it disturbed me. It states:

Marriage matters—but Government policy is encouraging divorce.

At a conservative estimate at least an additional \$21 million of Government expenditure could be saved each year if the Federal Government took more seriously the support of marriage and the family. This assertion was made at a meeting of the National Marriage Guidance Council held in Queensland last week.

At the present time its members receive an annual grant of \$2.5 million from the Commonwealth Attorney-General's Department, but save the Government at least \$21 million in supporting parent benefits each year. To this figure must be added Family Court costs, the cost of legal aid and the many other costs associated with marital breakdown.

Even in the short term this saving could be increased to at least \$42 million per year if the marriage guidance councils received the funding they need to meet the demands of the community. This money is urgently needed elsewhere in the welfare sector. The National Marriage Guidance Council has called for an urgent public inquiry into Government policy for marriage support and marriage counselling services.

Nearly half—40 per cent—of all Australian marriages are likely to end in divorce if the latest divorce rates continue. This rate of divorce places an enormous cost on the Australian taxpayer, apart from the human suffering for the couples and children involved.

'The direct cost to Government of marital breakdown', said Mr David Lardner, President of the National Marriage Guidance Council, 'is at least \$1 250 million each year, and much of this amount is cumulative.'

This figure of \$1 250 million excludes unquantifiable major costs to the health, education, welfare and employment sectors consequent upon marital breakdown. By contrast, the Australian Government is spending only \$4.1 million on marriage counselling this year, and only \$85 000 on marriage preparation. This total expenditure on prevention represents less than 0.3 per cent of the amount spent by the Government on marital breakdown.

Mr Lardner said: 'Marriage counselling enables a couple to explore all the options open to them when their relationship is in difficulty.' 70 per cent of all couples turning to marriage counselling when facing a crisis in their relationship report that counselling leads to improvement. Yet if only 2 per cent of couples seeking marriage counselling are enabled to avoid separation and the need of a supporting parent benefit the marriage counselling services have repaid the whole of their Government funding for the year. Present Government funding policy for marriage counselling is resulting in a severe restriction of services and preventing many families from receiving this sort of help.

The remainder of that correspondence only reiterates what I have already mentioned, but I think the salient point is that only \$4.1 million is spent by the Federal Government on marriage counselling but some \$1 250 million is spent on the divorce industry, if I may term it as such. That is disturbing, because obviously, if only 2 per cent of the persons who seek marriage counselling could be encouraged to stay together, that would cover the additional moneys required by the Marriage Guidance Council.

One of the fastest rising costs to State and Federal Governments is in the welfare area. Whilst we wish it was not necessary, the fact is that it is necessary. I am not denying that people should receive those benefits, but, if some of those situations could be avoided, tremendous savings could be achieved by the Government. We really need some compassion and initiative to assist marriage at the very beginning, rather than attempting to pick up the broken pieces at the end, because the broken pieces, at \$1 250 million per annum, represent a cost that this State and nation would have some considerable difficulty in sustaining.

The Minister of Recreation and Sport is not present at the moment, but I refer to a dilemma which arose for some of my constituents when the broadcasting of the racing codes was transferred from 5DN to 5AA. The problem occurs, particularly mid week, when some of my constituents who own racehorses, trotters or dogs, cannot hear the broadcasting of the race in which their animal is running. The 5AA network does not cover the western areas of the State, and in this electronic age that seems incredible.

For many years my constituents have had the services of race broadcasting. I am not a racegoer, but I am aware of the interest in not only galloping but also trotting and dog racing throughout the State, and yet many of my constituents cannot hear the broadcasting of races, which some would say is their right.

I have written to the Minister of Recreation and Sport, and I believe he is making an effort to rectify that situation, attempting to get the TAB to acquire 5AU or to effect an arrangement allowing 5AU to broadcast the races. Needless to say, if I have horse owners or dog owners in my electorate who cannot hear the broadcasting of the race in which their animals are running, a lot of people are not going to be able to place the appropriate bets with the TAB.

It is disturbing that, when complaints about this were lodged by my constituent, certain gentlemen within the TAB responded (and I must say that I received a similar response) to the effect that they could not care less because 95 per cent of the State could hear the races. They regarded his complaint as being bad luck. I do not accept that. I do not think we should have class distinction throughout the State. I believe that every citizen of South Australia should have the right to hear the races, which is a common and generally

accepted fact of life for the majority of the people of this State. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** I, too, support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I extend my sympathies to the families and friends of the late Leslie Claude Hunkin, CMG, who was member for East Torrens from 1921 to 1927, and to the family and friends of the late John Stephen Clark, who was member for Gawler from 1952 to 1970 and member for Elizabeth from 1970 to 1973.

I must say that it was interesting to listen to His Excellency's speech and hear what the Government's thinking is for the coming session and for the future. This evening I will address my remarks to some aspects of the Governor's speech and I will make some general comments regarding our State of South Australia. His Excellency said:

... my Government believes it is vital that the State pursues a strategy for development which encompasses support for existing industries as well as addressing the urgent requirement to bring new industry to the State.

Later, His Excellency said:

Following negotiations over a number of years by successive Governments regular liner services have now commenced with Japan. This is a major step towards my Government's objective of reconnecting the State's direct shipping services with our major trading areas.

I must say that it is very pleasing to see that shipping route implemented and operating. It is also interesting to look back in particular to June 1981 when the then Leader of the Opposition, Mr Bannon, was quoted in an article in the *Sunday Mail* under the heading 'Investment greed killing South Australia'. The article states:

The mad competitive battle between State Governments to attract overseas investment could end up costing South Australia dearly, the Opposition Leader, Mr Bannon, said yesterday. Mr Bannon said, 'The Federal and State Governments should be involved in setting up a national approach to overseas investment. Instead, we have this mad competitive battle going on with all the States beating each other's heads to present cheap packages for overseas investors. In the long term, this will cost South Australia and Australia dearly.'

It is very interesting to see an Opposition Leader come out with those statements. I wonder how the now Premier—the same Mr John Bannon—reconciles that with the fact that he is acutely aware that this State Government needs to support and look to existing industries as well as bringing new industries to the State.

I am sure that he is acutely aware that South Australia survives or dies on its ability to promote industry. It amazes me that back in 1981 he had the idea that such competition by States to attract industry would eventually kill South Australia. Hopefully he has seen the error of his ways because to my thinking competition is very productive to any State or any group because it usually means that the people who are being attracted are looked at realistically—they are not cast aside but rather given credit where possible, helped and assisted as far as can be undertaken at the time. I am fully supportive of the Government's moves in trying to bring new industry into our State.

At Technology Park, moves have occurred to try to attract industry and one can see that we need it desperately. We are pleased that hopefully some of the foreign banks will set up in South Australia and we welcome them. I refer also to live sheep export firms. One firm is setting up an important base in South Australia. The firm said that, if South Australia is not interested, Western Australia has its arms open for them. It is another example of where South Australia needs industry.

We can also take the Grand Prix—that exciting event coming up which was considered first by the Liberals and

then taken over by the current Labor Government. It will be brought to fruition in November this year.

*The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:*

**Mr MEIER:** The initial discussions took place under the previous Government.

**The Hon. Lynn Arnold:** You're crazy.

**Mr MEIER:** I will fill the Minister in later. I do not currently have the details because I was not a member of that Government. Has the Minister not heard us support it the whole way? I am saying that the initial talks took place under the previous Government in regard to the Grand Prix coming to South Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr MEIER:** The attitude of the then Leader of the Opposition has hopefully changed and I guess he saw that if he wanted to stay in Government it would have to change.

*Mr Whitten interjecting:*

**Mr MEIER:** The honourable member did not hear the first part of my speech. I could quote it again. It is interesting to see an article in the *National Times* of 20 to 26 June 1982. It had an article on the then Leader of the Opposition, John Bannon, headed 'South Australia's Opposition Leader, John Bannon'. It also carried a photograph of him and stated:

He has the thankless task of leading his Party into an election campaign that will focus unequivocally on the two issues where the Labor Party appears most vulnerable—uranium and the economy.

The article by Robert Milliken goes on to look at certain aspects of the then Opposition Leader, Mr John Bannon. The part to which I wish to pay particular attention is the fact that the Labor Party seems most vulnerable on uranium and the economy. How right was the author of this article! In what way did the then Leader of the Opposition go about overcoming the two big factors that he and his Party knew would mean the death knell for them? I think we have seen how, from the 'mirage in the desert' image of the Roxby Downs mining venture, they decided that it was the jewel in the crown and went about face, despite the fact that one member of the Upper House had to lose his place in the Labor Party because he was too foresighted.

In fact, even in the past few weeks we saw the Premier go overseas in relation to Roxby Downs, because he realises that it could still be an election issue. Unfortunately, the Government decided that Honeymoon and Beverley, two other important uranium ventures, were not relevant. What about the second factor, the second Achilles heel of the Labor Party—the economy? If we look at the 1979 election campaign papers, we note that in one of the advertisements it is stated:

Since June 1970 total tax revenue in this State has risen by 504 per cent, although the rate of inflation in this State has risen by only 145 per cent. South Australian State Governments since 1970 have increased income from State taxes at a rate 2½ times faster than the increase in personal incomes and 3½ times faster than the rate of inflation. South Australians are more heavily taxed than people in other States.

That was in 1979 looking back on the period of Labor Government since 1970—the previous 10 years. There was high taxation. We well know that the Corcoran Government was defeated. What was the result of the next three years? The next three years saw the Budgets of the Liberal Government reduce taxation in real terms by 3.1 per cent; there was no increase during those three years. There was a decrease in taxation, compared to a 504 per cent increase for the previous 10 years. What have we had since Labor took the reins of office just over 2½ years ago? We have had an increase in State taxation of more than three times the rate of inflation. So, it is back to the old tricks.

But perhaps one of the most worrying things is the way in which this Government is continuing to operate. Looking

back at previous election advertisements, I was amused to note that the 1979 election motto was 'Follow a leader,' and that was blown up a little by people who did not believe in following a leader and who said that only sheep followed a leader and that South Australia was going all the way down. I wonder whether the people of South Australia consider themselves responsible, thinking citizens or whether they have any doubts that maybe one particular political leader is viewing them in a way that is similar to the view of 1979, namely, relating them to sheep following the leader. We recall that in the 1982 election campaign the then Leader of the Opposition, Mr Bannon, made the following statement in his policy speech of 25 October:

Unlike the Liberals, we will not allow State charges like transport fares, electricity and hospital charges to be used as a form of back-door taxation. The ALP will not introduce new taxes nor increase existing taxes during its term of office.

And so the people went to the polls. We must remember, of course, that from 1970 to 1979 there had been a massive increase in taxes but that from 1979 to 1982 there had been an actual decrease in the rate of taxation.

The Bannon Government was prepared to make a commitment that for three years there would be no increases in taxes and that charges would not be used as a form of back-door taxation. So what has occurred? There have been seven tax increases, the introduction of a new tax, the financial institutions duty, and 188 increases in charges under this Government. I know that the Government made excuses at one stage why it wanted to increase taxes, and introduce a new tax, even though it promised it would not do so. Let us look at the progress of those tax increases. By November 1983, one year after this Government took office, over 70 taxes and charges had been increased. Part of the reason was the disastrous bushfire.

**Mr Plunkett:** What about the Liberal's tax increases—194 between 1979 and 1982?

**Mr MEIER:** If the honourable member had been listening, he would have heard me say that in real terms overall taxation decreased by 3.1 per cent under the Liberals; it did not go up.

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Ferguson):** Order! Interjections are disturbing the speaker, so I ask members to show him the courtesy that is due to him, and to cease interjecting. I ask the member for Goyder not to reply to interjections and to address his remarks to the Chair.

**Mr MEIER:** Thank you, Sir. I have indicated that some 70 taxes and charges increased during the first year that this Government was in office. If those increases were as a result of bushfires or natural disasters, they could possibly have been accepted because those were unknown circumstances occurring in the first year that this Government was in office. However, what happened following that? If one looks at the record one sees that by July of the following year, six months later, the number of rises in taxes and charges had increased from 70 to just over 100. So, charges continued to increase for that next six months.

A person who was prepared to give the Government every possible chance for 18 months might have thought that, our having had these huge increases, surely things would change, because the Government had promised that for the next three years there would be no increases in taxes and charges. However, we find that by November 1984, two years after this Government took office, 150 charges had been increased, as had seven taxes. So, taxes and charges continued to go up, until we are now to the point where 188 taxes and charges have been increased during the life of this Government—they have continued to skyrocket. This Government has no credibility left, because of its breaking of its unequivocal promise not to raise taxes and charges. In other

words, the then Leader of the Opposition told a blatant lie in relation to this matter. Yet what do we find in today's *News* under the heading 'Bannon pledges three-year freeze', by Randall Ashbourne, but the following:

The Premier, Mr Bannon, today gave a qualified promise of no tax rate increase for the next three or four years . . . Mr Bannon hedged his 'no tax increases' commitment with four qualifications—but said he believed at this stage the promise could be kept.

I grieve for the people of South Australia who nearly three years ago were told untruths that many of them believed. We have seen what has happened. Today, in August 1985, almost the same promise is being made. I hope that the people of South Australia will not be taken for a ride again.

I have faith and confidence that they can see through promises that have been broken right, left and centre—188 times! I cannot believe that the present Premier—the former Leader of the Opposition, soon to be the Leader of the Opposition again, although whether he will remain Leader of the Opposition is arguable, because many members on the front and even back benches are waiting to take his place—could have enough gumption and courage to make almost the same promise again. I do not know how he will face up to the people. I wonder how his Party supporters continue to back him.

Let us look at the rural policy that the then Labor Opposition put to South Australia. It is headed, 'A vigorous rural sector keeps South Australia going'. We will not take issue with that title. I have to agree with that sentiment. His Excellency's speech referred to the rural sector as a mainstay in getting South Australia's economy going again.

Another aspect of its policy, headed 'New agricultural technology', reads:

The ALP believes the development of rural industries is an important part of the long term recovery of South Australia's economy and should be given high priority.

Well said! The document continues:

Rural industries have generally low levels of tariff protection and have had to retain their competitiveness through adopting new technology. An ALP Government will marshal the resources of the State Department of Agriculture to provide assistance to farmers to keep abreast of and learn to adopt technology as it becomes available.

I can only applaud that policy, but a matter of weeks ago we saw farmers, who are being brought to their knees in some instances by Government inaction, marching here in the streets of Adelaide where they were addressed by the Minister of Agriculture.

**Mr Plunkett:** Were they just farming stock?

**Mr MEIER:** No, I marched in that march as well. Shall I say they were rural people.

**Mr Plunkett:** Where did they park their Mercedes? They are millionaires. Can you explain that?

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! I call the honourable member for Peake to order.

**Mr MEIER:** If we want to get into that sort of thing, we could look at Mr Gallagher, too—a union organiser. I suppose he has Mercedes vehicles left, right and centre. He would have Mercedes overseas. I am amazed that he did not have a private plane out of this place.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable member to address the Chair.

**Mr MEIER:** If the honourable member wants to see some farmers who are really finding the going tough I invite him to come with me to my district for a day. I will take him around to meet them. They will tell him just what the situation is.

**Mr Plunkett:** Just the farmers, not millionaires dressed up like swagmen.

**Mr MEIER:** It shows how far from reality the member for Peake is. It saddens my heart to hear him interjecting

on something he knew about years ago, but he does not realise that things have changed now in the rural sector.

**Mr Plunkett:** Don't try to put one over. Where you have millionaires dressed as swagmen—

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr MEIER:** If the honourable member identifies them I will be happy to acknowledge anything that he says there.

**Mr Plunkett:** They see the photos. They know the people, from the South-East.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable member to resume his seat. I ask the House to come to order.

**The Hon. D.C. Brown:** Name him!

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** I do not need any assistance from the member for Davenport. This debate relates to the Address in Reply and allows members to have a free ranging debate. I have been extremely tolerant on all matters to which the honourable member wishes to refer. It has been the custom in this House that whoever has the floor is heard in reasonable silence and I ask the House to respect that situation. The honourable member for Goyder.

**Mr MEIER:** What happened at the farmers march—the address in Elder Park—was that the Minister of Agriculture virtually got stuck into the farmers. Did he, as their Minister, have any sympathy for them? No way! In fact, he virtually said to them, 'A lot of you will be unemployed. You will have to sell up and get out.' It astounded me, and I dare say everyone who heard the Minister, that there was no compassion or sympathy for the situation that they were in. It was just too bad: 'Why do you come to me as a Minister looking for help?'

I compare that with the response of the Federal Minister, and I believe—I will give credit here—the Prime Minister, who apparently offered some sympathetic words, but in South Australia the Minister could well have had this sheet of paper detailing the ALP's policy and burned it or ripped it to bits, saying 'This is what I think of ALP policy, because we said that we would help you. No way!' It is a poor reflection on this Government and the Minister that the farming community and rural producers should have been dealt with in that way. It was an absolute disgrace, and they will not forget it.

Another promise, under the heading 'The wine industry'—there are certain wineries and grape growers in my electorate—says:

An ALP Government will put into operation the wine industry policy. That policy foreshadowed legislation to provide funds for the operation of regional councils representing both growers and winemakers.

Have we had legislation passed through this House? Have we had the opportunity to discuss it? Have the people outside? Maybe there has been a word mentioned of the possibility. The Government is running out of time, and here is a promise which it made and which I believe will not be fulfilled. Maybe it should have put a rider on and said, 'in the next 10 or 20 years', but it reads here as though it was going to be in this three year term of office. So much for its thoughts towards the grape growers and the winemakers! We can add an extra item there:

An ALP Government will continue to press the Commonwealth Government to give a guarantee that a wine tax will not be introduced.

What a laugh that is! We have seen that come up in this House on many occasions, when the Premier was a complete failure when it came to trying to speak with Canberra. We should not blame the Premier altogether, because the Hawke Government came into power on an unequivocal promise that under its Government there would be no wine tax, so, I guess that it is in Labor Party policy that it should make sure that what it promises it will break. It is pretty

good at doing that, both at the State level and at the Federal level.

Another promise under 'The fruit and vegetable industry', states:

An ALP Government will provide a suitable site on favourable terms and conditions—

this is for a wholesale market; at least, we have seen the disclosure of the site, and I acknowledge that—

and will assist the industry to build a new market on that site.

The latest information I have is that the Government has said, 'Look, there is no way we can provide you with assistance to build it. You are going to be on your own.' I wonder how it interprets its policy statement on that one.

Another one relates to growers markets. It says that an ALP Government will ensure the introduction of growers markets on a trial basis, and that, following an assessment of these trials, an ALP Government will assist groups of growers to form co-operative markets where appropriate.

Again, I remember reading something about a discussion—I do not know that it even got to the discussion stage—but certainly I do not think that trial basis has gone on. How much time has the Government got left—three or four months? Or will we be going earlier?

Under Market Development, Domestic, it states that an ALP Government will assist the industry to promote fruit and vegetables on the domestic market on the basis that fresh is best. We would have to applaud that statement. I wonder about that, in view of the way that the Government decided to do away with the Potato Board, when we heard many arguments put forward here that the fresh aspect has been an integral part of the potato industry. Some of my potato growers said to me, in only the last week and a half, that they have seen examples of ultrapoor quality potatoes coming on to the market—potatoes that they said they would not even feed to their stock. If that is the case, then we, as the consumers of potatoes, are losing out because of the Government's interference.

Under the potato industry, it says that an ALP Government will, at the request of the industry, commission a discussion paper on the industry and then submit it to a parliamentary committee of inquiry to provide the basis for changes to present legislation. Here, again, we saw where the Government decided that it would move in the potato industry whereas the legislation in place allowed the potato industry to decide its own future after consultation with the Government, but that consultation did not proceed with respect to wanting a poll. We perhaps dealt with that in the previous session of Parliament. So the Government's record in the rural sector, in just those areas that I have highlighted, has not been too good.

I would like to come back to His Excellency's speech and refer to another item, namely:

Increasing costs of production are of great concern to my Government. In the coming session legislation will be put before you designed to significantly reduce the cost of workers' compensation.

If we were looking at that, in today's *News* on page 12, we see an item headed 'Compo reform cost slammed'. It says:

The costs of South Australia's proposed Government-controlled workers' compensation reform have been criticised. The National Insurance Brokers Association executive director, Mr Murray Sainsbury, said costings of the scheme were out of line. The State Government intends a major reform of workers' compensation with a Government authority assuming control of the system. Mr Sainsbury branded the scheme as a 'red herring of bureaucracy'. 'At this stage the scheme is not right,' he said.

It does not take a lot of common sense to realise that, if we have only one insurance company, competition will disappear. Then what will stop rates from going up? Possibly we will have the opportunity to say a lot more about that when the legislation is introduced. I wonder whether Mr

Sainsbury will be proved correct or otherwise. We noticed also in the Governor's speech:

Legislation will shortly be introduced to secure proper retention and management of native vegetation. The measures have been devised in concert with the United Farmers and Stockowners, and will include positive financial incentives to aid farmers in maintaining what remains of our natural environment and wild-life habitat.

Whom do we blame for the absolutely disastrous situation that has prevailed for at least two years in this State in relation to natural vegetation clearance? Once again, it is the Government: a Government that, on its election to office, maintained that it would consult before it acted. However, it soon decided that it would have to forget about that promise, because it wanted to act first. So, the Government took the unprecedented step of stopping vegetation clearance.

This has again hit the rural community—those people who have debts of some tens of thousands of dollars, in some cases hundreds of thousands of dollars, in relation to properties purchased on the understanding that clearance could be undertaken. However, they were told that they could no longer clear vegetation. How do those people then service that debt? Many examples will be put forward (not so much from the Goyder District but in relation to other areas of the State) of people being unable to service their debts and, unfortunately, becoming bankrupt. This is a terrible situation where one Minister, through his proclamation, has broken these people. There are many others who have not been broken but who have had their livelihoods severely reduced, and over the past two years they have found life to be a very hard struggle. Those people will certainly be looking to this legislation for some relief. I wonder whether there will be retrospective compensation, as compensation is paid in many other areas of the workforce. Why should rural producers be adversely affected? In his speech, the Governor further states:

My Government is also concerned at the continuing high levels of unemployment among young people. Its economic policies are directed to ensuring maximum possible opportunities for all South Australians to find work; however, it particularly wishes to provide young people with the skills necessary to make the transition to the workplace.

We had a significant debate today about where the Government has failed to date. Obviously, the Government still maintains that it is concerned, and rightly so, and I acknowledge the concern that everyone should have in relation to the unemployed.

**The Hon. D.C. Brown:** It's a pity that they don't back it up with action.

**Mr MEIER:** It is a pity that the Government has wasted time for the past 2½ years. However, the Government now realises that it could be thrown out of office because it has done nothing and that it had better ensure that an advertising campaign is instituted. However, because the Government cannot afford this, it has decided that it will get the taxpayer to pay for its advertising campaign. Also, the Government has realised that, thanks to the Federal Government, at least there are a few CEP schemes and that it can try to blow them up a bit.

**Mr Baker:** They probably thought that they had the votes, anyway, and did not have to make an effort.

**Mr MEIER:** Maybe the Government has looked at the polls and seen that the youth are disenchanted with the Government and with the Federal Government as well, and why shouldn't they be?

**Mr Mayes:** What's your policy? What are you going to do?

**Mr MEIER:** Some members in this House are far removed from what is supposed to be happening, although I am sure that it has been pointed out to the honourable member

twice that the Liberal Party's policy has been out for some period of time. Yet the honourable member continues to ask what is our policy.

**Mr Mayes:** What is it?

**Mr MEIER:** I am sorry that the honourable member was not in the House, or did not listen, earlier today when aspects of the policy were clearly enunciated. However, a copy of the matters referred to can be provided to the honourable member later. Possibly \$150 000 up to \$300 000 of taxpayers' money could be spent because of Government bungling in not doing anything for youth. The Government's time in office is nearing an end. His Excellency's speech also states:

My Government is well aware of its responsibility to ensure that its own administration is both efficient and responsive to the public it serves.

I hear mirth from one of my colleagues, and understandably so. It has disappointed me that on quite a few occasions there has not been responsibility or efficiency with respect to the administration of this Government. I will cite a couple of examples, the first of which involved the transfer of land within a family from the parents to one of the sons. The value of the land was ascertained to be \$500 per acre by looking at the local government assessment, and the transfer went ahead at that price.

When the matter went to the appropriate division in the Department of Lands the assessor said that he would not accept \$500 per acre and believed it should be \$600 per acre. His stand was based simply on a recent sale in an adjacent area where the land had sold for \$600 per acre. The assessor had not appreciated that the amount of land sold was much smaller in that case and that that can sometimes inflate the amount received. He had not appreciated that that land was also significantly different and of better quality. It was decided simply that the land must be the same because it was fairly close.

My constituent's solicitor felt that he could not have the valuation changed. I was approached to see whether some commonsense could come into the matter. I saw the Minister and put the situation in as clear terms as I could. I give credit to the Minister: he acknowledged that \$600 per acre was too much and came half way, saying that he would make it \$550 an acre. As the deal had to go through, my constituents were not prepared to continue negotiations to see whether they could get \$500 an acre. As a result of my personal intervention, they saved some thousands of dollars. Why did that have to happen? I hope that the statement that the Government is well aware of its responsibility to ensure that its own administration is efficient and responsive to the public it serves will take place, because that is one example where it has not done so.

Another example in relation to land involved land that was to be transferred from leasehold to freehold. A Government assessor looked at the land and assessed the property. The owner disputed the figures, but the assessor said that the figures were correct and that he had looked at it fully. The owner then hired his own land assessor. The figures from that assessor were about half those of the Government assessor. Naturally, someone was wrong: there had been a mistake.

The Government assessor was again approached and asked how he came to his valuation, in reply to which he said that that was his own business. The owner asked the assessor to show him the figures that he used and to say on what they were based. Other than being told that they were based on general land values in the area, the owner received no satisfaction. Once again, these constituents came to see me as their local member. Although this matter has not been finalised, I acknowledge the intervention of the Minister who made the Government's assessor provide the figures

and information that he used to arrive at that land value. Why could that not have occurred in the first place? Why this closed Government? Why does it take a ministerial directive to open it up when commonsense dictates that the figures used by a Government assessor could be looked at by a private assessor? I am interested to see to what extent the Government can remedy the administration in this and many other areas.

The area of waste is one that we can look at in further detail, and I will quote some examples from my electorate. Some aspects may not be regarded as involving waste but rather as poor decision making. I refer first to road maintenance work that has taken place in many parts of my electorate. The roads in much of Goyder, particularly on Yorke Peninsula, are atrocious in some parts and need huge amounts of money spent on them. We are well aware that this Government decided that \$15 million less per annum should go into the Highways Fund and that, therefore, the roads will deteriorate at a faster rate.

**Mr Ashenden:** Even though they increased the petrol tax.

**Mr MEIER:** Of course, the petrol tax has been implemented. We could ask the Federal Government why it keeps increasing it but will not index the small portion that goes towards road maintenance. What disturbs me particularly is that a lot of attention is being paid to supposed repairs to our roads. Unfortunately, some roads that I have seen are worse after they have been repaired. I know of one area that was scooped out and new rubber was put down; it was then built up and the top dressing was added. However, it is now bumpier and has plenty of loose stones, so vehicles tend to slide through it. Although it tests the skills of the older driver, I suppose the younger drivers enjoy it.

**Mr Ashenden:** It's good for the windscreen repairers.

**Mr MEIER:** Yes, it is good for the windscreen repairers and manufacturers. Those road repairs, which occurred not long ago, are regarded as a retrograde step, and this matter will be looked at further. I can cite another case where a road had some cracks and was repaired, but there are now worse bumps in the road. The material used was of very poor quality, and it seems to be breaking up rapidly. I bring this matter to the attention of the House because, in 1985, why should we put up with repair work which is vastly inferior to work I remember being carried out some years ago?

I acknowledge that some repair work has been carried out properly and resulted in a much better road, but this is an area that I hope the Government is going to look at. The wages and materials involved would cost the taxpayer hundreds of thousands of dollars, but money is going down the drain on road repair work that is producing worse rather than better roads.

Another matter which I regard as involving waste is when the community is not allowed to use an area which is otherwise readily available to them and which could work towards the betterment of that community. I refer in particular to the Port Clinton dump. This is a dump site which is fairly close to the coast. It is used by many tourists and also by many locals. It adjoins a swamp area, which unfortunately was handed back by the council some years ago to become a national park, and that is causing problems in some areas. Once you walk through the swamp area you come to a beach, which is an excellent crabbing beach.

*The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:*

**Mr MEIER:** No, Port Clinton is across the gulf from there. This area near the Clinton dump can be developed for tourism by extending the dump and placing filling and metal on top of it so that cars can drive from the existing highway across the swamp onto the beach. The council has quite a reasonable proposal in that respect. The proposal

has been put to the Minister, and I must say that his initial reaction was positive.

I do not know whether it was the Minister for Environment and Planning or his advisers, but the matter was considered and it was decided that it should not proceed. I am worried that we are wasting money in the sense that waste material costs nothing—it is going to be dumped, anyway. It would not cost much to place waste material in the swamp area, and it is possible to stop any chemical leakage that may occur. I believe that this can be done without any real trouble. Over a period of some years that would then create a causeway through to the beach, giving tourists easy access. It will also stop tourists walking through the swampland; that occurs at present in a 'come as you may' fashion. There are no set paths through that swamp area. I think that ministerial intervention could have helped in this matter. At present this matter has not been resolved and I know that the Port Clinton council is determined that it should be allowed to go ahead. I guess the matter will have to be resolved between local government and the State Government.

Wastage could also be considered in relation to certain CEP schemes and the compulsory unionism aspect, about which people have approached me. I appreciate that unemployed people have received real benefits from some CEP schemes, particularly those who have found permanent jobs afterwards. However, I am disturbed that some of these unemployed people have received work and they are wanting to try and save every dollar they can in case things do not work out for them after they have completed the scheme. What has happened in so many cases is that the union has stepped in and told these people that, if they are not prepared to join a union before signing up, they will not receive a job. Why should these people be forced to sign away hundreds of dollars to a union when they are finding it very difficult in unemployed times to make ends meet?

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** It's blackmail.

**Mr MEIER:** I think that is a good way to describe it. I personally believe that unions have a positive contribution to make. However, I believe that a union must sell itself to its potential users and, in that sense, it is like a company. If people can see that a union has positive things to offer, they will join. When I was a member of a union in earlier years I was happy to join and happy to be a member because I could see that it could produce positive results, and it had positive effects.

If I had been forced to join a union, I think that would have driven me away from it. I felt that the union of which I was a member had a responsible attitude in many areas at that stage. It had its eyes set on things that its members basically believed in; they were quite happy to join and, therefore, fight for those things. However, to force people into a union simply because of a Government directive is not promoting positive unionism.

In education, wastage possibly does not occur so much because money is always needed for maintenance, and schools are invariably very happy to receive maintenance when it comes along. Therefore, wastage is not talked about so much. I believe that wastage occurs and I can think of two specific examples with schools in Goyder. It can occur when short sighted policies are implemented. The first case is Minlaton Primary School, which is on a block of land with the playing fields adjacent and one has to cross a road in each case. Children could cross two roads to get to the two playing fields. It is a safety hazard and a real problem. There is nowhere for the school to expand. However, land is set aside for a new primary school site. What has happened at Minlaton Primary School?

In the last 18 months or so the school received magnificent paving—some of the best paving I have seen. It has

an excellent playing area with a basketball court. Many thousands of dollars were spent on the paving. It received an excellent toilet block and upgrading of some of the very old buildings which, whilst still looking old, are at least not falling apart so quickly. They were recently told that the shelter area would be given a new roof. When I went there recently, the Chairman of the council said that they did not want the roof replaced. I said that he should not knock it back because if money is available they could certainly do with a roof. The argument was that they did not want the roof replaced because they wanted a new school on a new site because the current school is inadequate with respect to playing areas and the safety of the children. The Government has to look at the problem where tens of thousands of dollars are being spent on the school, yet anyone going to that school will acknowledge that its surroundings are unsatisfactory and that a new situation must be looked at.

The Governor also made comment about expenditure and planning for fishing and recreational boating facilities. I would simply like to refer to the fishing industry generally. It is interesting that the Minister of Fisheries also happens to be the Minister of Agriculture. The fishing industry in my area is not terribly happy with the Minister of Fisheries. I spoke to a line fisherman only yesterday and he said that the Minister could not care less about them. That is not my comment but rather someone else's comment.

*Mr Ashenden interjecting:*

**MR MEIER:** Possibly it is right. Fishermen feel that they are not being given a chance to advance their industry and that they do not receive much help from the department, especially around the Goyder District. We can think back to the reaction of the fishermen where their licence fees went up dramatically and the Minister managed to win on that one. A lot of water has gone under the bridge since that time. It is perhaps more with respect to seeing that fishermen do not abuse the fish stocks. The Government has made some progress, but it has a long way to go.

It concerns me that in two recreational fishing towns—Stansbury and Port Vincent—when the matter of protecting the fish stocks for recreational fishermen was brought to the Minister's attention he passed the matter over to local government. In the case of Port Vincent he said it was up to local government to work things out. I know that members of local government are not necessarily experts in the fishing industry and do not see themselves as set up to monitor the situation. Nevertheless, they went ahead with the public meeting and endeavoured to resolve some very unsatisfactory situations that were occurring in that area. Once again, this is a typical example of the Minister's passing it off and saying, 'Don't worry me with your problems. I have better things to do than worry about fishing.'

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** Did the council have the view that it was being used?

**Mr MEIER:** As the member for Alexandra has just pointed out, the council would have thought that it was being used. A few people spoke to me personally, but it would not be right to repeat in this Chamber what was said. The member for Alexandra probably said it in diplomatic terms. I hope that the Government will not wash its hands of the fishing industry but will endeavour to come to terms with the problems that currently exist.

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** Do you think he can physically possibly do that with all those portfolios?

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

**Mr ASHENDEN (Todd):** I support the Governor's speech, although I must say it is with a degree of pleasure that I realise that this will be the last speech that the Governor will present for the present Government, as an election will

intervene between this speech and the next: we will certainly find that, when the Governor presents the next speech, it will contain far more information of value to the residents of South Australia than has been put forward by this Government.

**The Hon. D.C. Brown:** The speech itself is an admission that the Government is on the skids.

**Mr ASHENDEN:** I will take up that point later. The member for Davenport is quite right. The only parts of the speech before us that were any good were those taken straight from Liberal Party policy. That is an indication that even the members of this Government realise that, after the next election, there will be a Liberal Government in South Australia. Personally, I do not mind when the Premier calls the next election, whether it is tomorrow, in one week, in a month or in six months—the result will be the same. It is just a matter of by how many seats the Liberal Party wins the next election. If honourable members had been door knocking over the past few months, they would realise only too well the way in which the public of South Australia is perceiving the Government. The polls that have been released in the *Bulletin*—

**Mr Mayes:** What about today's poll?

**Mr ASHENDEN:** I am happy to talk about today's poll: it involved the Federal Government. Let us talk about State Government polls. The last three *Bulletin* polls—

*Mr Mayes interjecting:*

**Mr ASHENDEN:** I will explain in words of one syllable for the member for Unley. Let him enjoy tonight, because he will not have many more days to enjoy in this place. In words of one syllable, I will explain the position to the member for Unley: the fact is that the poll referred to in today's *News*—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! It should not be necessary for the Speaker to interrupt an Address in Reply debate, but my deputy remarked earlier tonight (and I support him in this) that an Address in Reply speech should be heard in a courteous manner.

**Mr ASHENDEN:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. As I was pointing out, the poll referred to in today's *News* related to the Federal Government. If members opposite look at past copies of the *Bulletin* they will see that the last three polls conducted into the South Australian Government show a steady move away from that Government; so that, even with the metropolitan bias that exists, the Liberal Party is now 5 per cent ahead of the Labor Party. If we take account of the country weighting, we find that the Liberal Party is even further ahead. I look forward not only to returning to this place with an increased Liberal majority but also to having two Liberal colleagues join me as the members for Florey and Todd.

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** And one or two others down on the coast.

**Mr ASHENDEN:** I can certainly speak with a good deal of knowledge about the moves in the north-east suburbs: there is no doubt that there will be a major swing to the Liberal Party in that area in the next election.

I would now refer to some activities that have occurred since the Parliament last sat. The Premier's decision to appoint a fourth Minister in the Legislative Council must be commented on. After all, the Legislative Council, according to Labor Party policy, is a House that should be abolished. Despite that fact, the Premier has appointed a fourth Minister in that House, something that has never been done before. We must ask ourselves why that occurred. There is only one answer, namely, that the House of Assembly is bereft of any ability on the Government back benches. What a smack in the eye for some of those ever-hopefuls on the back bench such as the member for Florey.

**Mr Baker:** The member for Hartley.

**Mr ASHENDEN:** Yes, the member for Hartley; one could go on. All of them thought that they had a good chance of becoming Ministers, yet none of them was appointed by the Premier. The point that he has made is that members of this House on the Government benches lack ability. It was said that the new Minister was appointed in the Legislative Council because the Government wished to appoint a woman, but there are two women members on the back benches in this House, so that was not the reason: it was because the Premier decided to appoint an extra Minister in a House that the Labor Party wants to abolish purely and simply because of the lack of ability of Government members in this House.

Let us look at some other Government actions over the past few months. We find that the Government is trying to move more and more into ground occupied by the Liberal Party. This Government is totally bereft of any ideas. Let us look at some of the so-called initiatives mentioned in the Governor's speech. Let us look, first, at the matter of the unsworn statement. Shall we remind members opposite about the way in which they debated the issue of the unsworn statement when the Opposition tried to amend the Government's legislation to abolish such statements. Every member who spoke on the Government side—

**Mr Baker:** Wouldn't have a bar of it.

**Mr ASHENDEN:** As my colleague says, they would not have a bar of it.

**Mr Baker:** They didn't want to protect women.

**Mr ASHENDEN:** No. However, suddenly, because the polls are showing that law and order is a major issue, the Government says that abolition of the unsworn statement is a good idea. I emphasise 'good idea', because we have known all along that it was a 'good idea'. Suddenly, however, it is a good idea to the Government. Why? Because it wants to move into ground that is occupied by the Opposition. We have said for years that the unsworn statement should be abolished. Now the Government is saying, 'Heavens above, we had better show that we have some law and order in us—we had better move into the unsworn statement.'

What about vegetation clearance? Can members recall how the Government fought what the Opposition tried to do in relation to vegetation clearance? What do we find now? The Bill that the Government is to introduce is virtually identical to the amendments that the Opposition wanted when this matter was debated not so long ago.

Let us look at other claims that the Government is making. The Premier is claiming the Cooper Basin pipeline as his initiative, yet that was completed long before he came to power. The railway station redevelopment was in the planning stages before this Government came to power. The Premier says that the Grand Prix is his idea. What do we find? The Grand Prix was an initiative of the Jubilee 150 Board, which the Premier snatched, and he is now claiming the Grand Prix as his own idea. On Saturday I was unfortunate enough to be at a function in the north-eastern suburbs that was opened by the Premier. In his opening speech he made a couple of remarks that I must comment on. First, he referred to Technology Park, which he claimed was a Labor Government initiative. However, it was built before this Government came to office. What else did he talk about? He mentioned the O-Bahn system, which he says is an initiative of the Labor Government. In fact, in his speech the Premier said, 'The O-Bahn is proceeding on time.'

It might be on time for this Government, but had the Liberal Party been returned to Government in 1982 the O-Bahn would have been completed right through to Tea Tree Plaza in 1986. As it is, because it will be halfway the Premier now says that it is 'on time'. Shortly, I will embarrass

the Minister of Transport, because I will quote back to him words that he used in this House to describe O-Bahn not so long ago, the words that the Premier used and words that other members of the present Government used in this House between 1979 and 1982, when they absolutely castigated the then Liberal Government for its decision to implement O-Bahn. Now, it is the greatest thing since sliced bread!

Honourable members should have heard the Premier eulogising about O-Bahn, but did he give any recognition to the fact that it was an initiative put forward by the Liberal Government? Oh, no! This Government cannot even be honest enough to give recognition to where developments were initiated. Once the Labor Party used to have some ideals, but now its only ideal is to win government at any cost, and I will dwell on taxes and charges in far more detail tomorrow and later when we have an opportunity to speak to the Government's Bill, introduced today, relating to the spending planned.

Last evening I was delighted to attend two meetings in my electorate—one of some kindergarten personnel and parents of children attending kindergartens, and another at a sporting club. That was just after the Premier had made his announcement about the tax cuts. I have no idea of the political leanings of the people present at those meetings, but I was absolutely staggered at the comments made to me and by the discussions between these people in their own groups about that action. They have seen through the Premier's announcement only too well. I did not have to raise the matter: it was raised with me. I did not have to use the word 'cynical': it was used by someone speaking to me. Other comments were made such as, 'Does he really believe that we are going to forget what he has done in the first 2½ years?' One person asked me that last night. In other words, one cannot change a leopard's spots.

Let us go back to 1979, when the then Leader of the Opposition (now the Premier) went to the people of South Australia and said, 'Elect me, and there will be no increases in taxes or charges: no new taxes will be introduced.' What is more, when a reporter asked him on television, 'How can you say that if you do not know what the situation is in the Treasury?' he said, 'I have been briefed; I know what the situation is in Treasury and I can therefore make this promise.' Those were the Premier's own words.

He has had many lessons from Nifty Neville, in New South Wales, and other Labor leaders throughout Australia, who said, 'Listen, you will not be able to live up to that promise. We will tell you what we did. After we got in we slammed the previous Liberal Administration, and it worked well. You should do the same.'

That is exactly what our Premier did. After having said that he knew what the situation was, he suddenly washed his hands and said, 'Oh, no. I was not told what Treasury was like. I had no idea.' One cannot trust that man: he is totally deceitful and will say anything he can to curry favour in the electorate. What is he doing with these changes? He will bring in a so-called reduction of electricity tariffs—\$2 a quarter a bill. As someone said to the Premier on a talkback programme yesterday, 'What the heck is \$2 compared with what you have slugged us with already?' It shows that the public of South Australia can see only too clearly what this Premier is up to. Once again—

**Mr Groom:** It was your agreement.

**Mr ASHENDEN:** Right, but there is one big difference. We will certainly index taxes and charges when we are elected at the next election, but we will take action that this Premier has not done, because if he and any members opposite have ever operated a business they would know that if one is to reduce one's income one has to reduce one's expenses. But have we heard anything from this Pre-

mier about how he will reduce expenses? No! All we know is that the E&WS deficit will blow out by an extra \$22 million; the STA deficit will blow out by an extra \$10 million; the ETSA deficit will blow out by another \$10 million. In other words, because he is trying to buy votes, the next Government that comes into power will inherit a situation where, unless action is taken to reduce the cost of Government, taxes will have to be increased. I will repeat those words for members opposite; unless we have a Government that will take action to reduce Government costs—and a Liberal Government will—then we will have to have severe increases in taxes.

The Labor Party refuses to take any action to reduce Government costs and waste. It is not a matter of when it is returned. It knows that it will not be returned because it is saying to itself, 'It does not matter what we promise: we will not have to live with it.' At the same time it is trying to con the public of South Australia. I was absolutely delighted with the comments that were going around last night, because those people were saying exactly what we are saying. They have said, 'The Premier cannot be believed.' In other words, they know only too well that if a Labor Government were returned there would be steep increases next year. They have been bitten once: they know what the Premier did with his last promise, and they are saying that that is exactly what he would do with this promise. I do not care when the Premier calls his election—in a week, a month or six months; a Liberal Government will be returned. The only question is: by how big a majority?

I will look now at some issues that relate closely to my electorate. The first to which I will address myself is the O-Bahn system, which the Government has now grasped. It is now the greatest thing that this State has. The Labor Government is saying, 'It is our initiative; we did it out there. Mr and Mrs Elector of the north-eastern suburbs, you be thankful to the Labor Government for what it is doing with O-Bahn.'

The point is that the O-Bahn system was an initiative of the previous Liberal Government. I will place on the record comments that were made by members of the then Opposition between 1979 and 1982. First, the then member for Florey talked about 'the impracticability of the O-Bahn system'. The then member for Norwood (now a Minister in this Government) said:

The most irresponsible and the most ill thought out must be the O-Bahn proposal.

He also said (there are so many other comments):

It was regarded by the great majority of people as an election gimmick... The Minister has justified the extension of the O-Bahn technology to the Tea Tree Plaza area on spurious grounds indeed... ill thought out proposal.

I look now at what the then member for Salisbury (again, a Minister in the present Government) said:

The bad news was my discovery at Rastatt, in the Federal Republic of Germany, where I visited the Daimler-Benz facility. I thank the Foreign Affairs officials and Daimler Benz for giving me the opportunity to ride on the O-Bahn bus... I have to say that my conclusion from my experience with the O-Bahn is that the Minister of Transport and I have been taken for a ride...

He also said:

But a simple deduction about O-Bahn indicates that 80 per cent of travellers on the future O-Bahn system, if it ever has the misfortune to come into existence, must have a change of mode ahead of them.

There are further quotes from that honourable member:

If the Minister wants to experiment with little toys from Rastatt, he should consider more realistic ways of going about it than through the State purse.

The next quote is from the present Minister of Education:

The only cost would be the knuckles that he had to put on the buses—

and I will interpose here and state that, prior to this point being made, the member for Salisbury said that to save money we should not build buses to use the O-Bahn system, we should merely put knuckles, as he called them, on the existing buses so they could travel on the O-Bahn track. The Minister of Education said:

The only cost would be the knuckles that he had to put on the buses. These could be sold to Sims Metal at the end of it. Instead, he has decided at the outset on what is still an experiment to buy the complete bus system and units. We could have 150 passenger buses romping all over the city of Tea Tree Gully.

He then said:

That seems to be a gross misuse of the passenger capacity. I think the move into the O-Bahn system at this point by the Minister could be regarded in no wise as being a sound one.

This is now the project that the Government has grabbed with open arms. Of course, when things are different, they are not the same. The next quote from the now Minister of Education, then in Opposition is as follows:

I believe in fact we will be seeing LRT in years to come, as the O-Bahn proves itself not to be successful. I think that, finally, some years from now, even the Minister himself and the members for Todd and Newland—

and that was the then member for Newland, Dr Brian Billard—

will be saying in this House that the O-Bahn was nothing more than the ultimate Irish joke.

I might also point out at this point that when the first excavation was made in the Hope Valley/Modbury area for the first bridge for O-Bahn, it was described by members of the Labor Party in that area as, 'Ashenden's graveyard'. Incidentally, the now Minister of Education also said in this speech, after he had made that point, that the member for Todd would not be back after the next election anyway. I am delighted to say that he was wrong not only about O-Bahn, but about that matter.

**The Hon. Michael Wilson:** Especially as he was one of the few who went to have a look at it.

**Mr ASHENDEN:** I thank the honourable member for that interjection. That is perfectly true. It is not as though the present Minister of Education was speaking without first-hand experience. He had been there and seen the bus in operation. I can only think that, for his own personal or political reasons, he did have plenty to say, as we find from the quotes I am bringing forward. Here is another one:

The Minister could play around with his O-Bahn at much less expense and if, as I strongly believe, the system is not adequate for our needs and does not meet the needs of the north-eastern suburbs residents, the changeover could be done at much less cost.

He was talking about the then Minister of Transport, the Hon. Michael Wilson. Let us look at comments made by other members. It is interesting to note that the present Minister of Education does not live in the north-eastern suburbs, although he is pretty close to them, but the member for Playford actually has part of his electorate in the area that would be affected by O-Bahn. Let us look at some of his remarks in the House:

My own view is that we have been robbed... the absurdities of this new proposition... it will cause great concern to anyone (and is not that all of us) concerned with the impact on the environment of the Torrens Valley... there is no guarantee at all that it will work... at the least it was a risky experiment and at worst a potential disaster. When Government members in the north-eastern suburbs—

and that was the then Government members, the member for Todd, myself and the member for Newland, Dr Billard—

stood in the last election, they promised a viable transport system and they have not produced it. I say to the members for Newland and Todd (because I have been taken up on a point of order I am not allowed to put in all of the material that I could once

have put in) that they will be brought to account because of this question.

He further states:

The O-Bahn system, as any dimwitted fool would know, is the most polluting system of any of the systems that have been discussed. The O-Bahn solution has been proposed and approved only because it is an easy political way out for the Government—

**The Hon. Michael Wilson:** Who said this?

**Mr ASHENDEN:** The member for Playford while a member of the Opposition, now the Speaker of the House and a member of the Government Party. He went on to say:

... it is a way in which the Government can salve the wounds of its moneyed supporters in the wealthy inner suburbs surrounding Walkerville... the residents of the north-eastern suburbs have been robbed.

The fact is that this Government [that is, the former Liberal Government] was committed to a stupid programme, not for rational transport reasons about which its advisers are grossly embarrassed, but for devious political reasons. The residents of the north-east suburbs have been robbed without a trial. It is a disgrace.

I think those comments make the point about how the honourable member felt about the matter.

I now refer to some of the comments of the Premier, who on Saturday was claiming all the glory for the O-Bahn system and telling the residents of the north-eastern suburbs that the project was proceeding on time. All I can say is that if half completion by 1986 is considered to be running on time, the Premier has a funny way of looking at the truth, although we know that only too well. I want to refer to some of the comments made by the former Leader of the Opposition, the present Premier, about the system that he is now embracing. He said:

... regrettably, the whole issue was thrown into the melting pot... there was a rather vain chasing after alternative options and, even more regrettably, the Government finally came to a decision which is totally unworkable, which will be costly and which is a step backwards in terms of modern public transportation. We will find that out to our cost.

At that time, he further stated:

The Government's decision to build a busway in part of the Modbury corridor is a matter of grave concern... we believe that it is irresponsible for the Government to experiment with an untested and technically suspect mode of transport.

At the stage when the present Premier was seeking to debate the issue in Parliament to force the then Government to change its decision to implement the O-Bahn system, when he was speaking in the debate on the motion for that debate, he said that the member for Todd could lead the debate, 'as he seems totally committed and totally dedicated to this scheme'.

Truer words have never been spoken. It is the only time that I have known the Premier to tell the truth. The introduction of the O-Bahn system into South Australia was due to the Hon. Michael Wilson's initiative and hard work. As honourable members opposite know, I travelled to Germany at my own expense (because at that time there was no Government subsidy for members to travel overseas) to study the system. I have no embarrassment (indeed, I have only pride) in saying that the then Leader of the Opposition's words are only too true. I am and always have been totally committed and dedicated to the implementation of the O-Bahn scheme. I defy any member opposite to instance an occasion either in debate in this place or outside when I have ever indicated anything other than total support for the scheme. My one regret is that the scheme has been delayed by the present Government for two years. It should have been much further developed, but the Government deliberately underspent its budget on the O-Bahn system. The Minister of Transport might like to respond to this: he is presently in the Chamber.

*The Hon. Michael Wilson interjecting:*

**Mr ASHENDEN:** I do not think the Minister likes this, because it is a fact that the present Government deliberately underspent its budget on the O-Bahn system, and it is now two years delayed. The Premier had the gall on Saturday to say that the O-Bahn system is running on time. This is just another mischief and mistruth from this dishonourable and dishonest Premier. The Premier further stated:

He—

and he was there referring to the then Premier—

knows that we do not support the O-Bahn system and that, in fact, we have a contrary and extremely well founded view in opposition to it. We are not going to be supporting the member for Todd's motion.

The motion I moved in the House on 17 September 1980 stated:

That this House commends the Government—  
that is, the then Government—

on its decision to immediately proceed with the provision of a modern rapid public transport system utilising all the advantages of conventional and guided busways to serve the people of the north-eastern suburbs of Adelaide and its associated decision to restore and develop the River Torrens in line with the River Torrens Study Report prepared by Hassell and Partners Pty Ltd.

After I moved that motion every then Opposition speaker spoke against it. What sort of hypocrites is the present Government made up of? After having tried to defeat the O-Bahn system and having done everything in its power to stop it coming into this State, the Government now acknowledges that it is a world first, a world leader, which will have tremendous benefits not only to the residents of the north-eastern suburbs but to tourism, because people will come to travel on that system when it is in operation—a system which the present Government tried to defeat but which it is now grabbing.

What really galls me is that the now member for Newland and the ALP candidate for Newland are trying to curry all the favour they can in the *North East Leader* and at local meetings, trying to make out to local residents that the O-Bahn is their baby.

**The Hon. Michael Wilson:** Hypocrisy run rampant.

**Mr ASHENDEN:** Absolutely. Members opposite and their candidates are the biggest hypocrites one could ever imagine. They are dishonest, have no conscience and have no qualms in taking Liberal initiatives and saying that they are theirs, despite the slating they gave the Liberal Government when it was introducing such initiatives. In relation to the O-Bahn system, the present Minister of Transport stated:

If the Minister—

the then Minister of Transport—

delays his visit overseas to view the facility, we will be so far down the track that we will be unable to change what is obviously a wrong policy.

The gentleman who used those words is now the Minister of Transport. The Premier demoted transport down the line to a lesser ranked Minister but that lesser ranked Minister, within a few days of having been given the transport portfolio, could not get on the O-Bahn bus quickly enough with all the media he could summon to say, 'What a marvellous thing this is. Look at what we've got. Look at what we've done for you.' However, we should remember what he said when he was in Opposition. The present Minister of Transport also stated:

The Minister has a responsibility to investigate what he and his Government are imposing on South Australia.

The member for Adelaide, the then Deputy Leader of the Opposition, called it 'a proposal which the public does not support'. I have also been able to find some quotes made in the House by the Minister of Water Resources concerning the O-Bahn system.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** What's the date of that one?

**Mr ASHENDEN:** The reference is page 24 of Estimates Committee A on 21 September 1982, when the Minister said:

I am not overly enthusiastic about the O-Bahn system.

That is a fairly moderate statement, compared with what the other members of the present Government had to say, but then the Minister said:

It will be a burden on the community of South Australia for some years to come.

That was said by a member who represents constituents in the north-eastern suburbs. I have saved until last some of the quotes that were released, first by the Premier when the announcement was made in the *Advertiser* of Tuesday 26 August 1980. He said:

The Leader of the Opposition, Mr Bannon, said the decision to choose the experimental O-Bahn system instead of light rail was cheap and short-sighted.

He then went on to talk about extra congestion that the buses would cause on the roads. He did not really know much about a guided busway, and that is quite obvious from his comments. The current Premier also made reference to the effect on Tea Tree Gully. He is on record in all sorts of places as totally opposing O-Bahn. It is sheer hypocrisy on his part to claim, as he did on Saturday, the credit for that system.

In 1980 the present member for Newland had this to say about O-Bahn:

There is real danger that transport services from the North-East to the city might in many aspects become worse rather than better if the Liberal Government introduced a separate busway or O-Bahn system.

This was stated in a letter to the Editor of the *North East Leader* on 20 August 1980. He then said:

The large articulated buses will create a real traffic hazard in these smaller streets. This must inevitably mean a rerouting of buses along major roads only—

I think we can see that he has an abysmal knowledge of just what the O-Bahn system is all about—

leaving many people with a far longer walk to the nearest bus stop.

He was attempting to generate fear tactics and trying to make the residents of the north-eastern suburbs think that if the O-Bahn system was implemented they would have to walk a lot further to catch their buses. That is totally untrue. He then says:

In fact, the buses themselves would be a major factor in causing traffic problems and the promised 23-26 minute trip could easily become far longer.

Later, he says:

The busway systems will be totally inadequate to cope with the increased demand. Buses following each other every 36 seconds would be bad enough, but if they follow each other say every 25 seconds, they would be a danger to each other let alone the rest of the traffic.

What utter nonsense. Let us remember that those buses will be travelling on the busway at 100 km/h. That is considerably more than 1 km per minute which means that, if they are 25 seconds apart, they are more than half a kilometre apart—and the present member for Newland says that that would be dangerous. What nonsense! He then goes on to say:

There is an overwhelming argument against using any of the busway options.

This is from a member of a Government which is now claiming all the credit for this magnificent busway system—and I mean that: it is a magnificent busway system that is being built for the north-eastern suburbs. We are duty bound to point out to the residents of the new electorate of Todd what has been said by the present member for Newland, who will be the ALP candidate for the District of Todd in the next election. He also said:

There can be few things as ridiculous as taking buses off the road in areas of low traffic density like Tea Tree Gully only to put them back on the road in areas of high traffic density like Walkerville.

Once again, that is an absolutely abysmal ignorance of just what the system will provide. He then went on to say:

South Australia is in danger of spending millions of dollars only to become the laughing stock of Australia in the urban transport field.

That was his final paragraph in that letter to the Editor. There are many other examples of the comments made by the now member for Newland in relation to the busway system. Under the heading 'Hybrid scheme seems doomed to failure', the present member for Newland said:

It is inconceivable that Transport Department engineers could recommend such a hybrid scheme for the north-eastern transport system. It was clearly a political choice. For political reasons the Government has opted for the second best.

He then went on to talk about various aspects and said:

The system might entirely fail. The busway and O-Bahn assured a system of two sets of limitations and two lots of disadvantages... without being able to point to a single place in the world where it is operating as a transport system.

That is nonsense, because at that time it was operating in at least two places. The member for Newland then went on to say that an O-Bahn system will force South Australia to buy all its buses from the one company for the lifetime of the system. I see no criticism with that. After all, Mercedes Benz is recognised as one of the world's best vehicle manufacturers. I see nothing wrong with having a fleet of Mercedes Benz buses, but obviously, at that time, the member for Newland did. The member for Newland also said:

It is an intensely disappointing victory of political expediency over commonsense planning.

That is what the ALP candidate for Todd, the present member for Newland, had to say about the O-Bahn busway. I turn now to the Premier, who said:

The Government's decision to build a busway in part of the Modbury corridor is a matter of grave concern. It is a technically suspect mode of transport.

The Premier goes on in the *North East Leader* of 10 September with many other criticisms of the north-east busway. In another article dated 26 September 1979, the member for Newland said:

It is a disaster for Tea Tree Gully... I am afraid that all the people of the north-east can now look forward to is cosmetic alteration to the present bus system.

This is the system that the member for Newland, all ALP candidates in the north-eastern suburbs, the Premier and the Minister of Transport now support. In fact, the Minister of Transport could not get to the bus quickly enough a couple of days after he was appointed. He went out there as quickly as he could, taking with him the member for Newland, who also could not get there quickly enough, to try and claim credit after having said the things I have referred to about the decision to introduce the O-Bahn system. The member for Newland also talks about increased travelling time and increased pollution and states:

The O-Bahn system is patently unsuited to Australian urban conditions.

The member for Newland also referred to Mercedes salesmen and the benefit that they would get:

Because of that, the north-east will be paying the cost for a long time to come. Mr Klunder said that the Liberal Government should be called on, even at this late stage, to change its mind.

In other words, the member for Newland did not want the O-Bahn system and he wanted the then Liberal Government to change its mind. I also refer to an article written by you, Mr Speaker, as the member for Playford, in the *North East Leader* in which a large number of criticisms were made of the O-Bahn system under the heading 'Light Rail System—We have been robbed'. The article states:

Residents of the outer north-eastern suburbs were no doubt amazed at the decision of the State Government to use the O-Bahn bus system... My own view is that we have been robbed... I thought that I should fairly briefly underline some of the absurdities of this new proposition. In the first place it will cause great concern to anyone concerned with the impact on the environment of the Torrens Valley... There is no guarantee at all that it will work... It is a risky experiment and at worst a potential disaster... It was a rash promise without proper forethought and planning... What we have before us is really a disastrous insult to the residents of the outer north-eastern region brought about by political embarrassment and political cynicism... That environment is 10 times more threatened by the O-Bahn system.

The last comment was in reference to the Torrens Valley. I make the point clearly that the O-Bahn system was proceeded with by the then Government under abuse and all the obstruction that the then Opposition could raise against it.

There are more quotes that I could bring forward, both from the *North East Leader* and also from debates in the House. Another quote of the member for Newland was:

The Liberal Government, trapped as it is by a pre-election red herring, is becoming increasingly isolated on this matter.

I have another article by the member for Norwood under the heading 'Scrap O-Bahn, says Crafter'. He goes on to state that he supported a call by the then Deputy Opposition Leader, Jack Wright, to cancel the project. I am sorry that the Minister of Water Resources has left the House, because he also placed an article in the *North East Leader* stating:

The O-Bahn concept has immense drawbacks and its chances of being adopted are about nil.

**Mr Becker:** When was this?

**Mr ASHENDEN:** Back in about 1980. The present Minister of Water Resources was no more astute then than he is now. Thank goodness the O-Bahn system is proceeding because of the initiative of the previous Liberal Government, despite the fact that the present Government has underspent its budget on O-Bahn deliberately. The project is now two years behind what it should be. It was sickening to have to stand on Saturday and listen to the Premier lauding O-Bahn and claiming the system as his own Government's initiative, telling the residents of the north-eastern suburbs who were present how lucky they were that they had a Labor Government that was building the O-Bahn. What nonsense!

I give credit to the previous Labor Minister of Transport who did not at any time that I could find either in *Hansard* or in the press criticise O-Bahn. That man at least had the sense to wait and see. I am sorry that he is no longer the Minister of Transport because he fought as hard as he could against a Ministry that was opposed initially to O-Bahn. He fought in Cabinet to get the money spent but could not get it. He was the one Minister in Cabinet who never had a word to say against O-Bahn and he was removed from the transport portfolio by the Premier. That again shows only too clearly the cynicism with which the Premier views the project. The Premier tossed from the transport portfolio the only supporter of the project.

Whilst we are talking about the way in which this Government is so cynical, I also address myself to Roxby Downs—the Premier's 'mirage in the desert'. Let us remember what the then Opposition did between 1979 and 1982. The then Liberal Government fought tooth and nail to have Roxby Downs proceed. The then Opposition moved motions in this House against the project. When the legislation to enable the project to go ahead was brought before the House, members opposite opposed it, they called for a division and to a man they voted against the Roxby Downs project. Only because of the support of the Liberal Government, where the Bill then went to the Legislative Council, the Opposition

voted against the project. Only because one of the Labor Party's own members had the courage to cross the floor and vote with the then Government did Roxby Downs proceed. What was that member's reward? The Labor Party sacked him: it kicked him out.

**The Hon. G.F. Keneally:** And the people kicked you out.

**Mr ASHENDEN:** That is exactly what will happen to the Minister and his Government at the next election. I would like the Minister to speak in this debate and answer this question: what would the result of the election have been had the Labor Opposition defeated that project in the Legislative Council and we had gone to the people in 1982 on that basis? I am sure that the Minister will acknowledge that, had his Party voted against Roxby Downs, it would not be in office today. Unfortunately, and much to South Australia's detriment, members opposite were elected, but they will not be re-elected for reasons which I have already outlined. Let us make sure that we have firmly on the record that the present Government did everything it could to defeat the Roxby Downs legislation. Now what do we find? We find that Roxby Downs is great; it is necessary; it will provide thousands of jobs; it will provide a new city. Everything that we said! Now the Government is saying the same thing. The Premier even travelled to Japan to try to sell uranium.

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** He couldn't sell uranium to the Japs, but that's a pretty sensitive subject over there.

**Mr ASHENDEN:** The Premier could not sell tickets in a chook raffle in a pub, let alone sell uranium to the Japanese. I make quite clear that the Premier absolutely castigated the Liberal Government and rubbished the project: he said it was a mirage in the desert—and that was his gentlest term. He was critical of it, as were all members opposite. If members look at the *Hansard* record and the divisions, they will see that at every opportunity the Labor Party opposed that development. Now, it has the gall to come to the people in this way. There is even an advertisement in the newspaper with the Premier telling the people of South Australia what a great thing Roxby Downs is. How that man can live with his conscience I just do not know. He broke the promise that there would be no new taxes and no increased taxes: we saw what that was worth. The Premier did not have the guts to have his Party stick to its original opposition to Roxby Downs. He hopes to be re-elected (but he will not be re-elected), so he says that Roxby Downs is great.

We see advertisements, paid for with Government money, promoting the Premier, who says what a good thing Roxby Downs is. It just goes on and on. I refer again to the meeting that I attended last night. Without my raising the subject, comments were made to me and people asked, 'Does the Premier really believe that we can forget what he has done?' Those people were not just talking about Roxby Downs but about only one of the broken promises. This is an example of the Premier's deceit.

Let us run through the issues again—the statements made about Roxby Downs; the statements made about O-Bahn; and those made and the vote taken in this House when members opposite were in Government and when they defeated a Liberal Opposition amendment to abolish the unsworn statement. I could go on and on. The number of broken promises made by this Government is just incredible. I assure members opposite (and they know only too well) that the public of South Australia will not be duped by this so-called tax reduction. As the Premier said yesterday, the Electricity Trust charge reduction is for one year only.

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** It's \$2 a quarter.

**Mr ASHENDEN:** Yes—and after all the increases that the Premier has stacked on in the past years. Under this

Government taxation has been increased by 52 per cent. The Premier gives back \$41 million and expects the public of South Australia to fall at his feet claiming that he is the Messiah.

This Premier is (and is seen as) the most cynical politician that this State has seen since Dunstan. If he continues in the way in which he is going it will not be long before he is held in even less regard than was that Premier. I could go on recounting many other points about the waste for which this Government has been responsible. I am glad that the Member for Mawson is in the House, because I was disappointed in her and her colleagues this afternoon when she laughed quite loudly when the Leader said that the Government was using taxpayers' funds on a new advertising campaign. If that is the way in which members opposite feel, and if they think that it is funny that the Government is to use \$300 000 of taxpayers funds on a political campaign, I am sorry but my sense of humour is quite different.

I am disgusted that a Government would do that. An advertisement for Roxby Downs has appeared in the paper. The Premier is appearing in all sorts of advertisements and is being promoted by the Government at taxpayers expense for purely political purposes. Members opposite might find that funny, but I do not, and I will certainly let the residents of the north-eastern suburbs know in no uncertain terms that Government members think that it is amusing that this Government is using taxpayers' funds for political advertising. I remind members opposite that in his report the Auditor-General made specific and critical comment of the Government for doing that.

*Mr Becker interjecting:*

**Mr ASHENDEN:** I am sorry; I am told that the New South Wales Auditor-General made a comment about the New South Wales Labor Government for doing that sort of thing, yet we now find this South Australian Labor Government doing the same thing. They have no conscience whatsoever!

**Mr Oswald:** They thought that they could get away with it.

**Mr ASHENDEN:** They probably did.

**Mr Becker:** The South Australian Auditor-General has been asked to comment.

**Mr ASHENDEN:** I look forward to his comment. Regardless of the Auditor-General's comment on this matter, I unhesitatingly express my condemnation of any Government that uses taxpayers' funds for political advertising. This Government has taken \$261 million in extra taxation, and what has it to show for it? I will certainly be pointing out to the residents of the north-eastern suburbs that some of that \$261 million that has been hiked out of their pockets is being used for political advertising.

I turn to other areas of waste. The Government is spending capital funds on the State Transport Authority depot on Hackney Road even though it is to be moved. There is also waste at the swimming centre at North Adelaide. One could go on and on about such matters. The point is that this is a Government of waste, which is trying to buy the electorate with its promises of reduced taxes. However, the residents of South Australia well know that this is an attempt to buy them. It is prostitution! The Premier believes that the residents of South Australia are prostitutes who can be bought. That is nonsense; they are not. I make quite clear that the Government's actions have been seen by the media and the public of South Australia for what they are—an attempt to buy the public. The public knows this only too well.

I pointed out earlier that, unless the Government takes steps to reduce its costs, the deficit will blow out. As the Leader has said, and as our Party promises, State taxes and

charges under a Liberal Government will be increased only in line with inflation. We can make that promise, because we will be taking steps to reduce the cost of Government in this State—

**Mr Becker:** And it is the truth.

**Mr ASHENDEN:** Yes. It is unfortunate that we must follow a Government and a Premier who have been so blatantly dishonest. I will now briefly address a point that concerns me—the very long time that Ministers of this Government take to reply to correspondence. The Premier and all his Ministers are extremely slow at responding to representations, but the worst, without a shadow of doubt, is the Minister of Education. I shall give some examples of the delays I have suffered in my office with correspondence addressed to him. I will not use constituents' names, to protect them, but if the Minister wants the references I will give them to him.

My first example is a letter dated 25 November 1982, and I finally got a reply on 4 February 1983. That is not bad at all for the Minister of Education—only three months! Another letter of 29 September 1983 was responded to on 24 January 1984. I initiated on 1 November 1983 another letter which was finally responded to on 24 December 1984: that is 13 months, after many phone calls and letters reminding the Minister of that correspondence. Another of my letters, of 9 November 1983, was responded to on 13 March 1984; another initiated on 24 February was responded to on 18 December of the same year. Another letter initiated on 15 March 1984 was responded to in July 1984.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Mitcham.

**Mr BAKER (Mitcham):** I support the motion, and I congratulate my colleague the member for Todd on his very well reasoned speech which contained details of a number of indictments of the Government's performance. I shall comment briefly on one aspect of parliamentary performance which has come to my attention over the past almost three years that I have been in this place.

Before Parliament adjourned at the end of the May session, some public statements were made by a member on the other side complaining about the behaviour of the Opposition in terms of keeping the House. When I walked into this place in December 1982 I was appalled at the performance of the Government. That performance did not improve: it treated the Opposition in an absolutely disgraceful way. I recall a number of occasions during grievance debates when no-one on the Government side was in the House. Also, I remember a number of occasions when Ministers handling Bills were not present, nor did they have a senior Minister representing them.

I remember Notice Papers not being available at the start of the parliamentary day, and their arriving after the business had started. The Government has done everything in its power to demean the performance of Parliament over two years. Suddenly, during 1985—an election year—the Government saw that it was doing so poorly everywhere else that it had to use the opportunity to denigrate the Opposition, which has treated Parliament with far more respect than the Government has shown during that time. The Government has been absolutely disgraceful in the way it has trodden on the rights of Parliament. During the progress of the Casino Bill, parliamentary tradition was broken when a private member's Bill was handled during the process of Government business.

We remember many times when the Minister either refused to answer or was not even here to answer questions. The 2½ years of this Government's performance has been abysmal, inside and outside this House. For members opposite

now to claim foul and to say that the Liberal Opposition is not living up to its responsibilities is absolutely farcical, because the treatment we have received under this Government has been quite reprehensible.

Before addressing the performance of the Government I shall comment briefly on certain things that are happening in Canberra. I will take only one aspect of the taxation debate that is currently raging and which, in some ways, will reach a head on the bringing down of the Federal Budget. The Government has determined that there will be no free feeds: it has said that businessmen who entertain clients at lunchtime will have to be taxed.

**Mr Becker:** They haven't heard of the working lunch.

**Mr BAKER:** They have not heard of the working lunch. The Government believes that, because people are operating under an expense account, the company should be liable for tax. I am not sure of the legality of that belief, but perhaps it will amend the law to change responsibility for that provision. However, I expect that we as politicians should be measured by the same stick. As many members in this Parliament know, we spend a great deal of time at functions in our electorates and elsewhere. We invite people to dinner or a snack to discuss problems.

We spend considerable sums of money—I know that my colleagues do and I assume people on the other side do—in talking to people. If we are to use one proposition for the business community we should apply it to ourselves. We as politicians should say, 'There will be no lunches because we are not transacting business.' That is exactly what the Government has said, 'You are not transacting business; you are out there for a free lunch.' As any person who is in touch with the business community will tell honourable members, the best time to conduct business is at the dinner table. That is the time when many great deals are struck.

*Mr Becker interjecting:*

**Mr BAKER:** Indeed, as the member for Hanson points out, many of the largest companies and some of the greatest entrepreneurs would never have got off the ground or would be out of business now if they applied that rule of thumb. If we are to apply a rule of thumb, let us make it to one and all and not just to those select groups that the Government believes can pay the bill.

There has been a great deal of consternation on the part of the Bannon Government about the public perception of its performance. Members on my side of the House will no doubt address the question of taxation very vigorously, and I will just mention it briefly. The Government has suffered in comparison with the former Liberal Government in many other areas. The Premier has spent a great deal of time saying that the Liberal Opposition is knocking the Government's performance, but what a performance! One could only be critical of what has taken place.

I will run through the front bench of the Ministry and demonstrate clearly why the people of South Australia are in the process of repudiating this Government. I will not mention the former Minister of Labour because that is not appropriate, but certainly the Minister for Environment and Planning deserves some form of condemnation for his introduction of native vegetation legislation.

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** What about the administration of it?

**Mr BAKER:** And the administration of it, of course.

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** Or lack of administration.

**Mr BAKER:** I agree with that, too. The Minister for Environment and Planning is a fairly laid back Minister, said to be well in command of his portfolio. That perhaps explains why nothing is happening in that portfolio except

for one initiative in the whole time that he has been its Minister: that is, native vegetation.

I do not know whether he should be dubbed the 'vegie kid', or what other form of address we should use for him, but his administration in this area has been nothing short of disastrous. Can anyone imagine a person bringing in a rule which has caused so much disruption, heartache and hardship, and which has the Government now in the process of having to go through a very expensive mechanism to fix up? Can any Minister, at the end of the day, say, 'I made a decision that not only committed people to doing just what I did not want them to do, but also committed the Government to spend millions of dollars'?

We had a very good system in train before this Government came into power. We had heritage agreements on native vegetation. It was an area that we could have beefed up. If the Minister was concerned about native vegetation he certainly could have used the lead of the Liberal Government to improve it. He could have reached these agreements with the farming community, but he did not. He got this smart, inane idea that suddenly he would make a pronouncement.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr BAKER:** Very smart.

**Mr Trainer:** Could you explain a 'smart inane idea'?

**Mr BAKER:** Exactly. If the member for Ascot Park will look up the dictionary for the word 'smart', he will find that it has two connotations. 'Inane' is very, very clear. 'Smart' is the short track, and this was his short track. Unfortunately, the short track will probably not cost this Government very much, but it will cost the next Administration a lot of money, because of his absolute stupidity and inability to understand a few fundamental principles. That is his crowning glory for his three-year term in Parliament.

I must pay some kudos to the Minister of Transport because he has applied himself diligently. He has the fastest response of any Minister. I know that, if I sent the former Minister of Transport a letter, I would get a response within a week and I would have a considered reply within but a few weeks. The only difficulty he had was he did not sell himself in the same way as some of the other members have sold themselves. Perhaps they have not sold themselves very well. I know that the Premier was not very pleased about their performance and he told them to upgrade their game. He applied himself quietly and diligently. He only made one basic error in his time and that was not to acknowledge the need for the north-south corridor.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr BAKER:** I am talking about the Minister of Marine. I have yet to get to the new Minister of Transport. The Minister of Education made a very promising start, but he has now absolved himself of all responsibilities. One cannot get a response from the Minister of Education in less than three months, and the member for Todd detailed that. Yet he has the hide to send out a letter with Minister of Education, Minister for Technology, Minister of Childrens Services, Minister of Employment and Minister Assisting the Minister of State Development. He cannot even handle the Minister of Education portfolio properly. That is absolutely disgraceful.

The Minister of Local Government, formerly the Minister of Correctional Services, was sacked because of his performance in the gaols area. He presided over gaol burnings, riots and escapes. That is his mark on the Government's performance during the time of the Government. The Minister of Community Welfare is a very hard working person who applies himself diligently to his portfolio—at least, he made the attempt on some occasions—but he has presided over a debacle called the Children's Services Act. What can I say

about the Minister of Mines and Energy in his absence? All I can say is that we are still waiting for our energy policy. The Minister of Recreation and Sport is the Minister who runs an overblown bureaucracy which has its leaks. The Minister of Housing and Construction has presided over the greatest escalation in public housing prices ever seen in this State. We, as a Liberal Government, could have built 20 per cent more houses and provided accommodation for 20 per cent more people with the funds that he had available.

That is the current Government. It is no wonder the Premier is throwing his arms up in the air and looking for a way out of the system. His back bench could not even get a guernsey as a Minister on the front bench. It had to go to the Upper House to fill in the vacancy. That is what we have on the front bench.

The Premier has presided over Dad's Army. That is exactly what this Government has been. It has been a performance of crocks who have a chronic inability to come to terms with what is needed in Government. It was a no tax party before the election, and then it presides over very large tax increases. It did not like Roxby, but it has now taken it on board. The member for Todd has detailed the areas where it has been totally cynical and absolutely bereft of talent, because everything that has been taken on board has been taken on board by the current Administration. I could spend a great deal of time on the lack of talent, ability and performance of the front bench. That is why it is going to get new people in the next few months. It is not only because Ministers break their promises, but because they cannot perform. If they cannot perform, they do not deserve to be there, and quite simply—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr BAKER:** The only way that the member for Unley is going to get into Parliament is via the Speaker's Gallery.

*Mr Mayes interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! I remind the member for Unley that he should not interject, particularly when he is out of his seat.

**Mr BAKER:** I want to make one last brief plea. I refer to a matter that I hope we will consider very seriously in the next Parliament. An article in the *Australian Law Journal* of April 1985, referring to 'Legalese' and 'Courtspeak', states:

Once again the alleged abuse of the English language by parliamentary draftsmen and by the courts has come under attack for unnecessary lack of clarity when plain English prose could just as effectively serve the purpose of the statute or judgment concerned, and because the net result is mystification of the public and lack of proper communication between law givers and citizens. In the writer's experience, these claims of depredation of the English language have been continuously made for over half a century both in the United Kingdom and in Australia, and of course it is hardly necessary to point out that in the nineteenth century Jeremy Bentham and Charles Dickens were among the notable English figures who ceaselessly satirised the unintelligibility of the language of the law.

The article is quite brief, and I commend it to members of the House. I believe that we should make an attempt in this Parliament to simplify the law and to explain exactly what we are doing. People should be able to judge us on the merits of our performance rather than get lost in the mysticism of the laws that we create in this place. I would like all members in this place, Parliamentary Counsel and the people associated therewith to resolve to make clear and concise laws in the next session of Parliament, when in fact the Liberal Party will be in government.

**Mr BECKER** secured the adjournment of the debate.

## ADJOURNMENT

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Transport):** I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

**Mr MAYES (Unley):** The member for Mitcham's performance was very lacklustre, although it was probably his best performance for years. It showed a response to today's polls. Never have members of the Opposition been so grey and quiet as when they were told of the polls today by the Premier. An article in today's *News* states:

In South Australia, where an election looms, voters gave the ALP 50 per cent compared with 40 per cent for the Opposition and 10 per cent for the Australian Democrats.

That is interesting. I have never seen the Leader of the Opposition look so grey, haggard, and worried.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr MAYES:** I will be all right. Do not worry about me. Unley is very good. In fact, it is interesting that the member for Mitcham spruiks about what the member for Unley has to worry about. I have been in part of his electorate. They do not know who he is and have never heard of him. He has never been there to door knock—not once. Many of those constituents told me that it is the first time that they had a politician call on them. That says a lot for a Liberal electorate.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr MAYES:** Members opposite can laugh all they like. I have been out there door knocking, and the member for Mitcham has not. He has been swanning around, as usual. The article also states that in South Australia we will see an election in a few months. We saw the Leader flash down the aisle to what one might call his front bench. He must well look over his shoulder at the member for Davenport, because we wonder what will happen when the Bannon Government is returned. Given the poll, he called out, 'What about the size of the sample?' Even a 3 per cent error is generous and that means 47 per cent to 43 per cent. That does not look very handsome for members opposite. They will be staying in those seats, but there will be fewer of them for company, according to the poll figures.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr MAYES:** It does hurt: it is a bitter pill and we have watched them try to digest it this afternoon. It has been interesting for members on this side to watch such a lacklustre performance from a group that calls itself an Opposition. It is worth having that on record. We will enjoy the next few months of watching the Opposition squirm and wriggle.

It is with great pleasure that I indicate to the House that the Friendly Transport Company is undertaking its move from South Road at Black Forest to its new location at Richmond. It is with great pleasure that most of the residents of Black Forest will see the last few trucks in a few weeks move to the new Richmond site, which is already prepared and will assist that very large business. The past five years, since I have been a candidate and as local member, has been a long campaign. I want members opposite to note that this move has been achieved by this Government under the present Premier, the former Minister of Transport and the Minister for Environment and Planning, now the Deputy Premier. They supported me in the campaign to have this company relocated to an acceptable site so that it could successfully continue business in suitable environs.

One cannot ignore the fact that it is a very large company, employs many people and has a huge turnover. It is one of Adelaide's and South Australia's major transport companies. However, its location was not suitable in relation to the safety of the children of the Black Forest Primary School,

the commuters of Black Forest or those using South Road, particularly with the new Emerson overpass, another achievement of the Bannon Labor Government—a milestone in road safety. I have used that crossing for well over 35 years. I travelled to school by bike along South Road and over the years I have driven through the intersection. My parents, friends and neighbours are delighted to see the overpass completed. It is a great credit to and an achievement of the Bannon Government.

It gives me great pleasure to say that the Friendly Transport Company has undertaken to commence its move. Most of the heavy plant and equipment will be moved in the next few weeks and the office transfer will be completed. They will be relocated at a suitable site at Richmond.

Another matter I wish to raise concerns the Auditor-General's Report in relation to the Public Works Standing Committee. I regard this matter quite seriously, and I know I have the support of members opposite who are members of that committee. I was very disappointed with Mr Sheridan's report with regard to the Public Works Standing Committee, because I have known him for many years and have in fact worked with him.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** On a point of order, Sir. If it is not in Standing Orders, at least it has been made clear to members by circulars from successive Speakers that to mention the names of public servants in this House, and particularly in a critical fashion, is not an acceptable practice.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Ferguson):** I do not uphold the point of order. My advice is that if it is in relation to the work they are doing as public servants then it is quite in order.

**Mr MAYES:** It is extraordinary that the Opposition should raise such a question after the comments made by the Deputy Leader last week, particularly given my temperate comments on the issue on which I am about to speak. The Auditor-General has made a report to the Parliament suggesting certain recommendations and changes that ought to be made with regard to the practices of the Public Works Committee. In the limited time I have I refer very briefly to some of those reports and comments which I believe carry the support of my colleagues opposite.

At one point the Auditor-General makes the comment that four issues are raised in regard to the practice of the Public Works Committee and they are the difficulties of the committee in discharging its responsibilities unless (a) complete and reliable information is supplied and (b) the committee is able to satisfy itself that the information is supplied and it is complete and reliable. I believe our committee has taken the view that it has been reporting to this Parliament for years, asking the heads of departments to follow these sorts of practices. Given our statements and statements of committees prior to my joining it, it has been made quite clear that one of the prerequisite requirements is that the committee, in discharging its responsibilities, must have complete and reliable information. To the best of my knowledge most of the submissions that I have been able to peruse from the various departments have satisfied that requirement.

The second point which I would like to refer to in the Auditor-General's comments to the Parliament in his report which is made in P.P. 180 of 16 May states:

The decision to proceed with upgrading the Adelaide Swimming Centre as a State Aquatic Centre was made on the basis of a consultant's estimate which proved to be substantially inadequate.

On page 2 it states:

It is noted that proposals seeking approval to the increased cost (up \$2.1 million on November 1984 prices or 41 per cent) did not provide:

- (a) any explanation as to the reasons for the increased cost.  
 (b) any assurance that the Adelaide Swimming Centre proposal was still the most appropriate option.

I am speaking as one member of the committee, but I believe its view on that is that whilst the committee had sought reasons for the variations in the cost of the project, the matter has not been formally referred to the committee since it was referred in its appropriate form as a submission from the department.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Alexandra.

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra):** Earlier this evening the member for Flinders referred to the concern of the Eyre Peninsula community in relation to the proposed sale of Sims farm at Cleve. On 30 July 1984 I wrote to the Minister of Agriculture expressing similar concern which had been drawn to my attention by primary producers and those interested in future rural education in that region. On 16 August 1984 the Minister wrote back to me and, among other things, said:

Thank you for your inquiry on the current position of the future of Sims farm at Cleve.

A little later in the letter, the Minister said:

The Government has agreed that the remaining area should be used for the original intention of the will of Mr Sims, namely, a 'research farm' for Eyre region. It was established by the Working Party of the Review of Research Centres that the current location was only representative of a small area of Eyre region and that a research facility on the dune swale country should be provided.

It is fair to say that the Minister went on in his letter and indicated on behalf of his Government that he might consider selling that property and acquiring another and, if so, he would show the late Mr Sims' family the courtesy of naming the latter property after them. Be that as it may, concern has continued to flow through to us by various means from Eyre Peninsula—at the education level from students, from farmers and from citizens with no direct involvement with the rural sector but, indeed, generally from the area overall—at the proposed sale of that farm.

So that the matter is recorded clearly, I place on record that the total property bequeathed to the State in the 1960s by the late Gordon Sims involved an area of some 405 hectares. The first section of 109 hectares near the township was vested in the Cleve Area School in December 1984. The second section of 52 hectares covered with native vegetation was made a district council reserve in March 1985. The land use for those two sections stemmed from recommendations made by the Liberal Party while it was in Government. The remaining section of some 244 hectares of farming land, currently the subject of public auction or public disposal by the Minister, is the area of farmland which is causing so much concern at the moment.

While in Government the Liberal Party was lobbied to dispose of that property and use the money for other purposes. That lobbying came principally from within the Department of Agriculture and, indeed, I must concede that there was some lobbying from within the education area to try and obtain that land. Quite apart from the lobbying, to which the Liberal Party did not respond—except for the transfer of the two portions to which I have referred—we consistently rejected the disposal of that property and upheld what we believed to be the intent of the Sims family at the time the land was bequeathed.

Further to that, we find that the Minister has tried a couple of methods of disposing of the land: first, by making a public statement that he would sell the land by public auction. When that attracted an enormous reaction from the community, the Minister produced another press release indicating that he might consider not selling the land, if the community gave an undertaking that they would not now, nor in the future, seek additional funds for research in that

region. That latter proposal—or ultimatum—was seen to be a blackmail tactic which was totally unacceptable to the community and, as it was released, so too did farmers and others from around South Australia join ranks in their opposition to the Government and to the Minister of Agriculture in particular.

Recently, indeed during the UF&S 1985 convention, a resolution was put overwhelmingly supporting the retention of Sims farm and insisting that the Government withdraw from its earlier proposal. At the moment I understand that the Minister has accepted that it would be not only unpopular but indeed unwise—if not immoral—to proceed to dispose of Sims farm at Cleve. In very recent days—in fact, yesterday—the Minister gave me an assurance that he now proposes to work out the matter to the satisfaction of the Eyre Peninsula community.

I can only say that on the face of it I accept the assurance that he has given and can give an alternative assurance to the Minister and the Government generally that, if that undertaking falls apart, all hell will break loose over this issue. To many in this place it may seem unimportant, but indeed when a rural family of this State goes to the extent that the Sims family did in bequeathing their property to the State for the State and identifying the purposes—they being for rural educational and/or research use—whatever the politics of the Government in office, those intentions should be upheld. I can say now that we not only rejected proposals to dispose of that land and use the money for other purposes during the period we were in Government but also give an undertaking that back in Government again we will not consider the selling of that land nor the disposing of it other than to the Education Department or a local authority for the purposes for which I have identified that its use was intended.

I would briefly draw attention to another matter and give the Minister of Lands the opportunity of addressing himself to it before I further the subject in the Address in Reply debate later this week. It relates to the land on which the Cleve Field Day Society Incorporated holds its machinery show biannually. It has been the practice for a number of years for that society to hold a machinery show there in alternate years to that of the York Peninsula Field Days Society which in fact is being held this week. The land adjacent to that used by the Cleve community for the purposes of raising funds involves something like 26 hectares and to date that land, which has been cropped in appropriate years, and the land adjacent on which they have their structures and facilities for carrying out the field days, is tied up in sections 214, 215, 216, 217, 229, 435 and 441 in the Hundred of Yadnarie in the District Council of Cleve. That land has been occupied for some years on a peppercorn rental.

Indeed, the ultimate payment to the Lands Department previously and over a five year contract period has been \$35.60. That period expires in a few weeks time and the Lands Department office from Port Lincoln has advised the District Council of Cleve that the previous \$35.60 fee will now go to \$860. It is an outrageous lift in fee. It is the only area in that immediate region available for the purpose of cropping and raising funds for charity needs. In fact, in this instance the officer who signed the letter, Mr G.K. Woodroffe, Regional Manager for Eyre, Lands Department Division, does not recognise the practice as being sufficiently within the ambit fund raising for community purposes and has recommended that full tote odds be charged on what has been described to me as an inflated valuation process and a system of exploiting funds from an organisation that is worthy of its occupation and worthy of merit in relation to raising funds for that area. I will further that subject during the Address in Reply debate later this week.

**Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach):** During this debate I express my support for the recommendations from the study on the protection of workers' health and safety by the Occupational Safety Health and Welfare Steering Committee. Some of these recommendations have already been put into effect, but a need exists to embody others in legislation. The report has become known as the Matthews Report and I am also indebted to Mr Mike Rann for his observations on industrial health and safety. I have freely taken my ideas from his booklet *Limbs, Lungs and Lives* in this and other speeches I have made in this place on industrial safety.

It is a tragedy that by the end of this year more than 300 Australian workers will have been killed and more than 300 000 injured in the workplace. This accident rate fills our hospitals and takes up large amounts of taxation money. From time to time we quite rightly hear a great deal about our road toll, but few people realise that for every person injured on our roads each year five will be hurt at work. Until now very little public attention has been paid to industrial safety reform and, where attention has been paid, it has been done in an extremely haphazard fashion.

Therefore, I was greatly heartened by the production in May last year of the Matthews Report, which provides for very important reforms in regard to industrial safety. The first and perhaps the most important recommendation is that an occupational health and safety commission be established. This would be a tripartite body, responsible for the development of all standards and regulations necessary to protect health and safety of workers. It would detail codes of practice, laying down how employers should comply with standards and regulations.

The commission would be the focus in any Government's effort to regulate the provisions of a healthy and safe workplace in South Australia. It would be a tripartite organisation responsible to the Minister of Labour. I applaud the provisions in the Matthews Report that would involve the workers in formulating occupational health standards. I believe that one of the great successes of occupational health and safety was the earlier legislation in South Australia that involved the formulation of safety committees in the workshop where more than a certain number of employees were employed.

This Act, which was proclaimed in 1972, provided for the election of safety representatives who were drawn from the shop floor. Although the success rate in the formulation of these committees was low, where they were established I had the opportunity to see some excellent results. The recommendation of the Matthews Report has suggested that the existing provisions for workers health and safety representatives should be retained, but with clearer specification of their rights and powers.

This is an extremely important point, which the House should consider. It has been difficult in the past for safety representatives, when negotiating with their employers, to realise just how far they can go in regard to safety recommendations. The employer has the right to promote, to increase wages and to demote, and in some cases he has the right to decrease wages. It is not difficult to understand that some safety representatives, in negotiations with their employers, found themselves in situations where they did not get promotion when perhaps they should have. There was no clear way of pinning this down, but the introduction of specifications of their rights and powers in any special legislation would be a great advantage to all concerned.

It is very important that these people have an effective legal protection against discrimination. This protection against discrimination is very necessary, because it has been

my experience in the printing industry to see undue pressure applied to a safety representative (who quite often is the union representative), in a shop where the employer considered that the representative was tackling his task with undue enthusiasm.

There are all sorts of ways and means in which pressure can be exerted on somebody who is trying to do a conscientious job in a workplace to protect his fellow workers by way of attending to safety matters. Despite increases in regulation to the safety, health and welfare provisions, many factories have remained unsafe because of bad housekeeping and unsafe practices and because many employers were prepared to take the chance (and are still taking the chance) that the number of factory inspectors involved is so low that they will never get caught in any event. Therefore, it is extremely necessary that at the workplace there should be an employee who is able to utilise the full provisions of an Act and who, at the same time, has legal protection against any personal discrimination. I understand that the majority of the committee that produced the report recommended that health and safety representatives should be able, in certain circumstances, to halt work where there has been and is a high risk of injury.

This was perhaps a controversial matter for discussion, and the employers representatives on that committee disagreed with the recommendation. There was, however, a unanimous agreement that there should be improved training for all concerned in occupational health and safety. One of the most interesting recommendations (and to some extent I understand that this has now been fulfilled) was that there be a Government funded trade union managed health centre; the clinical services offered should be a combination of medical advice and treatment, nursing, occupational therapy and counselling; and that such services would be directed, primarily, at individual workers. The report suggests that files of the information unit would act as an invaluable resource for the clinic as well as for workers in general and enable the clinical staff to make connections between pathology and work conditions that would be beyond the capability of an ordinary general practitioner.

I support this recommendation because I can see definite advantages in work related injuries being treated in the one spot. Also, the information gathered as a result of this could be utilised in preventing accidents in the future. I had the privilege of attending the South Australian Sports Institute while the Parliamentary delegation was there. We had an opportunity to observe the experimentation that is now proceeding in the field of ergonomics. I expressed the point of view at the time that it appeared to me that some of the experimentation and work which was taking place and which mainly related to effort in sporting activities could be applied to the ergonomic situation of the people at the workplace.

There is no mechanism, so far as I know, to utilise and cross-fertilise the ideas that are now being used at the Sports Institute for ergonomic purposes in the workplace. The introduction of a managed health centre appears to me to be the first step in which all the effort now being used in various research programmes could be put together. Occupational health and safety reform is indeed a crusade for the 1980s. I see the production of the Matthews Report as being a first step in the crusade. I hope that parliamentary representatives take notice of the extraordinary casualties that are occurring in the workplace and look favourably upon the recommendations that come from this report.

Motion carried.

At 10.28 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 7 August at 2 p.m.