

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 13 August 1985

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

### PETITION: POKER MACHINES

A petition signed by 43 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to permit the use of poker machines in South Australia was presented by Mr Becker.  
Petition received.

### PETITION: LIVING ARTS CENTRE

A petition signed by 14 residents of South Australia praying that the House support the establishment of a living arts centre was presented by the Hon. D.C. Brown.  
Petition received.

### PETITION: PORT AUGUSTA BOTANIC GARDEN

A petition signed by 111 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to establish an arid lands botanic garden at Port Augusta was presented by Mr Gunn.  
Petition received.

### PETITION: BEACHPORT CONSERVATION PARK

A petition signed by 854 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to ensure that the Beachport Conservation Park remains open to vehicles and the public and that access to Lake George and ocean beaches is maintained was presented by Mr Lewis.  
Petition received.

## QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 22, 44, and 113.

## PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*  
Planning Act, 1982—  
Regulations—Development Control—Various.  
Crown Development Reports by South Australian Planning Commission on proposed—  
Laboratory—Port Pirie.  
Erection of Classrooms—Wirreanda High School, Morphett Vale.  
Aquaculture Research Station—Hundred of Noarlunga.  
Borrow Pit—Hundred of Hanson.  
Aboriginal Child Care Centre—Whyalla.  
Land Division—Saddleworth.

By the Minister of Lands (Hon. R.K. Abbott)—  
*Pursuant to Statute—*

Geographical Names Board—Report, 1984-85.  
Real Property Act, 1886—Regulations—Various.

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*  
Correctional Services Act, 1982—Regulations—General Regulations, 1985.  
Food and Drugs Act, 1908—Regulations—Pharmaceutical Colouring Agents.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: TAXICAB INDUSTRY

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

Leave granted.

The **Hon. G.F. KENEALLY**: Cabinet has accepted the recommendation of the Select Committee of the Legislative Council that a one plate system be adopted for Adelaide's taxis. I anticipate that this system can be brought into operation on Sunday 1 September. The arguments in favour of a one plate system, and against the continuation of the present system, do not require further elaboration in this forum.

The Government believes that sufficient investigation has been undertaken to ensure that our decision is based on a solid body of information which includes not only the Select Committee, but the committee of inquiry called together by the honourable member for Spence as Minister of Transport in May 1983. A one-plate system will be fairer and more equitable and it will also represent a significant degree of deregulation.

The current system is a source of unnecessary tension within the industry, and the historical reasons which led to its introduction no longer exist. The change to a one-plate system will provide a more economic and more efficient system, plus a better level of service to the public at a reasonable cost. Evidence from interstate and overseas indicates that, after a settling-in period, the abolition of restricted areas (which, of course, will be a necessary part of the new arrangements) will not lead to a concentration of taxis in high-density areas. Initially, however, there could be some congestion on city stands, but in time this will sort itself out.

Everything considered, the Government believes that, despite some possible temporary inconvenience that may affect independent operators who will have to modify their operations, the benefits to the community and the industry itself of a one-plate system far outweigh any disadvantages. After the industry has had an opportunity to become accustomed to the new system, other changes are in prospect.

These are matters also dealt with in the Select Committee's report. One of these matters is the restructuring of the Metropolitan Taxicab Board. For the present, however, we will leave the existing board to continue, so as to deal with any problems that might arise because of the change to a one-plate system.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: IRRIGATION AND DRAINAGE RATES

The **Hon. J.W. SLATER (Minister of Water Resources)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. J.W. SLATER**: I wish to make an important announcement about the 1985-86 irrigation and drainage rates for South Australia's Government irrigation areas. I am extremely pleased to inform the House that there will be no increase in these rates for the second successive year, and, when inflation is taken into consideration, this will

actually mean a considerable reduction in rates compared to 1983-84—the last time rates were increased.

This is the second year in a row that these rates have remained at the same level, due mainly to the economical and efficient management of these irrigation areas by the Government. I believe this is an admirable performance by the Engineering and Water Supply Department, which has continued to introduce cost-saving measures and trim operations staff so that costs can be reduced to a minimum level. This happy situation is also due to the continuing consultation with members of irrigation advisory boards, who have played an important role in helping to reduce operating and maintenance costs.

Another major benefit for irrigators will be the Government's recently announced 2 per cent reduction in electricity tariffs. This will help irrigators across the board to achieve a significant cut in their pumping costs. It appears that most sections of the irrigation industry in South Australia have weathered the storm and are now back on the road to recovery. This recovery will be helped substantially by the now formally constituted Riverland Development Council, which will examine all aspects of the region with a view to ensuring its long-term viability.

My Government has always believed that positive action and better management techniques would enable the irrigation industry to make a considerable contribution to South Australia's record economic recovery. In the three years of the Bannon Government, irrigation and drainage rates have gone up by 28 per cent compared to the 46.6 per cent in the three years of the disastrous Tonkin Government. It is in this context that the Opposition's recent statements on the privatisation of irrigation areas should be branded as reckless and irresponsible.

If these privatisation moves were introduced, they would cause widespread upheaval and uncertainty within the industry. Irrigators would once again find themselves in a hopeless situation of facing unbearable costs varying from one irrigation area to another along the length of the Murray River. It must be remembered that almost \$56 million in loans is being used to operate the State's irrigation areas, which are currently incurring an annual deficit of \$10.2 million. If all these areas were to be privatised, as suggested by the Leader of the Opposition, every irrigator would face a horrendous cost burden almost overnight. The Bannon Government, of course, would not allow that situation to occur.

## PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

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

Moana Primary School—Redevelopment,

Yatala Labour Prison—Operations and Admissions Facilities.

Ordered that reports be printed.

## QUESTION TIME

### CHILD ABUSE

**Mr OLSEN:** Will the Minister of Community Welfare ask his department to investigate immediately new information relating to the sexual assault of young children by a family day care giver? Since this matter became public last week the Opposition has received further information about it. That information reveals that the man against whom the allegations were made is still caring for young

children, including a three year old Vietnamese child, that the police had spoken to him once about two other child abuse allegations some months before the specific allegation involving a four year old girl was brought to the attention of the Department for Community Welfare two years ago, and that a young boy was also withdrawn from the centre operated by this man and his wife because of allegations of physical abuse.

The Opposition is particularly concerned that, despite these allegations, and despite the fact that the Director-General of the Department for Community Welfare in a public statement last week said she had no doubt that the allegations by the four year old girl of a serious sexual assault were true, this man is still involved in caring for young children. In view of this new information, I suggest that the Minister must be prepared to consider—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is debating the matter. I ask him to come back to the question.

**Mr OLSEN:** Community alarm is such, as a result of media reports on this matter, that the Minister ought to be prepared to consider further action to ensure that more children are not subjected to risk while in the care of this man.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his interest in this matter and for the additional details that he says he presents to the House in the form of alleged information. I will most certainly have that information investigated by the department, and I will ask the Police Department to investigate it, as is its duty. Following the Leader's question in this House last week, the mother of the child involved in this matter contacted the Director-General of the department with information regarding other alleged complaints about this person.

The department has had discussions with the Police Department about this matter, and I was informed a few moments ago that the police reported today that they have no record of these allegations being made or any investigations resulting from similar allegations. However, I will most certainly take up this matter and have it investigated most thoroughly, as I have promised to do. Already, the department is taking a very wide ranging series of actions to investigate any other case concerning the department where there is even the faintest suspicion that behaviour of this type might have occurred in the past.

I want to assure the Leader and members of the House that the Department for Community Welfare has a very good reputation in this State. It accepts with the gravest seriousness the responsibility vested in it and indeed officers give very high priority to these matters. There is an elaborate structure not only within the department but also in co-operation with the Police Department, the South Australian Health Commission, the Education Department and the community to deal with these matters.

*The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** The honourable member would know that these are not simple matters and that the information does not always come out as it should. That just makes it all the more difficult. However, we are doing all we can to ensure that this matter is investigated very thoroughly indeed. In reply to the honourable member's question, I can say that Mrs Beck, who has made public statements about these matters, and who is not a party to any of these events but is a concerned individual in the community, saw me, as the *Advertiser* reported, in Victoria Square last year, and three times on that occasion I asked her, 'Will you make a statement to the police if you have any information at all about this matter?' Each time she said, 'No, I have nothing more that I can give you.'

I took up the matter further and referred it to the Ombudsman, as his role as constituted enables him to deal

with matters like this. The investigation proceeded. If there is fresh information, from whatever source, I will certainly take it up and have it investigated thoroughly.

### TAX CUTS

**Mr KLUNDER:** Will the Premier advise the House whether future Federal-State funding arrangements between South Australia and the Commonwealth have been put in jeopardy as a result of the tax cuts announced by the Premier on 5 August? I refer the Premier to an article which appeared in the *News* yesterday headed 'SA funding in jeopardy—Messner' and which contained a report of statements made by Liberal Senator Tony Messner implying that South Australia would be penalised in any future Federal-State negotiations as a result of the tax cuts package.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I half expected that a question such as this would come from the member for Flinders, because it was in his electorate, at a meeting in support of the President in the other place, the Hon. Arthur Whyte, and his candidacy in that seat, that Senator Messner made his statement. Senator Messner suffered from an attack of Valderism, which seems to be sweeping the Liberal Party. Incidentally, I remind the House that Valderism is an urgent desire to tell the truth—not that Senator Messner has it quite right. It is certainly not something that has infected the Leader of the Opposition, I can assure the House of that.

I suggest that, in making that statement, in one fell swoop Big Tony has chopped off the Leader of the Opposition at the knees. After all, the Leader has been making completely contradictory statements regarding tax cuts. First, he said that they were a con, even though a few days before that he had urged that tax cuts be announced and that they be made retrospective. Then it turned out that they were no longer a con but a mirror image of what the Liberals had been calling for and were going to do. The Leader further decided that really they did not go far enough, that they were an election gimmick. On the other hand, Senator Messner has a different perception: no con and no gimmick, but he suggests that such is their nature and extent that they could jeopardise Federal funding arrangements.

I would say that Senator Messner, while he puts his finger on a very important aspect of tax policy at the State level, has not got it quite right. If his remarks were addressed to the Leader of the Opposition (a member of the Government that embarked on an irresponsible course of action that meant that in 1983 we had the Grants Commission looking very seriously at the so-called tax effort in South Australia to see whether or not penalties should be exacted against the State in that regard), those comments could be seen to have some validity. There is no question that, unless the State is seen to be assisting itself, it will not get support from Federal sources. That is what Senator Messner said, and I advise members opposite to listen to that.

*The Hon. Michael Wilson interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the Premier to resume his seat. I call the member for Torrens to order, and I remind the House that the next admonition will be a warning to any member of the House in breach of Standing Orders. The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The tax cut package has been made possible by successful negotiations at the Premiers Conference. Over the past 12 months I have said that, once we get our house in order and see that we are on a course towards a stable regime of public finance, and once our economy is improving and growing, we would be in a position to look at tax cuts in this economy, but crucial to that would be the attitude of the Grants Commission and

the Commonwealth Government in relation to Commonwealth-State tax sharing arrangements. Had I followed the irresponsible course suggested by the Opposition and said that willy-nilly we would do something about the situation, we would have been in grave jeopardy in relation to the negotiations which took place at the Premiers Conference. That is a fact of life, and Senator Messner has drawn attention to it.

In making these tax cuts we have had regard to the position applying at the Premiers Conference and under the Commonwealth-State tax sharing agreement. We have taken into account those results; we have made our calculations based on the outcome of that; and in choosing which areas to cut we have looked very closely at the economic effect on jobs and employment. With the reckless way in which the Opposition has been spraying around all sorts of different suggestions, it has still yet to come out with any sort of package. The Opposition has yet to say exactly what it will do and where and how it will do it.

I suggest to members that our package covers those areas of crucial need which relate specifically to economic generation and employment. It is about time that the Leader of the Opposition had an attack of Valderism, I would suggest, and that he looked at the package in its true form and told the truth about it. The tax cut is substantial; it is responsible, and it provides relief. It is certainly substantial enough in the eyes of Senator Messner, and it is about time that the Leader of the Opposition stopped trying to pretend otherwise.

### CHILD ABUSE

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Will the Minister of Education explain the serious inconsistency between a public statement that he has made about checks on family day care givers and information provided by the Minister of Community Welfare? In a letter to the Editor published in the *Advertiser* last Friday in relation to allegations that a licensed care giver had sexually assaulted a four year old girl, the Minister of Education said, 'Regulations covering family day care approvals require two references.' However, in a letter which he signed in December last year, the Minister of Community Welfare said that references were not generally sought. I shall quote from the Minister's letter to a Mrs R. Beck, as follows:

It has been found that it is of no great assistance, given that people often give as referees those who will give a positive report on them, so references are generally not sought.

This is a fundamental and serious inconsistency about a vital part of the checking process to protect young children which must be explained.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I must advise the House that last week when I wrote that letter it was written not only on advice given to me but also from my personal experience as a member of Parliament representing the constituency. I know constituents who have applied to be family day care givers or who have wanted to undertake that task. Some of them have come to me for a reference, indicating that they have needed such references in order to present them in support of their application. Where it has been appropriate for me to do so I have given such references. My first experience of this took place some considerable time ago.

I can also advise the House that I made reference in that letter that was published last Friday to the fact that police checking takes place in relation to those who enter into the family day care scheme, and that certainly is the case. There is a process of checking applicants for family day care schemes. Whilst certain questions have been raised as a

result of a recent episode, it is the intention of my colleague the Minister of Community Welfare and the Children's Services Office, which will soon take over this arena formally, to examine very carefully all procedures we follow with respect to the family day care scheme.

We made some assertions last week that a number of the statements appearing in press reports were in fact quite substantially inaccurate. They referred to a child care centre when in fact it involved a family day care arrangement. I met with family day care operatives in the northern area last week in order to talk with them about whatever changes need to take place with respect to family day care arrangements, concerning not only administrative procedures but also general procedures, because family day care represents an important part of child care provision within this State. When I formally take this matter over within a few weeks it is my intention to encourage that to be the case. I know from experience that references were required from applicants for family day care positions. The advice that I gave last week was advice I had received involving the formal procedures that currently apply, and I believe that that is all the information I can give the House.

### CLASS SIZES

**Mr FERGUSON:** Can the Minister of Education provide any information on progress being made to reduce class sizes in South Australian schools? For several years, concern has been expressed about class sizes in schools in South Australia, and in 1982 the criticism of class sizes probably reached its peak. The incoming Bannon Government gave an undertaking not to reduce teacher numbers in the face of falling enrolments. By this time of the year statistics as to class sizes are usually available, and a comparison between the year 1985 and earlier years should be of great interest.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Members will recall that between 1979 and 1982 the former Tonkin Liberal Government dispensed with over 600 teaching positions within the education system. That is not something which has taken place under this Government. We have maintained teacher numbers and have deployed those liberated positions in a number of ways. One of the significant areas of redeployment have been to reduce class sizes within the education system.

I have asked that survey data be undertaken for all schools in the State over the past three years to determine whether or not that is actually taking place. The figures for 1985 have been processed, and those figures, which were collected from schools in March based on February enrolments, show that quite significant improvements have taken place since 1982. For example, in relation to the primary sector of education, in 1985 only 2.5 per cent of our classes in primary schools have more than 30 students (that is, 121 classes), whereas in the last year of the last Liberal Administration it was nearly three times that percentage (7.2 per cent). With regard to classes between 28 and 30, the respective figures are 18.7 per cent for this year and 26.7 per cent for 1982; in other words, cumulatively, those classes that have 28 or more students in 1985 represent approximately one in five of all classes, whereas in 1982 they represented one in three of all classes. In relation to the secondary arena where we did not quite specifically—

*The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** If the member for Mount Gambier is asking for the full tabular statement, I shall be happy to incorporate it in *Hansard* giving the figures for 1982, 1983, 1984 and 1985. The honourable member will find that, if I wanted to go on at greater length, the figures would embarrass him even more. I am merely picking out

pertinent figures. I shall be happy to accede to his request to incorporate the figures he requires. Later, when I have the full table before me, I will seek to have it inserted in *Hansard*. Regarding secondary school figures, in 1982, 85 per cent of secondary classes had 25 or fewer students. In that year, the figure was 60.4 per cent with respect to secondary classes.

*The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Mount Gambier should remember my admonition. The honourable Minister.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** This year, 2.2 per cent of all classes had more than 30 students, whereas in 1982 that figure was 4.4 per cent. The honourable member who interjected referred to the numbers of classes, and the tabular information that I will table will include the number of classes. It is not a case of bending figures; these are figures taken on the basis of surveys made in 1983, 1984 and 1985 in all schools. In 1982, all primary schools were surveyed but only a significant sample of secondary schools because there was no readily available data in respect of all secondary schools for that particular year. However, it is quite clear that, unlike the former Liberal Government that was quite happy to dispense with over 600 teaching positions where we had maintained the head count over the past three years, we achieved a number of significant things in the educational arena, one of which has been a significant improvement with respect to class sizes, as the information I have given today shows and as the tabular information that I will have inserted in *Hansard* will clearly prove.

### CHILD ABUSE

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** Can the Minister of Community Welfare say why was the Director-General of Community Welfare not informed until last Wednesday of the serious allegations made against a family day care giver involving sexual assault of a four-year-old girl? When this matter was raised in the House last Thursday, the Minister revealed that he had received the report of the Ombudsman's inquiry into the case 10 days before. He also said that the Director-General of his department had the responsibility to act in these matters, which means that the Director-General should have been informed immediately about the Ombudsman's recommendations. However, after the Minister's answer in this House on the Australian Broadcasting Commission *National* program on Thursday evening, the Director-General of his department revealed that the original allegations made two years earlier had not even been drawn to her attention until Wednesday last week, let alone the Ombudsman's report.

That is more than a week after the Minister received the Ombudsman's report. The Director-General, the person who the Minister says is responsible, was not aware of the case. This delay is all the more incomprehensible when it is recognised that reports into the case had also been compiled by the rape inquiry unit, the Stirling CIB, and the Sexual Assault Referral Clinic at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. In view of the seriousness of this case, reflected by the fact that the Director-General revoked a departmental licence held by this person once she was informed about it, the Minister should explain why vital information was withheld from the Director-General until Wednesday last.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** I thank the honourable member for his question. I cannot say how the Director-General thinks. That is the purport of the first part of the question. However, the Director-General does not action every file in the department. This matter came through the normal channels following the inquiry by the Ombudsman. The rec-

ommendations of the Ombudsman were discussed with officers of the department and action was taken as a result of that prior to this matter coming for decision making analysis. The Director-General then had the matter brought to her attention and she then brought down a much more stringent policy in dealing with these sorts of matters. They are the circumstances involved.

*The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** The Deputy Leader in his usual way quoted only part of a letter. If the honourable member wants to help cases such as this and help children suffering in such circumstances in a very real way, rather than play politics, he should quote the full context of the letter. References were obtained in this case, but the department finds that often references do not help to get to the truth of the matter and that is explained in the letter. The letter also explains how the police are involved and how parents who are going to care for children are brought before various training panels, are assessed by staff, are interviewed and due inquiries made. All that occurred in this instance. For his own purposes, presumably political, the honourable member has chosen to put those facts out of context. That is a most serious way to express the interest of the Opposition in a matter of this importance.

### TAX CONCESSIONS

**Mr MAYES:** Will the Premier advise the House what benefits small businesses can expect to receive from the package of tax concessions announced on 5 August? Owners of small businesses in my electorate have recently received a letter from the Leader of the Opposition demanding money, in which he makes a number of allegations concerning the Government's record, particularly concerning deregulation and taxation. I have been advised that the letter—which is dated 9 August, four days after the Premier announced the tax package—claims that the Government had refused to give relief to persons paying land tax. I ask the question because this statement is completely at odds with the Premier's announcement on 5 August.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The extent to which this desperate Opposition is prepared to mislead people and tell untruths—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I suggest that backbenchers opposite should listen to this, because they are probably not aware of what has been said in their name by their Leader—blatant untruths that will rebound in the face of the Opposition. They can fool some of the people for a while but not all of the time, and that is what is going on opposite.

I have seen this letter, which contains a series of blatant untruths. For instance, it is dated 9 August—after our tax cut package had been announced—yet it is written as if nothing had happened and no change had occurred. It is blatantly untrue. It begins by talking about a hike of more than 50 per cent in the State's taxes and a high taxing Labor Government. The facts are very clear indeed. The total overall receipt collection under this Government is less than during the years 1979-80 and 1981-82 under the previous Liberal Government. There was an increase of 52 per cent at a time when the Government was boasting that it had cut taxes. It had indeed! It had cut tax rates, but the Leader of the Opposition insists—

*Mr Olsen interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the Premier to resume his seat. I am forced to warn the Leader of the Opposition.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The Opposition does not like its untruths being exposed in the public forum in this way. It is all very well to write privately to a series of small

businessmen in this form letter, full of totally misleading and inaccurate garbage, and then interject so that the truth cannot come out. If one uses the same criteria as the Leader of the Opposition has used, there was a 52 per cent increase under the Tonkin Government. Of course, we are talking about receipts, not rates. Let me point out that our tax package in 1983 was aimed at getting our State's finances on to an even keel again; it aimed at avoiding bankruptcy—doing what any good business would do in order to try to survive.

The effect of that was about 11.7 per cent. That is the component that is identified in that area. That is very different indeed from the 50 per cent plus—the totally wrong and misleading statistic that the Leader of the Opposition is using. He goes on, in a letter dated 9 August, to list a whole lot of things that the Government is supposed to do, including the fact that I have to explain apparently why he stopped the deregulation program established by the Liberals.

There is no question, as we announced in March 1983, that, from our analysis, the Liberals, so-called deregulation program, which consisted of repealing a few Statutes that had not been in operation for the last 30, 40 or 50 years, and not much else, and establishing a bureaucracy—a deregulation unit—in order to deregulate, a special bureaucracy, was simply not achieving results. It was being used as buck-passing by those in the Public Service who, when confronted with deregulation problems, simply said, 'Take that away from us and send it off to the Deregulation Unit.' A nice cop-out!

This Government decided to take a positive approach, to look at projects and get them carried out. Some examples of our achievement in the less than three years we have been in Government include the passing of the new Food Act—a substantial deregulation in that area; a review of the Planning Act—an appalling mess signed in the law the day before the Government went out of office; introduction of the new Licensing Act—a comprehensive reworking and deregulation in that industry; a review of regulations under the Fishing Act; and the establishment of a Commercial Tribunal which co-ordinates the activities of eight occupational licensing boards. That is a pretty substantial achievement, and there is more to come. I was not satisfied with the progress we were making. We established a special deregulation task force.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** This letter says that we have stopped the deregulation program. I am just pointing out what we have put in its place—the most comprehensive and effective deregulation program in years. The interim report of the deregulation task force has been received and further action will follow when its final report is presented.

This is the next statement: why has he increased stamp duty? That very week that this letter went out I decreased stamp duties comprehensively and provided considerable benefits by so doing. Here is a good one: why has he refused to give relief to small business from soaring rates of land tax? That is a blatant and mischievous untruth. In fact, the Land Tax Amendment Act provides major benefits in its provisions to small business in particular. It is a comprehensive change in the land tax rates aimed at that. Incidentally, I notice that there is no reference to one impost that concerns small business—payroll tax.

It is very conspicuously silent about that, because under our Government we have reduced the rate of that tax on small business by raising the exemption level progressively, above the rate of inflation, from \$125 000 when we came into office to \$250 000 from 1 July. Let me give honourable members some examples. Under the Liberals, in 1981-82,

a firm with a payroll of \$250 000 (not a large firm by any means) paid \$10 610 in payroll tax.

*The Hon. Michael Wilson interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** By 1984-85 under our changes (and the member who interjects ought to know because he has been in a pharmaceutical business, a small business, and if his payroll was under \$250 000 he would be up for a figure like \$10 610) it had gone down to \$4 167. From 1 July it is nil—nothing. That is a major reform not mentioned in this letter to small business that is being sent out—fund-raising on behalf of the Liberal Party.

In addition, of course, we have changed the taper zones and we have made other major changes to payroll tax which will benefit 25 per cent to 70 per cent of employers in this field. For the group with payrolls of \$300 000 to \$1 million (25 per cent of registered employers) the rate of payroll tax is the cheapest in the country. Where is that stated in the fund raising letter circulated by the Leader of the Opposition?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I would have thought that a letter like that to small business could have made one or two other points. For instance, I heard the Leader of the Opposition interject 'You've destroyed a couple of businesses.' Information just released shows that the number of bankruptcies in South Australia has decreased to the lowest level in eight years; if one wants to talk about businesses that are being destroyed, one should consider the period 1979 to 1982 to see the very sorry, nay, abysmal record of the previous Government. Bankruptcies are at the lowest level ever. Far from destroying businesses, this Government has revived business and has improved the position of business. We have allowed businesses to develop and prosper. We established a Small Business Corporation, which is already having a major impact. About 18 000 queries, or 1 600 a month, have been received by the corporation since its establishment. That is not a bad Government contribution to assist the prosperity and development of small business.

Finally, we should not just consider what the Government has achieved; we should view the matter as others see it. The Chamber of Commerce and Industry, the representative of small business, involving many small businesses, released a report last week which indicated that growth in sales, productivity and employment had reached major levels and that, in fact, there was a trend and considerable optimism in which business could have every confidence. That, coupled with employment and job vacancy rates and other statistics, means that, if one is writing an honest, truthful letter to small business, first, one does not publish these lies about the Government's record—

**The SPEAKER:** I ask the Premier to withdraw that remark immediately.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I withdraw it. First, one does not publish untruths about the Government's record and, secondly, one should include some facts. The negative, carping approach designed to destabilise and sabotage our economy must stop.

#### CHILD ABUSE

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** Is the Minister of Community Welfare prepared in any way to identify the former licensed family day care giver against whom serious allegations of child sexual assault have been made, in order to protect other children who may be left with the man? I ask this question in view of the information now available that this man is still caring for young children whose parents may be unaware of the matters put before the House. While

the Director-General of the Department for Community Welfare and the Ombudsman have accepted the evidence of child sexual assault, the current state of the law prevents that evidence being tested in a court.

At the same time, the Director-General of the department also said last week that the department had to give the benefit of any doubt in these cases to children, and that people who cared for children have to be absolutely beyond reproach. Further, in the House last week the Minister stated that, 'No risks should ever be taken in the care of children within the family day care situation.'

In addition, the Premier himself asked the Minister, in December last year, to keep him personally informed of the matter. That is hardly what the Minister described a few moments ago as 'normal channels'. Notwithstanding the fact that the family day care licence has been revoked, the children who are in private care with this care giver need the fullest protection that the Minister can provide to them, as well as to all other children in the community, which means that the man must be named in this House in the same manner as the Minister and his colleagues have been prepared to name—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable member to complete her explanation without debating the matter.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** This man should be named in the same way as the Minister and his colleagues have been prepared to name other people in regard to the provision of material things such as houses, real estate, and motor cars at a disadvantage to others.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** It is rather illuminating to note the real interest of the Opposition in these very complex matters. So much for the rights of the children of that family, the wife and the relatives and so many other people who are caught up in such matters!

*The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** If that is the honourable member's concern and if she had come to me and asked for that information, I could have assured her that the parents—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable Minister to resume his seat. Before the reply goes any further, I again call the House to order. The honourable Minister.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** In the case, as I understand it, of the child who is currently being cared for by that family (I am not sure of the circumstances: they are certainly not in any way connected with the placement made by the department or any other agency with which the department would have been involved), it is simply a private arrangement between two families. The parents of the child who is being cared for in some arrangement by the family involved have had explained to them in the fullest detail the reservations that have been expressed by the various authorities in dealing with this matter.

I remind the honourable member that nothing has ever been proven in these circumstances, and I understand that the people involved have now taken legal advice. They are incredibly upset by the allegations that have been bandied about by honourable members as if those allegations had in fact been proven and established at law.

*The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** One cannot twist circumstances, as the honourable member wants to do. These are complex situations. We have acted with the utmost responsibility in this matter, and now the regulations have been tightened to the extent where—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** Honourable members do not understand the facts. The family day care licence for these people was revoked shortly after these allegations were made

over two years ago. Honourable members opposite should pay some respect to the facts of this matter rather than try to make political capital out of the matter. Members opposite are trying to elevate the politics of smut, smear and innuendo into some sort of factual situation. They should have more respect for the families in these circumstances and for the difficulties that Government officers face across the board in trying to get to the basis of these circumstances.

### ADELAIDE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

**Ms LENEHAN:** Will the Minister of Transport outline to the House details of representations that he has made to the Federal Government requesting the upgrading of facilities at the Adelaide International Airport?

*Members interjecting:*

**Ms LENEHAN:** I do not find anything funny about this question. I have asked it because of media reports of statements and allegations made by the member for Davenport. Further, members of this House, including the members for Albert Park and Henley Beach, as well as myself, are on public record as having highlighted the need for upgrading of facilities at the Adelaide International Airport.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I have been very much involved in representations to the Federal Government involving Adelaide International Airport. As all members of this House would recall, when the present Government came to office in November 1982 (at which time I was Minister of Tourism) it was presented with an international airport which, frankly, was inoperable. That situation was bequeathed to the Government by the previous Government. Members of the previous Government had made a lot of noise at the time about it being their airport, notwithstanding that when it was opened there were no services provided at all: the airconditioning was continually breaking down, there were no carpets on the floor, no seats, and no trolleys. There was very little there at all. That was the international airport that the Liberal Government of the day had provided. In fact, what they accepted for Adelaide (this is fact: it is on the record, and the former Minister of Transport acknowledges this) was a rural city airport, like Townsville.

I made representations to the then Minister of Transport. One of the difficulties we encountered in enlarging and improving the facilities was that we had a complete rural city airport which was not constructed in such a way as to enable additions when growth in patronage occurred. We have made continual representations.

On Sunday night I received a telephone call from the press asking me if I was going to sign a telegram (about which I knew nothing at all) being sent by the member for Davenport to the Federal Minister. The letter in question arrived in my office on 12 August, a day or so after the honourable member had released it to the press (this is the sort of co-operation he was seeking). The letter is an indictment of his colleagues the then Minister of Transport—

*The Hon. D.C. Brown interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I warn the member for Davenport.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:**—and the then Minister of Tourism. The letter reads:

My dear Minister,

As you know only too well, the passenger facilities at the Adelaide International Airport Terminal are inadequate, even under normal operating conditions.

This is the airport which they bragged they had provided for South Australia and which the honourable member says is inadequate, even under normal operating conditions. It took him two years and nine months to take an interest in an international airport. At least his colleague the former Minister of Tourism had been active in this area over that

period, whereas the member for Davenport has just realised that the airport is inadequate. He goes on to say:

The use of the facility and the number of international flights has exceeded the expectations when the terminal was first built. Is that not an indictment on the previous Government? It had no confidence in its ability to increase the patronage of that international airport. In fact, it is a vote of confidence and praise for this Government because of what it has been able to do in generating throughput at that airport. Any Government which has such a poor opinion of its ability to increase the patronage of such an important facility as an international airport should never expect to have the confidence of the people of South Australia.

The Director-General of the Department of Transport is today talking to the Federal Minister in Launceston, and one of the issues they will be discussing is the international airport. We will continue our representations and ensure that the legacy which we received from the previous Government does not continue and that commuters in and visitors to South Australia have the facility that this State is entitled to have.

### AIDS

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** Will the Premier undertake to have the Government introduce legislation to make it a criminal offence for prostitutes to hire themselves out for sex knowing that they have the AIDS virus, that is, the acquired immune deficiency syndrome?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Will the honourable member resume his seat. I was unable to hear the question because of the noise level in the House, and I ask honourable members to come to order on what appears to be a serious matter. Will the honourable member please read his question again.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** Mr Speaker, my question is to the Premier. Does the Government intend to introduce legislation to make it a criminal offence for prostitutes to engage in sex knowing that they have the AIDS virus, that is, the acquired immune deficiency syndrome? The New South Wales Government has already foreshadowed this legislation following the case of a man who contracted AIDS from a female prostitute.

The head of the Federal Government's AIDS task force (Dr David Penington) has also said that some form of legislation is an option that should be considered so as to force prostitutes into rehabilitation programs. Because everything possible must be done to prevent the spread of AIDS, the Opposition would support the introduction of such legislation in South Australia. Is the Government considering the introduction of such a Bill?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I am not certain as to the practicality of or the necessity for such a move. Not all members would be aware that, right from the beginning, my Government has co-operated fully in the national fight against the AIDS virus: we have co-operated with the Penington committee and our health and hospital system has geared up effectively to prepare for any major problems that may arise. In a report, I think from Professor Penington himself, it was pointed out that South Australia had so far remained relatively free of the virus: no known case had been detected or contracted in South Australia. Let us keep it that way compared to the rising problem in other States. Whether or not the legislation referred to by the honourable member is necessary or can be effective must be considered in the overall context of action being taken by the Government on this issue. Obviously, we are looking at any suggestions that may be made in relation to this matter to

decide appropriate action. Nothing more can be added to that. Admittedly, prostitution is an offence, but how one identifies these persons and what action should be taken I am not sure. There are severe practical problems in this area, but to the extent that they can be tackled they will be tackled.

### SOUTH ROAD MEDIAN STRIP

**Mr PLUNKETT:** Will the Minister of Transport outline the present position concerning the installation of a raised median strip on South Road between Cowra Street and King Street, Mile End, and say what action the Highways Department proposes to take in light of the recent decision by the Thebarton Corporation to oppose the installation of such a strip?

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I thank the honourable member for notice of this question and for his continued interest in the matter. The Highways Department undertook an investigation into the need for a pedestrian crossing facility on South Road between King Street and Cowra Street, Mile End. It was found that the most appropriate facility would be the installation of a raised median of 1.3 m width at this location. The scattered nature and the low level of pedestrian activity was such that a pedestrian crossing facility was not appropriate. The raised median would act as a refuge to enable pedestrians to cross one stream of traffic at a time during gaps in the flow.

The Corporation of Thebarton was advised in 1983 that the raised median would be installed, but that land acquisition, pavement widening and relocation of public utility services would be required. Council subsequently advised that the raised median should be installed. Since that time, detailed design, land acquisition negotiations and associated activities have been proceeding. On 7 May 1985 the Commissioner of Highways forwarded to council a copy of the proposed median layout between King Street and Cowra Street. In accordance with established policy, council was requested to publicise the proposal. Council, in letter dated 2 July 1985, advised the Commissioner of Highways that it had publicised the proposal and that it had received a number of objections. It had, therefore, resolved that the proposal be not supported until such time as South Road had been widened by seven feet. It further requested that a pedestrian crossing be installed at this location. Notwithstanding council's earlier advice in 1983 that it supported the median proposal and the work undertaken to date by the Department, it is intended to proceed with an investigation to ascertain if current circumstances have significantly changed in regard to the need for a pedestrian crossing. The outcome of this latest investigation should be known before the end of September 1985, at which time a decision will be made as to the course of action to be followed.

### ADELAIDE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** My question, which is addressed to the Minister of Transport, relates to extensions to the Adelaide International Air Terminal. As the Minister refused to sign my telegram yesterday to the Federal Minister for Aviation asking that funds be allocated in this year's Federal Budget to finance extensions to the Adelaide International Air Terminal, the Minister of Transport preferring to rely on what he described as Government to Government negotiations, will the Minister now table in Parliament all correspondence over the past 12 months that has passed between the two Governments concerning extensions to the terminal?

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** No. I will not table the correspondence.

**The Hon. D.C. Brown:** Produce it!

**The SPEAKER:** I name the member for Davenport. The honourable member will be heard in silence.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** I apologise to you, Mr Speaker, and to the House for interjecting while the Minister was speaking. I was so incensed by the fact that the Minister has made certain public statements and has made claims through the Adelaide media during the past 24 hours as to his representations and then, this afternoon, has refused to produce that evidence. I know that that has nothing to do with the fact that I have been warned, but I did for a moment forget that I must not interject. I have breached Standing Orders, and I apologise to you, Mr Speaker, and to the House for doing so.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I move:

That the honourable member's explanation be accepted.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** I second the motion.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Does any honourable member wish to speak in support of the motion that the explanation of the honourable member for Davenport be accepted?

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I wish to speak in favour of the motion. It is becoming increasingly difficult to understand what thread of consistency runs through your instructions, Mr Speaker, to the House, especially since Parliament has resumed this session. It has been traditional in this place to allow a degree of tolerance, especially in Question Time and especially when the Government in reply to questions is deliberately provocative.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask for complete silence from the whole House while the Deputy Leader is speaking.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** When the Government is going out of its way to be provocative, to bait the Opposition, and to peddle untruths, a degree of tolerance is required in this place if it is to function at all, let alone function smoothly, and it seems incomprehensible to some of us that rulings are given peremptorily by the Chair with a minimum of warning. In the past, it has been traditional for a degree of tolerance to be extended and for a member to be picked up once or twice before being warned, not for a member to be warned the first time he interjects. Further, never have members been warned en bloc in this place. I make a plea that the directions from the Chair be more intelligible to members and that we do not break new ground in relation to strictures from the Chair, where warnings are often not given with a degree of tolerance that has persisted in this place and in the spirit of give and take that has traditionally been accommodated.

It is unreasonable for the member for Davenport to be ejected from the proceedings of this House, especially when the Government is allowed to get away with murder in answers to questions through deliberate evasion, untruths and provocation. In these circumstances, it is appropriate to warn a member and, if that member persistently defies the Chair, we cannot complain if in due course he is named. However, the member for Davenport has not been persistently defying the Chair. Indeed, he is one member who invariably shows respect for the Chair. It is difficult for us, Mr Speaker, to find a thread of consistency in your rulings, particularly those that you have made this session. So, I certainly speak in favour of this motion that a degree of tolerance be shown in this case to the member for Davenport and, indeed, so that common sense can prevail.



**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier):** I oppose the motion and ask honourable members to support me in opposing the motion. Much of what the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said is totally irrelevant to the matter before us. You have reminded us, Sir, on many occasions that Standing Orders are silent as to how questions should be answered. I cannot believe that honourable members are so immature that they have to feel they are inflamed by a particular way in which an answer is delivered and that they are therefore required to breach Standing Orders by the way in which the answer has been delivered. You, Sir, on several occasions invited honourable members to take up with the Standing Orders Committee the whole question of the content of answers as well as questions, but we have to deal with Standing Orders as they are presently before us. I believe that you, Sir, have indeed been exceedingly tolerant throughout these three years.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Deputy Premier.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I would have thought that the honourable member who interjected in a disorderly way while the Government benches were silent was contradicting the content of his own interjection. You, Sir, have been exceedingly tolerant with honourable members. There have been occasions when repeated warnings have been given without further action by yourself. In relation to the general warnings that have been given, I remind honourable members that there is a bias, as it were, as far as that procedure is concerned towards or in favour of the member who is inclined to be disorderly as opposed to the member (and there are many of them) who will go day after day without interjecting at all.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The question is that the explanation be agreed to.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** On a point of order—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! If the honourable member speaks he closes the debate.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** On a point of order, I understood that you, Sir, asked the Deputy Premier to sit because you heard a buzzer. In fact, the buzzer had nothing at all to do with the Deputy Premier's continuing to contribute to the debate. One related to Question Time and the other was an opportunity which existed for the Deputy Premier to debate the issue and continue to do so. It is on that basis that I ask you to retract the direction you gave to the Deputy Premier.

**The SPEAKER:** I am quite prepared to do that. If the Deputy Premier wants to speak further, I am sure the House will hear him.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I have only one further comment to make. It has been put to me that the member for Davenport interjected 14 times during this Question Time with 11 times being after the House had been called to order for the second time. Furthermore, he was thumping with his fist on the bench in front of him. I rest my case.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the House to order. The member for Light. If he speaks, he closes the debate.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I did not expand upon the motion that I put to the Chair as I believed it was quite relevant to the detail which the member for Davenport had presented. The House by way of explanation and having regard to the prevailing environment at the time his naming took place. It is therefore my sincere suggestion to all honourable members that the proposition I put to the House be supported.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (20)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Becker, Blacker, D.C. Brown, Chapman,

Eastick (teller), S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy, Ingerson, Lewis, Mathwin, Meier, Olsen, Oswald, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (22)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Ableby, Messrs Lynn Arnold, Bannon, M.J. Brown, Crafter, M.J. Evans, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hoppood (teller), Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Mayes, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, and Whitten.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Gunn and Rodda. Noes—Messrs Payne and Wright.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Motion thus negated.

**The SPEAKER:** Pursuant to Standing Order 171, I ask the member for Davenport to leave the Chamber.

*The honourable member for Davenport having withdrawn from the Chamber:*

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

That the honourable member for Davenport be suspended from the service of the House.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (22)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon, M.J. Brown, Crafter, M.J. Evans, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hoppood (teller), Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Mayes, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, and Whitten.

Noes (19)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Becker, Blacker, Chapman, Eastick, S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy, Ingerson, Lewis, Mathwin, Meier, Olsen (teller), Oswald, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Payne and Wright. Noes—Messrs Gunn and Rodda.

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

*At 3.24 p.m., the bells having been rung:*

**The SPEAKER:** Call on the business of the day.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 6 August. Page 72.)

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** I take this opportunity, as have other members, to express my condolences to the friends and relatives of the former members of Parliament: the late Leslie Claude Hunkin I understand was a director or governor of the Savings Bank of South Australia for some years, and John Stephen Clark was member for Gawler and the first member for Elizabeth. He was formerly a school teacher and a member I respected during his short term in this Parliament after I was first elected.

The Bannon Government has taken the opportunity to use His Excellency's opening speech to Parliament to promote its history and what it will do in future. The contents of the speech were quite light because, when one looks at the Government's achievements over the past 2½ years, its prospects are extremely 'iffy'. Claims have been made of progress and development that have proved very expensive to South Australian taxpayers.

Consumers in this State are now feeling the pinch—the impact of extremely high taxation levels during the term of the Bannon Government. No matter what the Government says or what it wants printed or stated, the ALP is a very high taxing Government. It always has been and always will be. To prove this, at the ALP special convention held on 27 to 29 November 1981, the following resolutions (under 'State Expenditure') were passed:

3.1 Increase public sector spending to maintain services in real terms.

3.2 Where possible, regulate its financial position by raising tax rates rather than cutting public expenditure programs.

So, it is fundamental to the need for a wide variety of public expenditures and development of the ALP in Government that it will always endeavour, wherever it can, to improve its tax gatherings. The ALP will obtain, wherever it can, the maximum level of taxation in real terms. So, it is committed by that resolution and also by its 1981 policy platform, which states:

Increase public sector spending to maintain services in real terms per head of population to the extent that it is possible within the limited financial powers available to a State Government.

4.2 Where possible, regulate its financial position by raising tax rates rather than cutting public expenditure programs.

It is clearly written in the policy and platform of the ALP in South Australia that it will raise taxation levels, rather than cutting its programs. Therefore, it is a very high taxing Government. That has been proved time and time again in the life of this current Government when tax rate collection has gone up 50.2 per cent *per capita*. That is considerably higher than the rate of inflation over that period. It is no wonder that the people of South Australia, and those in the rest of Australia, fear what could well come from the Hawke budget later this month. The Hawke Government is very pragmatic: it knows that there is a possibility of elections in Western Australia and South Australia within the next few weeks. Very little will be done to stop those Governments' opportunities of re-election.

The Hawke Government would well come down with a very pragmatic approach to budgeting problems, as will the State Government. Already we have had promised \$41 million in tax remission into the community. It will be some months before we see the impact of that move, if in fact we do. However, irrespective of what happens after the next election in this State and in Western Australia, if the ALP and the Bannon Government is returned in South Australia there will be a supplementary budget in late February or early March. Knowing that this Government is committed to high taxation, it will sell a bill of goods through its budget and bring down the supplementary budget which, of course, will make up the leeway of any moneys it loses.

The financial base of this Government was well established. In the three hard years of the Tonkin Liberal Government we did all we could to prune the waste and mismanagement that had been building up over almost a decade of irresponsible ALP rule. It had been very haphazard, because there was a total lack of control over the Public Service in some areas under Ministers of the ALP Government, some of whom are currently members of this Government. In the grandiose years of the Dunstan era there was no incentive: it was left to Premier Corcoran, in the latter part of his management of the State, to make the unpopular decisions and to pull back the enormous amount of mismanagement and waste.

Of course, it was Des Corcoran who was absolutely furious when the Public Accounts Committee was established in South Australia. He did all he could to stop its progress and development and to destroy its credibility. However, he failed, and he failed dismally. It was the making of the committee when the hospitals report was tabled in this Parliament under the chairmanship of the late Charlie Wells. That really showed what could be done by a committee of the Parliament acting in the interests of the State. So, full credit to the courage of Charlie Wells of the ALP, who brought down that report and led the way to the excellent achievements of the PAC in this State. That, in turn, led

to an improvement in the standards and operations of public accounts committees throughout Australia.

I well recall that members of the New South Wales PAC came to South Australia during my term of chairmanship, wanting to know what to do and how best to attend to the problems of vetting costs and management of government. Laurie Brereton, who was Chairman of that committee, went back to New South Wales and undertook an inquiry into hospital services. Within months of the report to the New South Wales Parliament, Neville Wran made Mr Brereton Minister of Health. He did a good job to clean up the problems of waste in the health services and improve (as we recommended) the quality of patient care. Quality of patient care suffers if haphazard management is allowed to continue.

The consumers of South Australia first feel the effects of a Government's Budget, whether it be State or Federal, in relation to the cost of living and supermarket prices. Anyone who goes to the supermarket will recognise that it is not a matter of a 5c or 10c increase per item: it is anything up to 35c per item. We in South Australia pay very dearly for our central location: we do not have the manufacturing base to provide some of the necessities of life. We pay for the transport of the goods on the supermarket shelves as well as the costs incurred in the respective States. It is no wonder that the consumers and the taxpayers of South Australia are crying out for some relief and for benefits.

The \$41 million that is being handed back in various forms by the Premier will have little impact at present. The 2 per cent reduction in electricity charges will mean possibly a quarterly reduction of \$1 or \$2 for the average consumer. I hope that that reduction remains for 12 months, but I cannot see that it will, because the Electricity Trust still faces enormous problems, such as the possibility of litigation following the bushfires. Already one court case has been brought down against the Electricity Trust and more will follow. If ETSA is unable to win an appeal, it could well be faced with claims of about \$200 million, so the impact on future ETSA tariffs will be considerable. This proves that the Government has displayed lack of foresight in regard to the management of statutory authorities.

When we consider the track record of ETSA over the past five years, we see that considerable capital costs have been incurred in relation to the building of the town of Leigh Creek, the removal of the overburden of the new coalfield, and the building of the new Torrens Island power station. Thus one can understand why we are paying dearly for our electricity. Irrespective of how the South Australian price compares with the price in other States in the Commonwealth, we in South Australia have always benefited by long term planning and by what we call relatively cheap electricity, so there is no excuse for present electricity prices.

Is it any wonder that consumers are complaining when we find that the State Government could receive in excess of \$27 million as part of the 5 per cent levy on the income from sales of electricity? In all, through payroll tax of \$6.5 million, royalties on coal of about \$700 000, land tax of \$550 000, council rates of \$435 000, vehicle registration fees of \$207 000 and FID of \$127 000, the State Government and local government authorities receive \$35.1 million from the Electricity Trust. However, the biggest killer for the trust and the consumers of South Australia has been the State Government Financing Authority. The State Government increased the interest rates on South Australian Treasury loans from 6.4 per cent to 12.2 per cent from 1 July 1983. So in the 1983-84 financial year that cost ETSA \$1.89 million and in 1984-85 it is estimated to cost \$9.361 million. The Government receives .5 per cent per annum on all ETSA borrowings except Treasury loans, so ETSA had to pay the Government \$3.454 million in 1983-84 and \$3.79

million in 1984-85. In all, the State receives \$4 million from ETSA, and within the next 12 months it will receive considerably more than that.

It is high time that the Government reviewed the cost of its financial impact on the operations of ETSA and the consumers and started to give back benefits to the trust, which in turn would give back benefits to the consumers. I hope that the reduction of electricity prices will continue: at least if there are to be increases in electricity tariffs, they should be kept well within the CPI. However, I do not believe that that is possible, because of the way in which ETSA has been allowed to operate and the influence of the present Government over ETSA.

If anything needs to be changed in relation to the management of the Electricity Trust, it is the board. Three retired politicians and a retired public servant are members of the board; it is time extra expertise was encouraged. The board should not be used as a repository for former members of Parliament.

**Mr Lewis:** Would you be qualified?

**Mr BECKER:** No, I would not be qualified, and neither would the member for Mallee. I make that very clear. There is no member who has served or is serving in this Parliament who should be on the board. There is enough expertise in the community, and we should start to use it for the benefit of the consumers of the State.

Some time ago the Premier said that he would declare war on waste. He is pretty good at making all sorts of wild and woolly statements, but when it comes to doing something we see very little action. There is nothing that the Government has been doing in regard to waste and mismanagement that I can see. The E&WS Department and ETSA each have a couple of depots that should have been sold two years ago—they still have not been sold.

Those depots have still not been sold. It took a long time before anything was done. The Engineering and Water Supply Department knew that they were surplus to its requirements, and the Public Accounts Committee pointed out to the department that they should have been sold and the land used to the benefit of the community. At least the area at Fulham Gardens will be used by St John Ambulance; that it will be ideal for St John, but it would be ideal for the community to use as well. However, I hope that St John will put it to good use and that the surplus land will be used for welfare housing.

We are not providing enough welfare housing in the inner metropolitan area. The huge housing schemes elsewhere in the metropolitan area are all very well, but there is a cost and an impact on the people who move to those areas, and there are problems associated with providing freeways and public transport to service those areas. Further, there are disadvantages associated with the time that people must spend travelling to their destination, and it is costly.

We should be providing more areas of land for housing developments in the inner metropolitan areas. We do not want high-rise development, but we could have low density housing projects in those areas. For instance, the Hindmarsh area is suitable for this purpose. It is tragic that there are some 33 000 people on the waiting list for welfare housing or housing assistance. Many people looking for assistance visit my office every week.

It is hopeless having to approach the Minister of Housing and Construction, the Minister responsible for the Housing Trust. He does not seem to lend a sympathetic ear in relation to assisting people in need, and I refer particularly to supporting parents with two or more children who are experiencing traumas in establishing themselves. The Minister does not seem to be able to do much at all. I find the Minister's claims quite hollow at times, because he just does

not seem to be able to provide enough housing for those people who are in need.

Another matter that has always concerned me is the waste and lack of control of Government assets and property. There is no doubt that the whole system needs to be tightened up, considering that we are losing between \$6 000 and \$7 000 a week in Government property. That is wasted taxpayers' money, money that could be used to provide relief for or to employ young people. I get very cross about the amount of property being stolen, as that indicates that there is a lack of supervision and that no-one seems to care. I have asked a whole series of questions in the past nine months to ascertain whether there has been any improvement, and I am disappointed that there has been none. The other reason I asked the questions was to check up on whether the departments and the Ministers are providing full answers to questions that are asked in this Parliament. I am very sad to say that I do not believe that that is so. I believe that the Deputy Premier has a case to answer. I asked him a question on notice (No. 553) as follows:

What items were stolen from all sections of each department under the Minister's control in the year ended 30 June 1984, and what action has been taken to ensure proper care and control of the equipment to prevent a repetition?

The Minister replied:

In response to question on notice No. 553 seeking information on items stolen from departments within my Minister for Environment and Planning portfolio, I am pleased to provide details of the reply which will appear in *Hansard* when Parliament resumes.

1. The following items were stolen from the Department of Environment and Planning during the financial year ended 30 June 1984:

National Parks and Wildlife Service Division

2 pairs binoculars  
1 fire extinguisher  
1 electric fence energiser  
1 chainsaw  
1 portable radio  
1 electric drill  
1 traffic counter

Development Management Division

2 tripods  
1 projector  
1 screen  
1 steel Locker

2. The Director-General, Department of Environment and Planning has drawn to the attention of all Divisional Directors the need for all staff to be aware of their responsibilities regarding the control and security over items of plant and equipment.

I remind the Minister for Environment and Planning that he is also in charge of the State Services and Supply Department. However, he did not provide me with the information that I had sought. During the weekend of 3 and 4 December 1983 intruders entered the premises of the Services and Supply Department and stole \$8 815 worth of items. The lack of control over this property is very annoying. This was property that had been recovered by the Police Department. However, it was no sooner down there in store than it was stolen. It could have been stolen because of advertisements that were placed in the media in relation its auctioning. The theft of such property just before Christmas makes one awfully suspicious. The stolen goods are set out in the following schedule:

		\$
10 bottles	Southern Comfort	150
10 bottles	Johnnie Walker (1 125 ml.)	180
2 bottles	Beer (750 ml.)	2
17 ctns x 24 bottles	Fosters lager beer	230
493	Pre-recorded cassette tapes (aver. \$8.00)	3 944
15 615	Cigarettes	1 400
95	Cigars	19

		\$
2 pkts	Drum tobacco plus 19 pkts papers	5
3	Car computers	240
2	Pioneer car speakers	100
1	Car radio & 1 car radio/cassette player	150
1	Lucas Stereo unit consisting of tuner, cassette deck & graphic equalizer	450
1	Lucas stereo unit consisting of tuner, cassette deck & graphic equalizer	450
1	Arrow graphic equalizer	100
2	Pioneer stereo amplifiers	250
1	Realistic stereo equalizer/booster	70
1	Sharp car AM/FM radio/cassette player	150
1	Pioneer cassette deck & stereo amplifier	300
1	Sharp AM/FM radio/cassette player	250
3	Car stereo cassette players	150
1	AWA portable AM/FM radio/cassette deck	100
3	Car speakers	80
3	Cigarette lighters	45
		\$8 815

\*Plus cash in office drawers

Approx. \$13

Details of that incident should have been provided in the answer given by the Minister. I want the Minister to explain why he did not supply that information. Was the Minister misinformed by his officers or did he deliberately misinform me and the Parliament? This illustrates the lack of concern for property under the care and supervision of officers within the various Government departments. I am very disappointed that the Government has not been able to come to grips with this large amount of Government property lost.

Another matter that is of concern to all members is the use of taxpayers' money to promote the existing Government. If the Government is not going too well it can take the opportunity to promote itself through advertising in various Government departments. This happened in New South Wales just before the New South Wales election. The New South Wales Auditor-General requested the Government to desist from using photos and Government departments to promote the Government of the day. I wrote to the Auditor-General earlier this year drawing his attention to the New South Wales Auditor-General's findings, and I asked him whether he would give a similar ruling in relation to South Australia. In relation to Government advertisements, on 26 March 1985 the Auditor-General replied as follows:

I acknowledge receipt of your correspondence and the accompanying information with respect to advertisements. The Auditor-General in the performance of his duties has a responsibility to ensure that advertisements which are paid from public funds are a proper charge against the Consolidated Account. In exercising that judgment the Auditor-General would need to satisfy himself that the advertisement relates to Government business and that there is a proper need to inform the public of that business.

If, in the opinion of the Auditor-General, public moneys have been spent without lawful authority and were not a proper charge on the Consolidated Account, then the matter would be reported to the Parliament in accordance with section 38 of the Audit Act. In my opinion the question as to whether photographs of Ministers should appear in Government advertisements is a matter for the Parliament to decide. I understand that the issue has not been addressed at that level. Copies of this letter have been forwarded to the Premier and to the Leader of the Opposition.

In several advertisements the Minister's photograph (and nothing else) appeared, and there was no statement from the Minister. If one looks at the advertisements, particularly those advertising the South Australian Financing Authority, there is a portrait of the Premier, but as far as I can see there is no statement attributed to him. The advertisement did not even indicate that the Premier was making a statement in that context.

Similarly, I believe that a photograph of the former Deputy Premier appeared in an advertisement which had something to do with the services of that department but, again, there was no direct quote or statement from him. In my opinion the advertisement picturing the Premier was used for one purpose and one purpose only, and that was to promote his image. I believe that everybody was fully aware of what was happening. The Financing Authority was endeavouring to establish itself and its credibility in seeking funds from the community and, in so doing, it used the Premier's photograph. However, it was also an opportunity, as we saw at Christmas time, and as we have seen on many other occasions following disastrous poll readings, to do something about the Premier's rating by using him in road safety commercials and in number of other promotions going on at the time.

I believe that it is morally wrong to ask Government departments to use money from their budgets for what I consider to be nothing more than cheap political purposes. That is why I asked the question in *Hansard* on Tuesday 2 April 1985 relating to advertising agents and departmental and statutory authority advertising budgets. It is amazing that over \$6 million a year is spent on advertising and promotion in this State. We were not given all the information as to the amount of money spent by some authorities such as the SGIC.

I believe that the answer appearing in the second column on page 3850 of *Hansard* could lead one to thinking that the Government has a commitment to South Australian based agencies, but that is not correct. Neville Jeffress Advertising is Australian owned with no local shareholding. Clemenger Adelaide has a large overseas (United States) shareholding with no local shareholding. Doyle Dane Bernbach has no local shareholding. D'Arcy-MacManus and Masius opened its branch office 12 years ago. About five years ago it purchased the Adelaide based MacNamara agency, merged and reduced staff. Masius is overseas owned with no local shareholding. McCann-Erickson was formally a South Australian owned agency (30 years ago), and there is no local shareholding.

Those agencies, together with Ogilvy and Mather, which is 100 per cent United States owned, and George Patterson which is 85 per cent United States owned, place 83.7 per cent of the advertising budgets. Those agencies are not South Australian owned and controlled, which was the question I asked of the Premier. With 16.3 per cent of the Government expenditure being placed with agencies which are South Australian owned and controlled, it could hardly be said that the Government demonstrates a commitment to South Australian based agencies. That is a bitter disappointment.

Time and time again the Government talks about promotion and the development and encouragement of locally based industries, small businesses, and so forth, and here is a classic example where the Government could direct some money towards South Australian companies, whereas only 16 per cent of the advertising budget involves such companies.

Government department budgets are created through taxes levied on South Australians with the intention of being reinvested in the development of this State. Development and employment can hardly be maximised if a percentage of these taxes, being the profits the overseas controlled agencies make, is sent out of the country. I request that this matter be further investigated so that more funds can be diverted to the various State owned advertising agencies. Neville Jeffress Advertising has the Public Service Board account worth \$85 000, and part of the South Australian Health Commission account, which is worth \$100 000, and that is 2.1 per cent of the total of Government expenditure

in this regard. Doyle Dane Bernbach has part of the South Australian Health Commission account, which is \$442 351, and the Department of Consumer Affairs, \$88 232. That is 6 per cent of the total Government expenditure in this area.

Ogilvy and Mather has the Department of State Development, (\$180 000), and the South Australian Enterprise Fund. The Government will not tell us how much it spends in that area, but again it would be approximately \$180 000, and that is 2 per cent of the total. George Patterson has the South Australian Financing Authority, \$250 000, and that is an industry estimate. The Ramsay Trust was about \$250 000; that was an estimate (it was not declared by the Premier) and that is 5.6 per cent. We know what a disaster the Ramsay Trust was at that stage. Masius has the Department of Local Government, \$55 000; the Electricity Trust of South Australia, \$550 000; and the South Australian Housing Trust, \$90 000; and that is 7.8 per cent of total Government expenditure in this area.

McCann-Erickson has the Department of Marine and Harbours contract, valued at \$59 000; and the Department of Mines and Energy, \$25 000; and that is .9 per cent. Clemengers, which has the largest share of Government advertising and which has a large overseas (United States) shareholding, has the State Bank account, worth \$1.7 million, and that is an industry estimate. SGIC is estimated at \$750 000; the Road Safety Council, \$265 000; the Department of Tourism, \$2 440 000; the Engineering and Water Supply Dept, \$77 000; and the Department of Woods and Forests, \$8 000, which totals 59.1 per cent. In other words, almost 60 per cent of the budget for advertising goes to the Clemenger advertising agency, which I have indicated has a large United States shareholding.

Those seven advertising agencies have branch offices in Adelaide. Whilst they may employ and create employment opportunities for some South Australians, the actual profits of those companies do not remain within South Australia. The Hocking Advertising Agency, which is 100 per cent South Australian owned, has the TAB account worth \$225 000 (or a 2.5 per cent share). Pym-Bruer Advertising is unfortunately in liquidation, and that agency has the State Electoral Department account which was worth \$10 000 (or .1 per cent). The Barr, Wollard Cawse Advertising Group, which is 100 per cent Australian owned, has the Lotteries Commission account, worth \$1 050 000; and the Department of Environment and Planning, worth \$162 000; and that is 13.7 per cent of the Government expenditure in this area.

That then gives us some idea of what is actually happening in relation to the Bannon Government helping local industry. There is an opportunity, taxpayer subsidised and taxpayer funded, for South Australian companies to be involved in considerable advertising and promotion, but they attract only a small percentage of such business, and that is extremely disappointing.

I hope that, if the Government sees fit to spend \$6 million or \$7 million on advertising, it will consider the skills of the local advertising agencies. Local skills cannot be developed unless local agencies are given the chance to undertake that work. If we are proud to be South Australian, let us get behind the local agencies by giving them such work.

I am happy that the Minister of Recreation and Sport is in the House this afternoon, because for some time I have been concerned about the misleading quotes that members were given during the sittings of the Budget Estimates Committees last year. I am especially cross that the Opposition was given information and that, when that information was related to the media, it was squashed. This long running battle between the Department and me will continue until this situation is rectified.

Recently, I received a copy of the development plan of the West Beach Recreation Trust area. In Estimates Committee B last year, members were provided with details of the State's sporting facilities that would be considered for funding in the next three to five years. I understand that these applications were involved with part of the Commonwealth Government funding program. The South Australian Baseball League had a proposal to build a State baseball training and competition centre at the southern end of the West Beach Trust site (currently the Glenelg Baseball Club facility).

The league wanted to have an international diamond. In fact, I supported this proposal because I believed that to establish the baseball headquarters on the Glenelg Baseball Club land at West Beach would be an ideal location. The estimated cost in 1984 was \$840 000. Regrettably, however, the Department of Air Transport has declined the proposal for two reasons. First, it said that intense lighting would be required under the main approach to Adelaide Airport if the baseball headquarters was established and major league games were played in that area. Secondly, I was staggered to learn that, as the height of an aircraft coming in over the Glenelg Baseball Clubrooms at North Glenelg was about 140 feet, it was feared that a baseball could be hit that high and therefore hit an aircraft.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** It would be a pretty good hit.

**Mr BECKER:** Phil Alexander could do it if I was pitching! Apart from that, it is disappointing that the Department of Air Transport has refused permission for lighting towers to be installed at that site. Hopefully, the Glenelg Baseball Club and the South Australian Baseball League are now considering another site, on Trust land at the corner of Military Road and Burbridge Road, opposite the housing area at West Beach, where there is sufficient land to develop a major baseball centre.

Worse is to come. I have now found from the Kinhill Stearns report on the West Beach Recreation Trust area that the Department of Air Transport at some stage hopes to extend the main runway across Tapley Hill Road into the area now occupied by the golf course, which would also affect the baseball area. So, an extension of the Adelaide Airport is proposed. In fact, a master plan has been drawn up and there is every possibility of Adelaide Airport being extended in the future. However, this master plan is just an ideas plan and there is no point in anyone getting excited about it at present. It involves an extension of the north-south runway over Tapley Hill Road; an extension of the west-east runway over Tapley Hill Road; and a dual runway traversing most of the West Beach land and crossing the intersection of Tapley Hill Road and West Beach Road.

It is a pity that those who are advocating improvements to the international terminal have not looked at the master plan because it is being considered that perhaps the international terminal facility should be located where the existing domestic facilities are now established and that the domestic facilities should be developed alongside the international terminal where the light aircraft are now parked.

Although this is a futuristic plan, it is the ultimate in the development of Adelaide Airport and it is not expected that this development will occur for the next 20 or 30 years. I wish that the people who are calling for all sorts of improvements at Adelaide Airport would consider the people who are living near it, especially those in West Richmond and Brooklyn Park, which are in my new electoral district, as well as the people living in Glenelg North. I am annoyed that people who for economic reasons and through no fault of their own chose to live in a certain area should be hounded by those who live nowhere near the area that is occupied by my constituents who must put up with greater inconvenience and the fear of new ideas that are being

expounded. Such action by people living away from this area indicates the type of greedy selfish society in which we live.

Because of economic necessity, several thousand people live under the flight paths of the main runways at Adelaide Airport. Indeed, many of those residents were there before jet aircraft were using Adelaide Airport and even before their use there was being considered. Now, there is talk of spending \$3 million on an uneconomic terminal, and that does not make sense to me. The Sir Thomas Playford International Terminal will not be viably economic for many years yet and, when people including members of Parliament advocate spending money there, they should realise that such a sum must be amortised over the landing rights and the licence fees paid by the aircraft using that airport. So, the expenditure of \$3 million at the airport must have an impact on air fares charged by Qantas and British Airways. Indeed, it must be remembered that Air New Zealand has the right to land there at any time and may do so during the Grand Prix. Flying Tigers come in regularly with the jumbo cargo aircraft and such expenditure would have an impact on its operations as well. The expenditure of \$3 million must have an impact on all aircraft using the airport, whether light aircraft, the hobby farmer's aircraft, aircraft flying to Kangaroo Island, or those of Airlines of South Australia, Ansett or TAA.

Money spent at the Adelaide Airport must be amortised by these airline companies so, when anyone, whether the *News*, the Lord Mayor of Adelaide, or anyone sponsoring a convention centre, talks about upgrading facilities at Adelaide Airport, we must consider, first, the economic impact on air travellers and air traffic generally and, secondly, the possible environmental impact on the people who are forced, through economic circumstances, to live where they do. Get off the greed kick and leave us alone! We have learnt to cope with the problems we have at the Adelaide Airport. Regrettably, there are no plans for the next 30 years. Adelaide Airport is 30 years down the track for any consideration of major upgrading or any possibility of transferring.

I have been informed that the current Federal Government has no intention of doing anything in regard to relocating Adelaide Airport. I believe the current State Government also has no intentions in this regard. It would cost \$500 million to \$600 million to build a new Adelaide airport. Costs have got out of hand and out of kilter. This means that the facilities such as freeways, railways, rapid transport or anything else to go with a new international airport out of the city would be beyond the current economic situation. It is a tragedy because it is putting a tremendous amount of stress on those who live close to the airport. The only thing we can hope for is that the new generation of aircraft will be much quieter.

Some people are convinced that the jumbos are much quieter, but I am yet to be convinced. Qantas has informed me that the new aircraft are much quieter, but we will wait to see. It does nothing for the confidence of people in those areas when politicians demand this or that of the Adelaide airport. The real test will come in the last week of October and the first week of November when there will be unprecedented air traffic in and out of Adelaide airport.

**Mr Plunkett:** What about the Kangaroo Island farmers?

**Mr BECKER:** They are forced out to the peripheral airports at Parafield and down south. The one at the south coast is receiving attention from local residents.

*The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:*

**Mr BECKER:** If it does not have a bituminised airstrip or control tower with radar, I do not consider it even to be an airport. Possibly we need one down there, but local residents are not too happy about getting an airport. Bit by bit airports will be established around the city and we must

give consideration to that matter. It is disappointing that good rural land will be used for airport services. We should let the Adelaide Airport go along and spend \$3 million if we want to have bars and facilities in the Playford International Terminal. The airport is known as the Sir Thomas Playford International Airport. It took two years to get a plaque designed and placed on the terminal building.

*The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:*

**Mr BECKER:** I am opposed to any extension of runways over Tapleys Hill Road. The resolution on the books of this House has stood for some 10 to 12 years and I will continue to oppose that. I am pleased that the Minister is here because I have a copy of the Kinhill Stearns report into the possible use and development of the West Beach Trust area, which concerns him very much. I am concerned that his department proposes to build a sporting stadium and complex on West Beach Trust land.

From information I have, I understand the Minister has put the proposal to Cabinet three times and it has been thrown out for several reasons. Unfortunately, the soil in that area proposed for a Commonwealth Games facility is not suitable. Now is the time to start building and planning for Commonwealth Games facilities, but an outdoor stadium, aquatic centre, indoor centre and warm-up track proposed at West Beach would go over the old West Torrens Council rubbish dump. That is certainly not on because it would sink. The soil there is most unstable and unsuitable and would mean again taking part of the existing very popular golf course.

The Patawalonga golf course is a credit to the West Beach Trust and has proved extremely popular. I would hate to see it destroyed and certainly it is not a proposition to put a major athletic stadium there. I am suggesting that if the department is genuine—and the Minister only has 40 or 50 days left of his 90 day option over that land—that be where we build the hockey stadium. We could put down astra turf as grass cannot be grown there. I would welcome a hockey stadium in this general area near Tapley Hill Road at West Beach.

*Mr Peterson interjecting:*

**Mr BECKER:** Unfortunately, the Minister's department will have to look elsewhere for the Commonwealth Games stadium and entertainment centre. Let us put the hockey stadium there because it does not require a large grandstand and needs only an area for three ovals, which can be done. A small parcel of land would be stable for a building to house clubrooms and a major centre for hockey. Another option exists on West Beach Road—an area used by the pony club. We have the possibility of accommodating hockey and lacrosse, but I am afraid that a major 40 000 seat stadium/entertainment centre is not feasible due to a lack of sufficient stable soil in the area. There has been poor planning over the decades as well as poor use of the land. The current West Beach Trust is trying to rectify that, and I compliment it on going to consultants to prepare a master plan so that the area can now be fully developed.

I have expressed concern on numerous occasions to various Ministers and to the trust itself that to carve up the current Par 3 golf course and put in a fisheries research station was awfully unfair. The trust proposed to build a Par 3 18-hole golf course, with a few holes being Par 4. It will be too big for those who use the current Par 3 course, which is compact and ideal for retired or disabled people as well as for the school children who use it to learn the fundamentals of golf. It is a pity to see it go.

Back in 1977 I asked for a fisheries research station to be incorporated with Marineland and still believe that that should occur, but the size looks too large. If it has to go there, the building should be deferred until the new Par 3 golf course is available. I can see no reason why the Fisheries

Department cannot wait another six months. Unfortunately for the Department of Recreation and Sport and its proposals—although I would like to see a \$2 million State indoor sport and recreation centre there—it is not feasible in that location. I would be more inclined to look at the Holbrooks Road site at the Underdale College of Advanced Education. That site could be developed into a fully integrated sports institute as part of it is there already.

We could also look at the possibility of a sports centre which is not possible in the West Beach Trust area. It is a tragedy that we do not have a permanent headquarters for the Amateur Weightlifting Association. It is a shame, in light of the fact that in this State we have someone who has won a gold medal at the Olympic Games. We have men and women achieving excellent results in weight-lifting, but we have not been able to obtain permanent headquarters for them. I hope that we can keep looking. As I go around my area I see one or two sections in the industrial complex at North Plympton that may be suitable for a weight-lifting centre, although the floor may need to be reinforced.

We should do more to assist our sporting and recreation organisations. We need to realise that they should be located in the metropolitan area, close to the city, so that public and general transport is easily accessible, yet cause little inconvenience to residential areas. There is a possibility of one or two other sports facilities, such as a small bore rifle association, being established at West Beach. Also, we must do something quickly to assist the sport of hockey to establish itself.

I am very concerned about the drubbing that some unions took following the release of the Costigan Report, and I am disappointed that this Government has taken no action whatsoever in relation to the painters and dockers. This has reflected on other unions involved at Port Adelaide. A few have made it difficult for others, but we have not heard the other side of the story, so it is easy to pick up examples and criticise what is going on. However, industrial relations in this State and country need to be improved. It is time the unions woke up to themselves and improved their image.

However, one reads of huge rip-offs, such as a quote of \$9 000 to clean a ship yet the bill suddenly comes out at \$17 800, and another quote of \$9 000 yet the payment was \$18 000, and there was an additional cost of \$16 000. We can pick at random allegations of huge sums of money having been paid, and I understand the practice is still continuing. Quotes are asked for ship cleaning, yet the final payment considerably exceeds the original quotes. One original quote was \$734, it rose to \$2 772; the extra cost was \$2 032.

That all affects the consumer because, for instance, we are dependent on exporting grain for the farmer and the rural industry; in turn that affects our credibility overseas. The goods we import are also affected by hold-ups and problems. The Government owes consumers of this State an explanation as to why it has not taken any action in relation to allegations of problems at Port Adelaide, referred to in the Costigan Report under the heading 'Extortion in South Australia'. No-one has explained whether or not that is correct.

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** Of course, it is correct. He would not put it in his report, otherwise.

**Mr BECKER:** That is right, but one needs to hear the other side of the story. As the Minister of Recreation and Sport found out, one does not ask for a sketch plan to cover a swimming pool at North Adelaide and expect it to cost, say, \$3.5 million. That is the tragedy. If the consultant had said \$10 million and the bill had been \$9.7 million or \$7.8 million, then the Minister would have been saved.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Ferguson):** Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The member for Florey.

**Mr GREGORY (Florey):** I was very pleased to have the opportunity to listen to His Excellency the Governor's speech, because it outlined a number of innovative measures that our Government will introduce in this Parliament in the forthcoming session. I want to talk about only two in which I have a particular interest.

One matter that causes considerable problems within our community is the Workers Compensation Act. A number of people have not accepted that there is a need for change. At the moment, the Act provides very good compensation to people who are injured at work and who do not suffer any residual injury. There could not be any better form of compensation for them.

However, problems arise in respect of those people who suffer an injury and for whom there is a residual disability. At the moment, in South Australia many people are finding themselves excluded from work, particularly if they have had an injury to their back, legs or arms. Employers are reluctant to employ them because insurance companies advise that, if they do, their premiums will be markedly increased. Yet, when one challenges companies and employers they deny all knowledge of that.

However, from time to time, we come across evidence that it is so. Perhaps one reason for this is that there is a multiplicity of insurance companies—53 or 54 operate in this field. It is a highly competitive business. It means that employers are able to avoid their responsibility to provide a very safe workplace and when insurance companies tend to take punitive action against those who operate an unsafe business they go somewhere else.

I was fortunate in late 1978 to be asked by the then Minister of Labour (Jack Wright) to participate in an inquiry into rehabilitation and compensation of persons injured at work. At that time, the Hon. Jack Wright recognised the deficiencies of our current Workers Compensation Act. He charged the committee to inquire into rehabilitation. Incidentally, there were very few programs in which the injured worker was properly supervised in a rehabilitation program which would get that worker mobile again and back into the work force, not necessarily in his previous job.

Further, lump sum payments were totally inadequate. Even today we find that lump sum payments under the statutory requirements set out in the Act do not last very long when they are paid to the worker. We find other anomalies in that the person who suffered an injury years ago and who could no longer work because of that injury was paid out a lump sum commensurate with the amount in the Act at that time, but that it was inadequate.

I well recall a person coming to me on a number of occasions when I was Secretary of the United Trades and Labor Council seeking my assistance because he had injured his back in an accident 22 years previously and could no longer work. He was offered an \$8 000 lump sum, which was totally inadequate for a person who had suffered a number of operations that did not improve his position at all, but had caused him further injury and anatomical loss to such an extent that, if he had not migrated to our country, his marriage would have dissolved. As it was, it was under considerable strain.

There was no relief under the current Act. This was one of the things that guided me in my role on the committee in inquiring into what a new Act should be. Those are some of the deficiencies in the Act, but the real disability and deficiency of the current Act is that once the legal process is concluded, the person in all probability is not able to work in industry again, because under our Industrial Con-

ciliation and Arbitration Act rules that person can no longer remain a member of his original union. The lawyer is finished: he no longer wants to know that person. The insurance company has finished its obligation and does not want to know, so these people are left in the wilderness and have to fend for themselves. The statutory sum is inadequate.

When the Act was amended in 1981 or 1982 I pleaded with the then Minister of Labour, the member for Davenport, that the maximum sum should be \$62 500 and not \$50 000, because \$62 500 would be the exact sum required if inflation was taken into account. However, the then Minister chose not to take the advice of the trade union movement and made the sum \$50 000. That sum has not been increased, and so many people are suffering great deprivation.

I note with some interest that the Opposition has proposals in this area. I must say that, to the credit of the member for Davenport, when he became a Minister he instructed the committee to continue its work and made arrangements in that regard to the extent that he organised an investigative tour of a limited number of Canadian Provinces and of New Zealand to enable a study of the no-fault compensation scheme involving no lump sum payments but providing pension payments. It is unfortunate that, when the report was presented, the only organisation to adopt its provisions (and it was a fairly lukewarm approach, I understand) was the Chamber of Commerce and Industry. The trade union movement did not adopt the report: the issue was lost on a vote, and the report was left in limbo.

The new Minister of Labour and Deputy Premier in the Bannon Government (the member for Adelaide) resurrected the report and undertook discussions with employers and the trade union movement. He arranged a conference called 'New Directions', bringing together people in the workers compensation field such as unions, employers, the medical profession and insurance companies. It is interesting to note that at that conference the insurance companies tried to pretend that the current scheme was the best and that the proposals of 'New Directions' were wrong and flew in the face of all the evidence that had been accumulated by the committee and by speakers at that conference. I was disappointed at that attitude, but I suppose that one must recognise that these companies are greedy: they care for themselves and do not worry too much about the people they should be protecting.

The other problem is that at that time, and even today, insurance companies were spouting that they had a solution, but no solution has ever really been offered. All that the Liberal Party could offer was, 'We will cut down the costs of workers compensation. We will lop off the benefits.' That is a totally inadequate response to the plight of workers in pursuit of employment.

I was particularly pleased with the report of the tripartite committee, which called for the introduction of an independent board. The board would not be part of the SGIC but would be managed at the top by a chairman appointed by the Government and two part-time members, one from the trade unions and one from employer groups. The board would have very important powers, such as the oversight of rehabilitation. If one reads the report, one finds that the concept of rehabilitation is emphasised. For the first time it is stated that workers will be rehabilitated.

A lot of people do not know what that means—it means that workers will be able to go back to work if they can and, if they cannot work at their chosen former employment, they will be trained for other suitable employment. The most notable example that I saw was in Saskatchewan. The Chairman of the board there, when asked whether the

rehabilitation program had progressed, said, 'I am a product of it.' He said that when he was a manual worker he had lost a leg in an accident but when he had recovered physically he was interviewed by the board. He went to university and subsequently became a teacher and developed an interest in compensation and rehabilitation. Thus, when the position of Chairman of the board was advertised, he sought and gained it. He spoke with first hand knowledge of the achievements of the board. The employer and employee representatives on that board were equally frank about its workings.

If we had that situation here in Adelaide we could overcome a number of problems associated with workers compensation. Quite often I have cited the example of an insurance company representative who visited a factory in Glynde to speak to the owner of the factory about the high rate of injuries. That occurred in October. The employer was most concerned: he asked, 'What are you worried about? We have lost only 34 joints so far this year.' He was referring to joints from hands, etc., not joints that grow. They are gone forever. The insurance company representative was getting stuck into the owner, because the injury rate was costing the company a considerable sum. The representative told me that it was not fair to the workers, either. I am pleased to say that other employers would sack a manager who allowed that sort of thing to happen.

A number of things are wrong with our workers compensation system. Section 10 of the Act exempts BHAS, at Port Pirie, from certain aspects of workers compensation. Apparently, that has to do with lead. But there are other effects. A company that operates in Port Pirie, Cheesmans, does contract work at the smelters and people employed by Cheesmans can work for most of their life in the smelters. No matter how long after a person leaves the employment of Cheesmans, if he develops asbestosis he can claim workers compensation. However, the same class of employee of BHAS after 12 months cannot claim a thing. BHAS will not pay.

One power of the board would be very innovative. It could set premiums for a certain class of employee. I recall that in the South-East insurance companies charged 35 per cent of the payroll in regard to tree fellers because of the high incidence of injury. Through training programs the injury rate has been decreased, and consequently the premium was reduced to 17 per cent. The board would have the power to strike a median rate and, if a company did not perform adequately within the safety area, the premium could be increased, in some cases by 150 per cent. The committee believed that that would be a sufficient incentive in regard to safety. On the other hand, the premiums for a very safe workplace would decrease.

Another innovative aspect was that the common law would be abolished. Members of the committee felt that there should be no lump sum payments, except small statutory amounts, and that people should be compensated for injuries leading to residual disabilities by payment of a regular pension.

In other words, that meant paying them a wage until they had finished their working lives. It was felt that adopting such a scheme would reduce the costs of compensation by up to 35 per cent. That was not a fanciful figure thought up by the committee but a figure given to us by the Public Actuary. We felt that, if we were able to reduce the costs of compensation in this State by 35 per cent to improve the return to workers, we would be doing a marvellous thing.

However, as most of us know, when trying to introduce something new one runs into some resistance. I am confident that the negotiations, discussions and consultations that are taking place between the Chamber of Commerce



and Industry, a number of other employer organisations, and the United Trades and Labor Council will result in a situation where the Government will be able to provide a Bill that has the support of employers and employees.

Together with the innovative powers that the board would have, there would be provision to fund educational programs on workers compensation and research, particularly at universities, so that some problems in industry could be looked at and possibly some action taken to assist people in need. With industrial safety, it is no good talking about reducing the costs of workers compensation unless there is a reduction in accidents in the workplace. Some people tend to place most importance on accidents at work resulting in death or serious injury, but with occupational safety practices it is shown that if an attack is made on unsafe working practices at the base level (that is, reducing accidents, near misses, and so on) this means a reduction in serious injuries. It works on the pyramid principle, and it works extremely well.

When introduced into Parliament the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act was quite innovative and provided significant changes in safe working practices. However, that Act is no longer adequate, and there is a need to upgrade it and to ensure that more people are involved in safe working practices. This would mean a fairly big training program in this State, involving workers and their representatives. More particularly, it would involve employers and their representatives in the workplace. Most accidents occur due to a lack of understanding by employers and/or their representatives of conditions in the workplace. The sooner we can get rid of the macho image that the tough bronzed Anzac Australian can do anything, the better. We need to create safe working environments where everyone takes precautions.

I believe that we have adequate knowledge to prevent most of the traumatic injuries that occur in the workplace today. However, we lack information in respect of the toxic effect of work processes that are used. A radical change is needed in the approach to the use of chemicals and work processes. No longer is it good enough to say to someone, 'Don't worry about it; you can't understand it; it will be all right.' We need to know. No longer can workers be used as guinea pigs, with a serious injury or death occurring before something is done about work processes. We cannot allow four or five deaths to occur before realising that something may be wrong.

The American Government organisation which deals with occupational safety and health has been innovative. At a conference in Geneva on safety, at which I was present, that organisation issued to the ILO alerts on five chemicals which in its opinion needed to be withdrawn from industry so that it could be determined whether those chemicals had a toxic effect on workers using those chemicals. Subsequent efforts showed that the action taken in this area was proper. Yet I can remember being at that conference with a doctor from Australia who said that the matter was not proven.

He was right: it was not proven that some of the chemicals could cause cancer, but grave doubts were raised. Subsequent tests proved that it could. The action of OSHA in America in issuing that safety alert probably saved a number of lives. I think there should be more of it. Australia should be able to participate and we should also ensure that the chemical and work processes that are used are adequately named and labelled so that people can understand what they are doing.

I now refer to something that happened on 4 July that I think showed a lack of appreciation and understanding of the trade unions' efforts to ensure that the unemployed got work and that people who were working had their rights protected. I refer to the hoo-ha, as the member for Kavel

frequently refers to things when he wants to denigrate something, when the trade union movement said that union awards must be kept. It was all because the United Trades and Labor Council said that people involved in the Grand Prix organisation ought to be members of the union. The Secretary of the United Trades and Labor Council said that volunteer labour should not be used for litter collection at the Grand Prix.

What was it all about? It was about an article that appeared in a news-sheet called 'Wheelspin' dated January 1985, which states:

FREE  
SEE THE AUSTRALIAN  
F1 GP FREE!!!!

Kesab—Keep South Australia Beautiful, has won the contract for litter control at the Australian Formula 1 G.P. To do the job Kesab will have to employ over 260 people in all and that's where you come in . . .

We are offering the members of car clubs the chance to see the G.P. and all other events FREE plus the opportunity to earn money for their clubs—all in return for some dedicated help to ensure that no one can point a finger at motor sport enthusiasts and say 'they're a dirty mob'.

Now you won't just be working in one area—Kesab will rotate litter crews so that all 'staff' will get the opportunity to see all parts of the track plus the holy of holies—the pits!! Yes, we guarantee that you won't have to work during the races BUT you will work at other times . . . indeed we want an undertaking that no one leaves each day until the job is done.

That's the deal for '85—Kesab expects to continue the arrangement into the future and those who do the job as required can expect a place at those future events.

Now, I'm a little biased towards the SCC and as I know that the club has to raise \$30 000 to resurface Collingrove Hillclimb, then I see this as the ideal opportunity for club members to earn a significant amount of money for the club.

So, SCC members who want to help are going to get the first bite at the cherry and then, if more help is needed, other car clubs will be offered the same deal.

There are also two clean up days—the Monday after the G.P. and another day, yet to be nominated. Any volunteers for those days will have the option of being paid direct at \$7 per hour or donating the money to their club.

Please fill out the form in the back of Wheelspin and return it to the club, now.

There was a form attached at page 13, which states:

I hereby undertake to assist Kesab as requested and that payment for this service be forwarded as a donation to the Sporting Car Club of SA Inc.

The Executive Director of the Employers' Federation complained about the unions wanting a closed shop. A report which appeared in the *Advertiser* of 4 July states:

The executive director of the SA Employers' Federation, Mr R. S. Warren, said the federation had heard that unions wanted a 'closed shop' policy in areas which were traditionally voluntary labour.

'If the unions were to attempt to move in on that ground they would be doing a disservice,' he said. 'It would damage our reputation to run the Grand Prix. All the hopes and money would be out the door.'

The *News* of 5 July contained the following report:

The Deputy Liberal Leader, Mr Goldsworthy, yesterday called on the State Government to firmly resist the union move. Contractors should be free to make their own arrangements.

'If the unions are successful in this case, will they then force KESAB workers who clean up our beaches to join the union as well?' he asked 'And will kids who work at the Royal Show and the cricket also be forced to join a union?'

Mr Goldsworthy said it was 'the thin end of the wedge'.

On Saturday 6 July the *Advertiser* reported a statement by Mr Lesses on the shemozzle over the Grand Prix. The report states:

He Mr Lesses said the UTLC and the Chamber of Commerce and Industry had been 'working like hell' to made the Grand Prix a success and avoid any industrial disputes.

What disappointed me about this business was that KESAB had no contract as yet. Apart from personal pride that we would have in a South Australian Grand Prix, such an event would create investment and job opportunities because

it would bring extra money to South Australia. The funds that have been spent by this Government and the Federal Government on the Grand Prix will be returned to the Governments in full as a result of the increased tax paid by people who work on the event, the increasing business that will result, and a number of other circumstances.

One reason for running the Grand Prix in South Australia is to provide jobs here, and the effect of KESAB's advertisement would be to ensure that its members, who are not unemployed and who can probably afford to buy tickets, would see the Grand Prix at no cost to themselves, at the same time preventing people from being gainfully employed on the work in question. Incidentally, the rate for a casual cleaner is \$7.25 an hour, not \$7 as is quoted, and people working on Saturday and Sunday would be paid at time and a half for the first three hours on Saturday and double time thereafter, as well as double time for Sunday. People working after 12.00 p.m. on Saturday would expect to be paid double time, and the result of KESAB's advertisement would be to have people working for less than award rates.

Further, it could not only deny unemployed people the opportunity to obtain work but also prevent those who did the work from being covered by worker's compensation in case of injury. Indeed, other problems would be caused because of the employment of volunteers. Therefore, I was disappointed to find that the Deputy Leader had made a statement on this matter for the purpose of short-term political gain by having a go at the unions as he frequently does. It also demonstrated the amazing lack of knowledge on the Deputy Leader's part concerning the operation of industrial relations and the obligations of people to those who do the work. In saying this, I do not denigrate the great volunteer spirit in our community.

I now refer to an incident concerning a shut down at the Westernport oil refinery. Recently, that refinery was shut down so that proper maintenance could be carried out. The need for such work is critical and it is done by stopping the refining process and allowing as many maintenance employees as possible to move in to do their repair work. This maintenance, which is carried out about every 12 months, limits the supply of the product. It is called a shutdown or stoppage, whatever you like. It is properly controlled and work proceeds until the plant is totally repaired. It also has some other effects. It causes the refining process to cease in that area and there may be shortages. However, the oil companies plan for those shortages and adequate care is taken to make sure that people are not deprived.

On 22 July I was contacted by the principal of a primary school in my area. He told me that his school had run out of dieseline which was used as heating fuel, and would not be able to get any until the end of July or the beginning of August, and possibly not until a few days into August. He wanted to know what was happening. I contacted the Seamen's Union and found out that indeed, as press reports quoted, an oil tanker at Port Lincoln was having some trouble unloading dieseline and other fuels that had come from Singapore. It was a flag of convenience ship. It had 20 000 tonnes of fuel and it was being denied the opportunity to unload that fuel.

The workers in South Australia had taken those decisions to protect jobs because there is an overcapacity in Australia at the moment for refining of oils, and an oil refinery has been closed—the tenth on the list of oil refineries in Australia. The ninth on that list was the oil refinery at Port Stanvac. Therefore, the workers in South Australia were taking action to ensure that this State kept its only oil refinery. They were seeking assurances from the oil companies that this would be so. They saw the importation of any oil and refined products into South Australia as an attempt by the oil companies to close down the oil refinery

in this State. They were particularly conscious that in Singapore there is a 50 per cent overcapacity. People were feeling this was rather serious and they were taking action accordingly.

I then got onto the Transport Workers Union and said that I had been told that there was very little dieseline around. That caused some laughter. I was told that there was plenty of fuel, provided it was properly rationed to the people who needed it. There were problems in Port Lincoln because there was a shortage of fuel, and 7 000 tonnes of it was offloaded for the farming community in that area.

The ship was wanting to go into Port Pirie, but that was not allowed. Port Pirie was supplied by train from Adelaide. The amazing thing was that on the two nights prior to this principal telephoning me, 900 tonnes of fuel had been pushed down the pipeline from Stanvac to Birkenhead distribution centre. I advised the principal to get onto the oil company and, if he could not get the appropriate amount of oil, to go to another company. The company in question was Shell. He advised me the next morning, when I went to see him, how he got on. At 4 o'clock he was able to get onto the two companies and to explain what he knew of the situation, and at 4.30 they both telephoned back offering oil.

The real crux of the situation is that the Education Department quite properly seeks the cheapest tender it can get for the delivery of fuel to its schools. In so doing, it got the oil as supplied by the person who delivers for Shell. As he receives more money for delivering to private enterprise than to schools, he decided not to deliver to the school until all the fuel was available. I assure honourable members that the next morning fuel was delivered to that school.

In the course of the Address in Reply I have heard records of this Government at great length about the economic mess they made in the three years that their Party was in government up until the last election. It is appropriate to advise the House of a portion of the Address in Reply made by the Premier in December 1982. It is as follows:

In August the previous Government brought down a budget which it claimed aimed at a balance on the Consolidated Account. Admittedly, this balance was to be achieved after an expected \$42 000 000 deficit on recurrent operations was compensated for by diverting an equal sum from capital works funds a pattern of financial juggling with which we have become all too familiar. However, the Treasury now indicates that this forecast is hopelessly inaccurate, particularly as regards recurrent expenditure. Indeed, I must say that the picture is far worse than I had ever contemplated.

My Government now finds that the deficit on recurrent operations will exceed the estimate made by the former Treasurer in August by a minimum of \$30 000 000. That is, without any additional calls on Government expenditures, without taking into account the commitments of the new Government, and assuming no increases in costs for the remainder of the financial year, the deficit on recurrent operations will be approximately \$72 000 000.

Consequently, the blow-out of the deficit on recurrent expenditure could be as high as \$55 000 000, to give a recurrent deficit for 1982-83 of some \$97 000 000.

Further on in that statement the Premier also said:

This latter category is most disturbing. In 1982-83 the South Australian Government will have to find \$9 000 000 for drought relief, yet no allocation was made in the Budget for such expenditure. However, the former Minister of Agriculture has made clear that this oversight was of no consequence to him. In the *News* of 19 November he is quoted as follows:

... the money was there. I had Cabinet approval,' he said: The former Premier, Mr Tonkin, gave me an open cheque book.

I have no doubt that the member for Alexandra, the then Minister of Agriculture, believed that, because in Estimates Committee A he was questioned by me about there being no allocation of money for fruit fly eradication. Hardly a year goes by in which we do not have to eradicate some fruit fly and it does cost money. One would have thought that a prudent money manager would have allocated some

funds for such eradication. However, the Tonkin Government did not do that. In response to a question by me, the member for Alexandra stated:

I think it might be likened to the drought situation where we do not put any estimate on our requirements. There is no way in the world that we could predict when a drought will start or finish, so we do not provide a line to cover drought aid assistance.

That was in September 1982. One would have thought that the Government of that time, with all its resources at hand, would have known that we were in the grip of a drought and that it was getting worse. Later in that committee, upon questioning by Mr Plunkett, the Minister stated:

Shortly after the commencement of this financial year, the State agreed to participate in a drought assistance programme for South Australia, recognising that a drought was either pending or beginning. Subsequently, meetings and discussions were held with our Commonwealth colleague to reaffirm the Commonwealth/State agreement for funding during the drought, either this financial year or extending into next financial year.

Later in the committee, again under prompting and questioning from Mr Plunkett, the Minister said:

We are heading for a very rough time and it is terribly important to do everything possible to ensure that the majority of our breeding stock is maintained.

So, it was ridiculous for the Government of that time to say that it was not aware of and did not know that there would be a drought: it should have provided funds but it did not do so; this is illustrated by the big deficit with which we were confronted when we came into government. If we had allowed the Tonkin Budget to continue, by the time we came round to working out the funds for the next financial year we would have been bankrupt.

I had the opportunity in July of going to the United Farmers and Stockowners annual meeting in the Festival Theatre. I was very grateful for the invitation that I received. I thought that I was at home: there were signs around the place that said, 'Unity is strength'. The main speakers all had a go at the Government. There were things that they claimed were wrong, and it was just like being in the trade union movement.

*The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:*

**Mr GREGORY:** I am not a member of the United Farmers and Stockowners: I was a guest and I was not going to stand up for anybody. I note its concern, but I find it rather whimsical that these people do not want subsidies: they just do not want to pay tax on some things. It amazes me why they adopt that attitude. They have adopted the attitude of whipping the trade union movement as though it is the problem and cause of all their ills. It is not, and they ought to realise that.

There are poverty and problems within the farming community, but they are mostly brought about by the fall of world commodity prices for their products, which is in all probability caused by the surplus of food and products in Europe and America. We will be in for a fairly tough time in the future. However, this does not mean that they are the only people in South Australia who are suffering: workers are suffering, too, but the trouble is that workers have nothing at all. This attack by the country on the city is rather a useless way of trying to overcome their problems. It will not solve their problems, because they do not appreciate and realise that, as citizens of this country, they are in this boat along with the rest. If they have problems, they need to be attacked as problems.

They go on about fuel parity pricing. It was not a Labor Government that introduced it, but a Liberal and National Party Government. At that time, for very good reason, to ensure that anyone who drilled oil wells and found oil was able to get a world price for the oil and do it profitably—because most oil drilling in Australia is being done in very expensive places for small amounts of oil—a tax was introduced by Mr Fraser, supported by Mr Anthony and by the

Party on that side. I find it ridiculous for them to say, 'We do not want a subsidy: we just do not want to pay tax.'

I will say a few things about how the city benefits the country and how, when we do some things collectively, it can work for everybody. In 1943 the Hon. Thomas Playford, who was a respected political figure in this State, introduced in this Parliament a Bill to establish an Electricity Commission to regulate the production of electricity in South Australia. He made the point that South Australia probably was one of the backwoods in not having brought a measure of this nature forward sooner. He went on to talk about how the Adelaide Electric Supply Company produced 90 per cent of the electricity generated in South Australia and that 90 per cent of that was used in the metropolitan area. He also made the point that some country towns had two electric power stations.

One supplied the town with direct current and the other with alternating current. Those were backward times. He was introducing a system from which people throughout the whole length and breadth of South Australia could benefit. In 1946, Sir Thomas Playford finally got his way over the troglodytes in the Upper House and introduced a Bill to establish the Electricity Trust of South Australia. At that time Sir Thomas said:

Whereas it is a very simple and profitable process to generate electricity to supply heavy industrialised areas and centres of big population, it is very costly to generate and transport throughout the length and breadth of the State. Where there are open spaces the cost of transmission is very heavy.

His point was that most of the farming community in South Australia benefited from the single wire earth return system of power distribution. This was done because of a Liberal Conservative Premier in this State who had opposition from within his Party and who had the strength and courage to nationalise a State instrumentality which would not support the farming community. If we ever did what the farming community wanted—pay on the user demand basis—we would hear them squeal if the cost of power went up in accordance with the cost of getting it there.

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** We still have farmers paying a loading on that system.

**Mr GREGORY:** And they are getting it very cheaply in comparison with what they did before. I lived in a farming community when one could not even leave 25 watt globes on. This is what members opposite forget. However, as requested by a number of honourable members, I conclude my remarks and wish the people in this House well.

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra):** I appreciate the opportunity to address the House, in reply to the speech delivered by His Excellency the Governor at the opening of the forty-sixth Parliament on 1 August this year. I extend to those families of the two deceased former members of Parliament my condolences, along with those of other members of the House. I note with interest paragraph 3 on page 1 of His Excellency's speech, which reads:

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. This has resulted in more South Australians finding employment with a further 20 000 jobs being created in the 12 months to June 1985.

His Excellency's requirement to deliver to Parliament a preparation by the Government of the day is respected. However, that particular announcement is false. From my research it appears that, while it is conceded that unemployment is still unacceptably high, it has fallen over the period to June 1985. That aspect of the announcement is true—it has fallen over recent months.

However, I put the record straight: in June 1982 the unemployment figure was 5 800 fewer in South Australia than it was at June 1985. It is recognised that Parliamen-

tarians on both sides of the House jump on the band wagon when announcements by the Australian Bureau of Statistics and other authorities disclose unemployment figures. It is traditional for those involved in the Ministry of Labour and their respective shadow Ministers to argue about such details. However, over the past three years unemployment has risen to the extent that I have outlined, despite the minor fluctuations alluded to in the speech.

Having put that point straight, I now refer to the rest of the program. His Excellency indicated that the legislative program would be minimal in this budget session leading to the State election. However, certain matters relating to the rural community have been vividly drawn to our attention throughout this Parliament under the Labor Government, and more especially in recent weeks, by the National Farmers Federation and the United Farmers and Stockowners in South Australia. I refer particularly to paragraph 8, where His Excellency states:

My Government recognises that a significant factor contributing to recovery was the renewed prosperity of the rural sector following the devastation of drought and fire in 1983.

It is true that, during the fire in 1983, devastation was experienced over a significant part of the State. Many people in the rural community and even in the near metropolitan area of Adelaide were affected as a result. However, it is not true—indeed, it is quite false—to suggest that the rural community has contributed significantly to the recovery, because the rural community itself has not recovered since the two year drought period of 1980-82. It will not recover, despite good seasons, while it experiences the pressures that are being applied by national and State Governments and indeed, to some extent, by local authorities.

To that extent I draw to the attention of the House a number of those factors which are not in the category as outlined by the member for Florey, that is, in the call for subsidies; instead, I refer to relief sought from significant taxation in the direct sense and, of course, indirectly across

the board. But first I draw to member's attention a situation that was apparent in the mid 1970s. Members will recall the occasion when South Australia was involved in a union dispute over the loading of live sheep. Members will also recall that at that time, when a few farmers were affected, their colleagues throughout the State and indeed nationally travelled to South Australia's ports to fight the union movement and ensure shipment of the livestock.

Ian MacLachlan, of South Australia, was one of the industry leaders who coordinated that effort, and we now find again in a national rural campaign that same person is prominently and appropriately placed to represent primary industry. The climate prevailing in the rural sector at the moment is probably more aggravated now as a result of the downturn in export opportunities and more burdened with internal national, State and local authority pressure than it has been ever before.

When talking about Australian primary industry it is worth also repeating that a substantial part of the nation's export income is derived from the primary sector. In South Australia, significantly more than half of our export income is from primary production. In fact, it has been the economic backbone of this country since its settlement. Despite the improved output of mining and other industries, it will remain so into the distant future. In that context, I believe it is important to recognise the position of those participating as often as the opportunity arises.

It does not give me any thrill at all to disclose to this House the serious situation—and, indeed, the deterioration—that has occurred in the rural sector of Australia in recent years. I refer to a table produced by the Australian Bureau of Statistics identifying the increased indebtedness of primary producers between the years 1970 and 1984. I seek leave to have the table, which has been sighted by the Clerk and approved, inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### 18 RURAL INDEBTEDNESS

At 30 June	Major trading banks (a)				Pastoral finance companies (b)	Commonwealth Development Bank (bd)	Life Insurance companies	Ex-service settlement	Other government agencies (including State banks) (b)	Primary Industry Bank of Australia (b)	Total Institutional Indebtedness (c)
	Term loans (b)	Farm development loans	Other (c)	Total (b)							
	\$m	\$m	\$m	\$m	\$m	\$m	\$m	\$m	\$m	\$m	\$m
1970	131	79	787	998	349	176	128	80	351	—	2 082
1971	122	90	782	994	333	192	129	83	374	—	2 104
1972	116	113	733	963	293	202	125	79	432	—	2 094
1973	121	215	715	1 051	303	198	117	71	481	—	2 221
1974	133	267	761	1 161	371	203	107	61	499	—	2 402
1975	122	286	812	1 220	279	232	104	58	554	—	2 447
1976	119	324	874	1 317	254	243	96	54	633	—	2 597
1977	121	380	896	1 397	200	254	86	49	696	—	2 682
1978	122	461	977	1 560	200	280	80	43	797	—	2 960
1979	161	586	944	1 691	244	288	70	39	859	111	3 302
1980	193	715	1 037	1 945	321	293	67	34	897	216	3 772
1981	248	860	1 199	2 307	315	309	74	35	1 003	317	4 360
1982	281	970	1 181	2 432	366	327	77	33	1 060	429	4 725
1983	360	1 082	1 300	2 742	364	367	83	31	1 324	567	5 478
1984	411(s)	1 057	1 329(s)	2 797(s)	471	456	82	29	1 394	694	5 923(s)

(a) Figures for the major trading banks refer to the second Wednesday in July.

(b) PIBA commenced lending operations in November 1978. The bank is not a direct lender to primary producers. Refinance loans are provided to primary producers through a network of prime lenders comprising banks and other approved institutions, whose figures are given net of the PIBA loan content.

(c) Includes overdraft, commercial bills and other advances.

(d) Excludes equipment finance under hire purchase arrangements.

(e) Excludes indebtedness to hire purchase companies, trade creditors and private lenders.

(s) Estimated by BAE.

na Not available.

Sources: Reserve Bank of Australia. *Statistical Bulletin* (various issues); ABS, *Estimate of Gross Indebtedness of Agricultural Producers Australia* (various issues); PIBA, *Annual Report*, and personal communication.

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN:** I turn now to background matters that cause me to raise this subject on behalf of primary producers. At the same time, I acknowledge that members of the community at large are beginning to support the farmers and understand the real importance of our rural sector, not just to those in the industry or within country towns but indeed to all citizens of the State.

In order to expand this subject, I draw to the attention of the House that this broadly based community support for farmers has arisen and become possible following a Liberal Party representation to the Federal Council meeting in Canberra. The country delegates and MPs won the support of their city colleagues for lower tariffs and taxes, less Government spending, the abolition of important parity pricing and a fairer deal for Australian agriculture in the inter-national marketplace.

It is also noted that a most important resolution in which the Federal Council expressed alarm related to the gap that has been allowed to develop between urban and rural communities, the matter about which the member for Florey was most critical a few moments ago. The Liberal Party is determined to bridge, not widen, that gap, and it did so at its Federal Council meeting. That was an unreported but important step forward for Australia's primary producers, because it is believed that the Liberal Party will form the next Government in this State as well as nationally. The Labor Party cannot bridge the gap, because it is solely an urban Party.

The Liberal Party then has a very major and unique responsibility to bring the concerns of rural Australia, carried by its rural MPs and rural councils, right into the city arena. It can do so, and is doing so steadily, because it is the only political Party in Australia that holds rural and city seats. The National Farmers Federation is faced with the same challenge, and that is why the recent city marches were so significant. In fact, that is why the person I mentioned earlier, Mr Ian McLachlan, a South Australian based primary producer, is again leading a campaign on behalf of primary producers throughout Australia in order to seek a fair go for those in the industry. That is why the revolt was brought to Adelaide a few weeks ago.

In Argentina, a country of similar agricultural capacity to Australia, the rural community was overwhelmed years ago by Peronist Governments obsessed with the interests of urban trade unionists. The consequence was the neglect of the rural wealth creators of that country and its slide into economic oblivion. That same situation will apply here if people such as the member for Florey continue with their attitude towards the breadwinners of this country. In fact, Australia is now set on the same course as that which applied in Argentina. In 50 years we have seen our national living standard slide from being the highest in the world to twenty-first position; Australia has slumped from being the twelfth greatest trading nation in the world to the twentieth position; and we have dropped from being the eighth most competitive nation to the nineteenth. There is an enormous task ahead for all of us.

I plead with all honourable members to adopt a bipartisan approach for a fair go for the primary producers of this State, and, of course, nationally, in the overall scene on which we are all dependent. If we are to reverse this trend then both State and Federal Governments must act soon, before it is too late. The task ahead will not be easy, but rural Australia knows that achievement and success are not and never have been for the faint-hearted. We must pursue economic policies that reduce the extravagance of government and encourage wealth creation, not the welfare state

mentality that is blowing out our public debt, Government spending and taxes.

Thanks largely to Governments in the past five years, farm costs have increased by 44 per cent, yet farm-gate prices have increased by only 12 per cent. That has led to a 121 per cent increase in farm indebtedness, which can be demonstrated by the table inserted in *Hansard* earlier. This has risen to an astronomical figure and, in fact, is still blowing out. On this issue I will read from a speech made by the Chief General Manager of the Commonwealth Development Bank to the State conference on 30 July 1985. After informing the conference that he had joined the bank in mid 1983, he said:

It gave me great satisfaction to see the Commonwealth Development Bank increase its overall loans and equipment financing for developmental purposes by over 100 per cent in the year ended 30 June 1984 and again increase its business during this its twenty-fifth silver anniversary year.

He was referring there to South Australia. He continued:

Total lending jumped from \$190 million to \$380 million in round figures in one year, rural loans from \$90 million to \$180 million and equipment finance to the rural sector from \$40 million to \$80 million.

The indebtedness to which I previously referred has increased over the past seven years to the extent I have mentioned. Farm income per work year of family labour is now \$6 598 as compared with average earnings of \$20 000. We must reduce the protection given to manufacturing industry, a matter to which the previous speaker made no reference at all. He failed to recognise the sort of protection that is provided for manufacturing industry based in the metropolitan area. That protection costs the average farmer an incredible \$9 000 a year.

We must reduce taxes, including those on essential farm commodities such as fuel. This matter requires specific attention. I note that a member on this side of the House has already stated his intent to move the following motion:

That this House condemns the Federal Government for its decision to terminate the Fuel Freight Equalisation Scheme, thereby treating non-metropolitan people as second class citizens and in particular it draws to the attention of the Federal Treasurer and Prime Minister the effects such actions will have in—

- (a) increasing freight costs on all consumer goods, thereby further increasing the cost of living for non-metropolitan people;
- (b) increasing fuel costs in primary production thereby—
  - (i) forcing smaller operators out of the industry;
  - (ii) encouraging greater use of chemical farming as an alternative to traditional farming practices;
  - (iii) forcing an already cost squeezed industry to the point of bankruptcy;
  - (iv) raising the overall costs of production; and
  - (v) raising the freight costs of primary products which will increase home consumption prices in particular of wheat, barley and livestock;
- (c) increasing the already high costs of the fishing industry which will, in cases where the respective fishery is managed with quotas, force many of those operators out of business; . . .
- (d) makes reference to the impact on the tourist industry generally and, in particular, on the hotel, motel, hospitality, caravan and other source industries.

It is not my role to expand on that motion, which is an initiative of an anti-Labor Party member. The motion is on the Notice Paper for this Chamber and will be moved by the member for Flinders. I can assure him that we support his intent. It is a part of our objectives to achieve that sort of return of the Fuel Freight Equalisation Scheme to Australians across the board and, more specifically, to South Australians.

We must reject new taxes such as a capital gains tax and death duties. We must dispense with unnecessary regulations

and Government charges, such as export inspection charges. We must act with the full force of the law to reduce the power of trade union leaders and to tackle, through a more flexible and rational wage fixing system, our ridiculous labour cost structure which, above all, is strangling our rural exporters.

One example tells the whole story. Last financial year industrial strife cost wheat exporters \$270 million. Yet, despite their apparent industrial militancy, grain terminal workers in Sydney and Newcastle work a 32½ hour week, get 30 days paid sick leave annually, of which they on average take over 24 days sick leave, get double pay for all overtime and a 100 per cent loading on night shifts. And what is their take home pay? The average Sydney grain handling worker earned \$36 000 last year, while his colleagues in Newcastle earned an average \$44 000. It is ultimately the wheat grower who pays that bill, and remember the average income for the man on the land is \$6 598. Surely that example alone is enough to convince city people, and I hope at least members of the Labor Party in this House, that Australia's new poverty is right here in rural Australia. This madness just has to stop if our rural sector, the great wealth creator of our nation, is to survive.

One could go on with the international problems that are associated with the marketing of our product. I am pleased to note that that matter has already been canvassed in this debate. It is true and I acknowledge that there is an oversupply at a world level of a number of the products with which we are involved and upon which we depend so much in this country.

In the meantime, it certainly does not help our rural community to be for ever burdened by tariff protection on importers of manufacturing equipment, and at the same time trying to make a quid on the land. It is that sort of relief that we need from the Federal Government in order to survive. It is that sort of relief from the Federal Government that is necessary not as a cost to the taxpayer as such but indeed as an investment nationally to protect our future as a community across the board.

There are a few other matters to which I would like to refer and I make no excuse about the fact that they relate to the man on the land. However, it is difficult to proceed in the form that I had hoped to in this debate because only a few moments ago I received a message that Mr Keating, the Federal Treasurer, has announced that he will now not be proceeding with the White Paper tax options that have been bandied around the community for the last several months. I think it not only makes a farce of the tax inquiry instituted by that Federal member but it really demonstrates the sort of chaos that the Hawke Government is in at present.

Fair dinkum, the Hawke Government is reeling from one crisis to another almost on a daily basis. One has to be fairly close to the media and to the radio to know quite what the position is day by day. Indeed, I cannot recall ever a Federal Treasurer or a person in such a position in the Federal Government seeking to condition the community over the period that that Minister has and then just throwing the proposition out the window. One can only presume that in this instance someone, perhaps even Ian McLaughlin, has had yet another win.

His multi-million dollar campaign planned for later this year and beyond, on behalf of the farming community of Australia, in the main is really directed towards those taxation pressures contained in the white paper reports. I know that he had all sorts of other matters in mind in order to bring home to the community at large the mood prevailing in the rural sector. He has received enormous support from the rural sector in funding that campaign. However, if the reports I have received this afternoon are true, it would

appear that some of our fears, at least in relation to backdoor taxation, have been allayed. I hope that, now that the Federal Treasurer has seen the light in that respect, some of his colleagues will recognise that the world price parity policy on fuel needs to be reviewed urgently. They must recognise the enormous impact that that policy is having on people living outside the metropolitan areas of Australia, and particularly in the far distant rural regions.

The cost of fuel on the farm has become a very significant ingredient of the annual expenditure of farmers, as has the purchase of superphosphate. That is another issue currently being directed to the Federal Government. Farmers are seeking at least a retention of the superphosphate subsidy. This is not just for the purposes of propping up the primary industry but indeed for ensuring that our pastures and crops in the phosphate deficient areas of the nation will be properly fed. Most of our high rainfall areas, especially in South Australia, require a superphosphate dressings annually. This, too, is a multi-thousand dollar essential expense to the farmer, one which many farmers are having great difficulty in meeting.

Members opposite say that that is a subsidy: indeed it is, and it goes some way towards offsetting the enormous contribution made by farmers to ensure that manufacturing industry and machinery manufacturers and distributors of equipment around Australia are kept alive. As I mentioned earlier in this address, Australian manufacturing industry is subsidised to a very significant extent in order to keep it going—on average, to the tune of something like \$9 000 a year by each farm. Against that background, we do not want it all back, but at least we need some relief from the pressures that are put on the rural sector to allow those on farms to stay in business.

Farming is just not like manufacturing areas. It is not an arena into which one can work as an apprentice this year and qualify to become a farmer next year. It just does not happen that way. Farmers are a certain breed of people who are part of the rural scene, having grown into it over a very long period, in some cases over generations. They cannot be trained, like machinists or assembly line workers, by the dozen, and so on, as required. Nor can they automatically be transferred into other areas of employment quickly, as can occur with people working in the manufacturing and secondary industry arenas. Farmers are part of the Australian country scene and, while they might be replaceable generation by generation, they cannot be made available at the drop of a hat. It is against that background that the community as a whole must recognise their importance and insure that they are acknowledged, or at least relieved of the sorts of pressures I have outlined.

Having chastised the Federal Government for its insensitivity in this arena I point out that, at the State level, we have almost an identical attitude under a Labor Government towards the rural sector. Admittedly, the South Australian Minister of Agriculture has been burdened with a whole host of other portfolio responsibilities and, since he has taken office, has not been able to give the agricultural people of this State the attention that they deserve. Administratively, in recent months he has directed some severe blows towards the rural sector.

I refer first to the meat industry people, those who are battling along at butcher shop level in country regions to process livestock requirements for their own premises. To say the least, he has given them one hell of a hard time. The licensed slaughterhouse proprietors set up and given assurances by the Liberal Party when in office in South Australia have been absolutely devastated by the present Government's Administration. There is something like half the number of licensed slaughterhouses now than were in business when we left office in 1982. Some of those slaugh-

terhouses have phased out of their own volition and some have joined with other colleagues to set up joint operations. Some have left because they could not economically meet the stringent requirements of the department, not because of the legislation, but rather because of the administration of the Meat Hygiene Division of the Department of Agriculture.

Of course, more will go. As do a lot of other people in the country, they have their backs to the wall. It is because of this insensitivity on the part of the Government and the officers who are directing and administering those regulations on behalf of the Government that these people are going to the wall. I could cite a whole host of examples, but I do not have time in this address to do so.

The demands on a number of country slaughterhouse proprietors-cum-butchers have been extraordinary in the last 12 months or so. Having read a considerable amount of their correspondence and having discussed the subject at regional and individual levels, I am satisfied that the present Government is on a course which will destroy the local slaughterhouse proprietor and the local slaughtering concept in the meat industry in this State. This is a return to the so-called Chatterton philosophy of having all the meat for human consumption processed through licensed abattoirs and to disposing of, one way or another, those small slaughterhouse proprietors who do a great service to their respective communities (recognising, as we do on this side of politics, that the slaughterhouse operation is part and parcel of their local butchering business).

I turn now to the situation surrounding the marketing of horticultural products, that is, fruit and vegetables. Over the last several years the relocation of the East End Market has been the subject of concern to a substantial number of fresh fruit and vegetable growers in this State. It has been their merchandising and marketing outlet for their produce. On page 13 of the ALP promises delivered in 1982, that is, prior to coming into Government at the end of that year, it states:

We will assist the industry to overcome the present problems with inefficient and high cost handling that have resulted from continuous use of the overcrowded East End Wholesale Market.

In recent days we have seen a press release from the Minister's office where, on behalf of the Government, he said that they would enter into a joint venture with the industry.

From that, one could only presume that the term 'joint venture' meant 'financial partnership'. However, on interview following the release of that document, the Minister said, 'No, there will not be any financial involvement by the Government. We will provide part of the SAMCOR land at Gepps Cross for the purposes of relocating the East End Market, but it will be a private venture and the Government will not be having any part in it.'

So much for that promise, and I can appreciate there was a problem there. The Minister had some difficulties with our own House of Assembly Speaker, whose district surrounds that region. I understand that an internal fight developed within the Labor Party but that that matter has since blown away.

For the record, I put down our position. Acknowledging that the East End Market facilities are inadequate for the fresh fruit and vegetable industry, in government the Liberal Party will not only provide the appropriate area of land on which the industry can establish premises, but we will also provide the infrastructure as in water and power facilities to that site. Further to that, should the industry require financial or funding guarantee assistance, we would be prepared to consider any reasonable application for underwriting or guaranteeing loan funds for the purpose.

On the estimated \$30 million costs in such a venture, it is in my view unlikely that a private operator would want

to go alone into such a venture. However, it may be that arrangements can be made with some other section of the primary industry or some other area of marketing that might be incorporated in the establishment, thus lightening the load on the pending users of that premises. Be that as it may, our position is quite clear and we as a Party would have no objection whatsoever to utilising the triangular piece of land identified just immediately north of the SAMCOR selling arena for the purposes of establishing the long sought and adequate marketing premises.

Among other things, I cite just a couple more articles out of the Labor Party pre-election issue in 1982, the promises that in fact it made. One of them was this:

We will resurrect the negotiations for new projects that have been allowed to lapse and take up the many offers that overseas Governments have made for South Australian involvement in agriculture development.

I know of not one contract, not one single overseas contract, that the Minister of Agriculture has entered into since the Labor Party came back into government in 1982. Within 12 months of our coming into government in 1979, the Tonkin team secured a contract in Iraq, albeit one which had been partially discussed, if not negotiated, by previous Governments, but we secured a contract there involving about \$A11 million over a five year period. It was a farming project which was the largest entered into by an Australian outside Australia in the history of this country. That scheme, I might add, has been most successful.

We entered into a contract with Algeria, one which was resurrected from one we inherited in 1979, and put it on a stable footing. We pursued ventures in Tunisia and Saudi Arabia, but, despite the foundations and input by Governments of both persuasions over a number of years in relation to overseas projects in the agricultural arena, the Minister of Agriculture, I repeat, to my knowledge has not secured one overseas contract since he came to office. The ALP promise of 1982 is ringing a little hollow at the moment. The Government that the Minister represents, on page 8 of the bulletin, stated:

We will establish a demonstration centre for dry land farming technology in South Australia.

Even though we are about to go to an election now, I have no evidence whatsoever of that dry land farming technology outfit being established.

In regard to the wine industry, page 10 of the document to which I referred states:

We will encourage regional councils to become involved in developing identities for their regions which reflect the unique characteristic of each district.

I know of no evidence that the Government has been positively involved in this direction. I know of keen efforts by people within the wine grape growing industry to organise themselves into district identities and to combine their efforts for the purpose of appearing before both State and Federal Governments on issues with a single State voice. Generally speaking, the alleged or promised assistance by the State Government, when in opposition, has not come to fruition.

Referring again to the fruit and vegetable industry, on page 14 of the document the Labor Party stated:

We will provide a suitable site on favourable terms and conditions and will assist the industry to build a new market on that site through the establishment of a statutory co-operative on the model of Co-operative Bulk Handling.

It was a wordy statement, but the Minister was unable to come up with the money or with anything positive by way of assistance, and to date that promise also rings hollow. On page 19 of the document the Labor Party stated:

Legislation to protect the use of words like 'fresh' from advertisers of processed foods will be introduced.

We are in the third session of Parliament since this Government came to office and to my knowledge there has been

no Bill, or even draft Bill, to proceed with that undertaking. It was also stated:

Wherever possible, market gardening land near centres of population will be retained to ensure ready availability of fresh food.

I know of no action in that direction. In relation to cooperatives and syndicates, it was stated:

We will set up a cooperative advisory unit to advise farmers and other growers who wish to form cooperative groups for farm syndicates.

I do not know what has happened in that direction; and, frankly, I do not know that the idea has a great deal of merit, anyway. It was also stated:

We will maintain research into more efficient technological aids to agriculture and will place increased emphasis on unlocking existing reserves of knowledge for farmers through the use of audiovisual aids and video film.

On that subject the Government has been extremely silent and, to my knowledge, has done little or no work in that direction. In the meantime, the Liberal Party, in readiness for its entry into government, has not only produced a policy on videotex distribution of agricultural data but released that policy, which has attracted enormous support not only from the rural community and end users of that system but from those in the private sector whom we would seek to join and not oppose or go into competition with over this venture.

Videotex information of a market reporting kind of a distribution of research detail from ABS via the Department of Agriculture, and a whole range of other banking and financial material that is essential in today's agricultural arena, will be distributed via the private sector distribution system from the Department of Agriculture to its regional district centres. Where farmers are in a position to install their own private receiver, that information will go direct to the farm itself. It is that sort of distribution and sensitivity to the needs of the farming sector about which the Liberal Party is consistent and about which the Labor Party never seems to have time or is not able to recognise the need for attention.

The Labor Party said that in government it would restructure the Rural Adjustment Program to make it a more dynamic force in assisting rural communities to meet the challenge of new markets and new methods of production. Those are only words. It has done absolutely nothing about it. We are really way out in front on this issue.

The Liberal Party has put down its policy and announced publicly that in government it will consolidate the several rural industry assistance Acts in South Australia and identify within a single State Act not only the criteria that are required for a primary producer to qualify in its several areas for assistance but the system of repayment, the term of the loan and the interest rates that will be applicable to each. Promises before elections as far as the Labor Party is concerned seem to flow like a water, but, when it comes to putting them into practice, they do not occur.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN:** One of my colleagues asks whether I think that they are crook. The Labor Party does not understand on which side its bread is buttered. It does not recognise the importance of the rural communities at large, leave alone those who are trying to farm. It is all very fine for the people in the Labor Party, the greenies, the eccentric environmentalists, the animal liberationists and what-have-you to scream about the need to preserve the rural community and not destroy our native vegetation and so on, but that whole rural community, that aesthetically beautiful setting, as it is so often described, is absolutely useless to the economy of the country if there are no farmers on it.

In the meantime, those people who are seeking to occupy those properties are being destroyed by insensitive people

who really do not understand the subject. That is why it is so frustrating to us on this side who, not only electorally, but locally and on the ground, are closer to that scene. It is not for political grandstanding or for purposes of that kind that we raise these subjects here, but simply to try and encourage a bipartisan attitude for subjects of the kind that I have been outlining and of the kind that we all need ultimately to survive.

I recognise that the time is due, and I will conclude my remarks. The other points that I wish to raise I will pick up in an adjournment debate in the evening sittings to follow.

*[Sitting suspended from 5.59 to 8.7 p.m.]*

**Mrs APPLEBY (Brighton):** I support the motion before the House and indicate my agreement with the matters to which His Excellency referred in his speech of 1 August. At this point, I would like officially to record, on behalf of a large number of my constituents and myself, appreciation to the member for Adelaide in his previous capacity as Deputy Premier, Minister of Labour, Chief Secretary, Minister of Emergency Services and Minister with responsibility for youth matters, for the way in which he carried out his duties in those positions and to pass on best wishes from the many people who have benefited from knowing him as a sincere, dedicated human being. Personally, I am pleased to call him colleague and friend and I am happy to have him on the back bench with the type of advice one so experienced can impart on a broad range of topics.

As 1985 sees the official end of the Decade of Women, I pay tribute to the dedication of women from all walks of life who have contributed to the recognition of the difficulties, discrimination, educational needs, health requirements, financial disadvantages, housing and world peace that have been addressed over this period by many individuals and collective groups of women in our society, both in Australia and on an international basis.

In South Australia many long fought for initiatives have been achieved, but achievements in themselves do not guarantee security of tenure, and it is now recognised that much effort and activity must continue to be expended to ensure broader understanding and provision for improvement as the need arises. As we come to the end of the Decade of Women (1976-1985) to which I briefly referred, it is significant to point out that this last decade follows a most historic decade previously experienced in South Australia—between 1885 and 1895.

During the span of the decade of which I speak, striving for equality of opportunity demanded the energy and participation of women and community leaders who had come to understand that women were a significant force who had an equal right to participate in society, in particular, the right to vote on equal terms with men.

Six legislative attempts were made, unsuccessfully, to give franchise to women during the decade. The final and successful Bill was introduced in 1894, finally receiving assent on 21 March 1895. At the South Australian general election of 25 April 1896, women in our State had the first opportunity to exercise their newly acquired right to vote. Of the newly franchised 58 000 women, 39 000 (66 per cent) attended the polling booths where the necessary business was conducted with perfect propriety. Regarding the fears expressed by speakers during these debates, namely, that women would take over the hallowed chambers of the Parliament, it is interesting to reflect that, as was put by one speaker who opposed women having the right to vote, it would mean that women would take seats in Parliament and would even take the President's chair.



To date, only nine women have served the South Australian Parliament. At present, there are six women serving the South Australian Parliament and to date we have not been successful in obtaining a woman President or Speaker in the South Australian Parliament. I take this opportunity to congratulate the new Minister on her recent appointment.

This year is International Youth Year, and the theme for this special international activity is development, participation and peace. In my capacity as a member of Parliament, I have many opportunities to be involved with young people through schools, colleges, employment and unemployment, social and sporting activities, and in family environments.

I have great faith in the youth of our community and give them credit for their goals and achievements. On many occasions I find that young people have a far more realistic grasp of what is happening, where they fit and what they are pursuing prior to becoming the adult generation. In a recent conversation with several young people, a member of the group said that it is trendy for adults to talk about kids and say that they want to help and do things for them, but, if asked for five minutes of their time, they are always too busy.

I am sure that many young people perceive this to be true. However, it is also true that much attention has been focused on youth by Governments and other bodies. I would argue that youth have been exploited and, in many respects, have not always had the ability to fight against the tide. In employment, particularly in non-skilled areas, youth have been seen as inexpensive workhorses until they reach an age when they are expendable, and the cycle begins again. I do not need to elaborate on the aspects inferred by my last statement, but I am sure that every member has had to deal with some aspect of this type of exploitation.

In listening to the debate on the motion moved by the Opposition in this Chamber on 6 August, I failed to see how one could have any confidence in the so-called youth policy presented by members opposite particularly in relation to youth unemployment. I believe that the Premier and the Minister of Employment made very clear the actions taken by this Government to assist the youth of our State. No realistic person could doubt the benefits of that action. The initiatives developed by this Government must be better understood and access made clearer to potential participants.

However, I do not believe that taking employment in isolation is fair to the youth in their developing years, so I refer to initiatives relating to the youth of South Australia. In March this year the Minister of Labour announced that \$150 000 would be spent on special projects for young people during International Youth Year. These projects include the provision of information services, theatre workshops and a number of other initiatives and include the distribution of \$20 000 for 30 community based International Youth Year projects throughout South Australia. This Government has committed more than \$1 million for International Youth Year covering a wide range of activities that have been submitted by the young people themselves.

Other Government financial assistance has included \$55 000 to assist the involvement of service clubs with youth programs. That project was established in 1983 to help service clubs in South Australia develop and implement projects to assist young people in their transition from school to work.

This funding has assisted the service clubs to employ three part-time officers during International Youth Year. The second storey adolescent centre, which is scheduled to open in September during Health Week, is a major long-term initiative supported by \$700 000 Government funding, and will mean that young people will have access to a wide range of health, education, counselling and recreational

services at a central location which is readily identified. I congratulate the Minister of Health for the foresight he has displayed in establishing the State Government initiative, which is a significant contribution by South Australia to International Youth Year.

Another first for South Australia has been the appointment of the Commissioner for the Ageing, following the passing of legislation in State Parliament in 1984. Dr Adam Graycar, appointed to this position in February, is one of Australia's leading authorities on social welfare and ageing and was previously Director of the Social Welfare Research Centre of the University of New South Wales and a former Senior Lecturer in Social Administration at Flinders University.

In his agenda he places seeking the views of aged people about their needs high on the list, which includes providing a focal point for information and advice about ageing in South Australia, encouraging co-ordination of services for the aged, promoting activities and structures which aim at making sure the aged are included in the community rather than being seen as separate from other groups.

The need for giving emphasis to the requirements of ageing has been recognised by the appointment and activities to date of the Commissioner. Already the increase in the number of aged in South Australia is about 4 000 a year. Many services and programs have developed over the years and the co-ordination aspect has not been totally effective. The growing number of aged people has highlighted the need for greater coordination of services and information and recognition of the contribution aged people can and do make to our community.

The centres in my electorate where the aged gather in no way indicate that the aged are the non-contributors of our society. This Government does not believe that ageing people are a burden, nor are they a problem. I believe that we should recognise them as a rich resource of wisdom and expertise which should be fostered and encouraged for the benefit of the entire community.

In the recently announced \$150 000 grant funds for seniors, Cabinet has insisted that favourable and special consideration should be given to those grants which encourage activities that bridge generations by bringing aged people together with young people. The aged who gather in the community in a club environment are generally found to be very self-sufficient and generate funding for trips, activities, birthday parties, Christmas parties and pursue other activities relevant to the community, and for this they are to be commended. Very rarely do these groups seek special funding, and very rarely are they a burden to other aspects of the community.

Recently I have been able to specifically assist three clubs in my electorate. The Oaklands Park Senior Citizens Club has been pursuing the idea of involving its membership with handicraft activities. These handicrafts are being sold to members of the club and visitors to provide funding for other activities. This has enabled the club to pursue a broad range of activities and to provide other equipment for the use of club members. Due to the provision of a small grant, the club is now able to extend its tool bank for handicraft making, and this will give more members the opportunity to participate. Hence, the overall effect will be to the benefit of the club.

The second group that has been assisted is the Seacombe Gardens aged and invalid pensioners group. This club pursues activities related to meeting and discussing matters, and the members participate in these less active pursuits. This group has now been able to purchase a lightweight portable microphone which enables better communication in group discussions and meetings. Some of the aged have problems in relation to hearing effectively, and many speak-

ers do not always speak clearly and loudly. A better form of communication will be of great benefit to this group.

The Resthaven day care centre provides for participants activities which include bus trips and day outings. This lessens the isolation aspect of simply visiting a day care centre. Outdoor picnics are held in the grounds of the centre, but previously for trips and outdoor activities the centre has had to borrow the necessary equipment, such as thermoses and other picnic equipment. However, the centre will now be able to put together a set of equipment of its own, and it will not be reliant on borrowing from others.

Groups catering for the aged in our community need to provide diverse activities for their members, to give them the opportunity to extend their activities and to maintain an involvement and participation in the community. That promotes a happier and more effective section of the community.

I refer to an article published in the local press recently, and this relates to one of my constituents. The article, headed 'Art has given Venda, 91, a new lease of life' states that Venda, at 91 years of age, has just found that she can pursue painting as a hobby and also to give her enjoyment and fulfilment in life, even though she suffers from arthritis in parts of her body other than her hands and is confined to her room.

I have raised in this Chamber on a number of occasions my concern about the mature unemployed and the need to recognise the special problems that they face. Tonight I want to refer to two initiatives of the Government which have greatly assisted in addressing the needs of these people, for whom I have been able to contribute support.

I have already raised awareness of the social and economic consequences related to the matter of mature age unemployed, and in this regard the first initiative of the Bannon Government was the establishment of the Mature Age Unemployed Research Unit. This project, established under CEP and State Government funding, was launched by the Premier in July 1984. Having completed its 12-month task, the first to be undertaken in Australia, it will present a report in the next month or so, with recommendations, which I hope will provide a fact base for future planning for provision of resources and programs to assist the unemployed in the 25-plus age group.

In particular, those in the 45-plus age group appear to be the most disadvantaged in terms of future potential. Six unemployed women were engaged to work on the project undertaken by the Mature Age Unemployed Research Unit. They worked as an effective unit for 12 months, and at the completion of the period for which funding was available to date three of the six women have obtained full-time employment enabling them to utilise skills acquired and broadened during the term of the project.

The second initiative which I believe has done, and still is doing, much to assist the unemployed, with a high priority on mature unemployed, is the Special Employment Initiatives Unit in the Department of Labour. This unit was established in April 1984 and, at the outset, Cabinet gave the unit responsibility for administering the following State programs: the Self-Employment Venture Scheme; the Home Assistance Scheme; State Government job creation initiatives and the Government apprenticeship training initiatives. It has also been responsible for investigating and developing initiatives in a number of areas but with special emphasis on adult unemployment.

I have spoken strongly on a number of occasions in this House about the special needs of the mature unemployed or adult unemployed; that group received little attention over a number of years. Adult unemployed have suffered more severe losses of jobs over the years and have had to face looking at alternative employment potential. Since the

beginning of 1980 workers in the '45 years plus' age group have lost some 15 000 jobs in South Australia.

In December 1984, at the request of the Minister of Labour, a conference on adult unemployment was conducted by the Department of Labour to draw together the relevant agencies working in the area of matured unemployed, to assist the Government with information and to clarify the best way to help tackle the problems of this group. A great deal of useful information was obtained and, following the seminar, further work was carried out on the topics raised at that conference.

Following this, the Premier announced in April that the Government would spend nearly \$500 000 to help mature unemployed people in South Australia. Cabinet approved a plan to spend \$425 000 to establish programs to help mature unemployed people improve their job prospects. As the Premier pointed out at the announcement, assistance for the adult unemployed workers in this community has been long overdue. The final preparation period prior to acceptance of submissions for these funds is almost complete and groups are prepared to make effective use of these funds to assist the projects and thus the adult unemployed to attain self-esteem and involvement in the work environment.

Over the past few years in South Australia alone, in the job market workers aged 45 years and over have lost a substantial number of opportunities for employment. This scheme has been developed to be as flexible as possible, given the circumstances of dealing with mature unemployed or adult unemployed who are not always geared to retraining programs; in some instances they find it preferable to be involved in direct job creation schemes.

In human and economic terms the community cannot afford to disregard people who, in some cases, still have 15 to 20 years of their working life ahead of them, particularly if you assess the skills and abilities possessed by many in this age group. It then only requires a potential employer to ascertain the requirements of the job to be filled and they find that many from this group of unemployed carry out their responsibilities effectively and efficiently.

At the moment, in conjunction with the South Australian Employers Federation and other agencies, the Government is also in the process of producing publicity material, which will be directed to employers and will explain the benefits of employing the over 45 age group. Significant work has been done by the DOMU organisation—Don't Overlook Mature Unemployed—which has addressed the matter of ensuring that employers understand the benefits of employing the over 45 age group. That organisation has had some very significant successes in the placement of members from that organisation into employment, the major portion of which is long-term employment.

However, there is a long way to go and at this stage it is pleasing to know that both the Government and organisations addressing mature age unemployment are giving priority to this group that is so rightly deserved. I still hold the belief and argue strongly that the Federal Government has a responsibility to the mature unemployed and must activate a funding commitment that is realistic to provide resources and support for mature unemployed. The Bannon Government has again been a leader in the field by responding to the challenge and tackling this issue, but the Federal arena must support the responsible lead shown by South Australia.

The opportunities a member can offer the community which give them a better understanding of the system of government, their Parliamentary representative's responsibilities and this building in which action on their behalf takes place can take many forms—visits to Parliament House by schools groups, special project groups, service clubs, community organisations (including Venturers, Scouts and

political Party groups), individuals and small groups of people. Recently I have been able to sponsor two special visits to the Parliament of South Australia. The students of Brighton High School and Dover Gardens High School used the Chamber as a forum for debate in early July. Year 9 students debated the topic 'That we are prisoners of a materialistic society.' The preparation and presentation was an excellent example of the young people in our education system. The knowledge of the topic displayed showed the amount of work the students had expended. I would like to congratulate the principals, staff and students of both schools who made this special activity so successful.

It has also been pleasing to have the aged of my community take an interest in Parliament House and in the historical significance of our political system. Oaklands Senior Citizens Club recently visited the building and were addressed by the Commissioner for the Ageing in this Chamber. Of the 50 present, it was interesting that only a very small percentage had ever entered the front door before. I believe that encouraging more people to take an interest in the political and historical procedures of our political system ensures an increased community interest in what we do as their elected representatives in this forum and how matters determined here on their behalf are presented to the broader community. I still hold the strong belief that the economic, legal and political system of our State and country should be automatically taught in our education system, beginning with basics in primary school and developing through the secondary years.

I would like to officially record congratulations to Tatia Schmerl, who recently received an award as the most successful third year apprentice in South Australia. She also received a silver medal in the salon culinary competition for main course. This award is sponsored by the Hotels Association. I believe that all members would share in extending best wishes to Tatia and all the catering staff coordinated by Tim Temay and Nancy Bickel. It is always a pleasure to invite guests to partake of the excellent culinary delights and service extended by this section of the Parliament House staff.

In conclusion, I would like to again express my sincere thanks to my staff, Lorraine and Chris, for their dedication and effective work carried out on my behalf for the constituents of my electorate.

**Mr INGERSON (Bragg):** I rise to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Governor's speech and in so doing express my condolences to the families of Mr Hunkin and Mr Clark, the gentlemen mentioned in the Governor's speech. I also pass on my good wishes to the members for Price and Victoria as each has made what is probably his last major speech in this Parliament.

Let us face a few facts about South Australia and South Australians. This State has slipped out of the mainstream of Australian economic life, which should be a cause of anger and shame to every member of this House. Let us look for a minute at the wider influence of creeping socialism that is pushing us backwards. The taxation summit was a debacle: one had only to listen to the news tonight to hear that the final thing has occurred—Mr Keating has backed down totally on the package he put to the summit. The accord is totally in tatters with the ACTU showing uncustomary good sense in siding with the weight of public opinion against the slipping and sliding insensitive, indecisive Hawke Government.

Our labour costs are an international joke. As I look across the House I wish that I could say that the joke is a funny one—unfortunately, it is not. It is a sad and tragic joke that we are saddled with an overregulated labour market.

This overregulation is forcing sackings and unemployment. As my colleague the member for Davenport has already so graphically informed this House in relation to youth unemployment, it is also sending small business to the wall.

The Premier has accused the Opposition of painting a black picture of the economy. He said that the picture would depress and discourage the unemployed. What does the Bannon Government think of our young unemployed? Nothing is more depressing or discouraging to the young unemployed of this State than loss of work as a direct result of a rigid labour system that is attractive to neither employer nor employee. It is not a matter of painting a black picture. We know—and South Australia's young unemployed know—that if it looks rotten, smells rotten or tastes rotten there is a darned good chance that it is really rotten.

Of course, we are blamed for pinpointing what every young person looking for work and every businessman needing help knows—that the rigidity of our labour system in this country keeps them apart. We ought to be looking at the recommendation strongly put forward by Professor Keith Hancock and his committee because it provides an alternative. It is important that we ensure that the mainstream system of arbitration continues.

It is also absolutely important that, for those who wish to opt out, we set up a voluntary contact system as an alternative. We only have to look at the Mudginberri station fiasco in the Northern Territory to see that a group of people who have got together to decide on their future, on what will be their wages, what sort of conditions they will have, when they will work, whether they will have penalties. They know how effective that sort of exercise can be. Now they have found that their situation is blocked by big Government, big unions and big business. Unfortunately, we have a system that does not recognise that more than 90 per cent of the community is employed in the small business sector and would like this proposal.

The proposal put forward relating to voluntary contracts is a proposal totally supported by the Australian Small Business Association. It is supported by the Federation of the Chamber of Commerce and, interestingly, in a document hailed by the Labor Party as an excellent one on industrial relations. I refer to Professor Keith Hancock's report on industrial relations, the law and systems in Australia in which he came out and suggested that we need, as an alternative, a secondary voluntary contract system. I return now to the low rating soap opera known as the *Days of Hawke and Keating*. Paul Keating recently stage managed one of the greatest fiascos in Australian political history when he failed to gain any support for his so-called taxation reforms.

Honourable members know that tonight on the media the system has gone the whole way. It just could not work; it had no chance whatsoever. Like his Labor predecessors, he seemed more hell-bent on creating history than on creating a better and more equitable economy. To be fair to Mr Keating, he at least exhibits a measure of genuine concern, a far cry from his counterpart here in South Australia, the Premier, who only days ago unveiled one of the most scandalous examples of political opportunism that this State has seen.

Does the Premier really think so little of the voters of South Australia? Does he think that they will not see through his cheap election tactics? Perhaps he should spend a little more time listening to the voters and opinion leaders in the community. On Tuesday last week, on the Philip Satchell show, the Premier was asked what the 2 per cent reduction in electricity charges represented—whether they would be reduced from \$100 to \$98.

The people of South Australia are taking notice. They know that the \$34 million granted to this State Government

by way of handout by the Hawke Government in May this year was a political stunt. They also know that the \$5 million grant to this Government to help it balance the Grand Prix budget was also handed out in an election context—\$39 million out of the \$41 million handed back to the people of this State.

The people of this State will clearly recognise that this is purely and simply a federally-backed political stunt. One thing that the Bannon Government shares with the Hawke Government is a belief in the well-known myth that economic recovery is predicated on accelerated spending; increase taxes and charges on small business and the man in the street and then spend more; create artificial schemes, and blow out the Public Service—create big, fat Government. There is a saying that when the going gets tough, the tough get going: the socialists in Australia have come up with something new—when the going gets taxing, the taxing gets going.

I stand here today as a voice for small business. If businesses tried to invest using a policy of 'When in doubt, spend', which is what this Government is all about, we would not have any businesses at all. I look, as an example, at the spending exercise that this Government has undertaken. We had a State deficit in June 1982 of \$6.1 million. In the first year of the Labor Government to June 1983 the State's deficit was \$63.1 million. In its second year to June 1984 we had what was called a 'balanced budget'. What happened? We still had a deficit of \$64.7 million.

What has happened this year? Why is it that the Federal Government can produce figures to tell the people of this country where its balance is and this State Government cannot? Surely, it is not because we have an election approaching: surely, we must have an accounting system here that can provide those figures. One of the other more important things is the State's interest on debt. In 1980-81, the interest on debt at State level was \$180 million; in 1983-84, less than four years later, the State interest on debt was \$236 million, an increase of \$56 million in interest alone that had to be paid on borrowings just to enable this Government to come out with a deficit of \$64 million. We have heard so much hollow political rhetoric about a balanced budget: a more appropriate description would be a juggled budget. The Premier seems more interested in book cooking and budget juggling to suit his short-term political aims than he does in the genuine recovery of South Australia. That is bad news—that is the Labor Party, the bad news of Australia. What is in store for South Australians under a Liberal Government in a few months? The first thing that we will do is to introduce a few principles of sound business sense.

We will learn to live within our income, and we will cut the cloth accordingly. We will pay off debts inherited from Labor Party ineptitude. We will reduce the interest payable and, as a result, we will make more capital available. The Bannon Government will be remembered—it will take its place in the history books—as the Government that mortgaged our children's future.

When we return we will pass into private hands unneeded and unnecessary assets. We will set new standards of productivity and effectiveness in Government departments and QUANGOS. We will reduce wastage and increase accountability and efficiency. It is interesting that we get all these vibes from Government members about privatisation. On page 3 of today's *News* the Minister of Health is reported as saying that he will sell off \$20 million worth of assets that are no longer required. Why do we suddenly hear statements from the other side of the House that privatisation is no good, when the Government is doing exactly that? It has recognised that some assets are not required by selling off some of the assets that are not required.

**Ms Lenehan:** That's not privatisation.

**Mr INGERSON:** Of course, that is privatisation. It is selling to the private sector assets that are not required. Another matter to be considered is duplication of services, and there are several areas of duplication of services for which the private sector should have an opportunity to continue to tender, for example, transport, electricity and water and sewerage.

The other day a woman inquired about the cost of shifting a water meter about two feet from inside to just outside her house. The E&WS Department had quoted \$290 to do that simple job. Had the Minister replied to our letter, my constituent and he would know a little more about this, but the local plumber, who had been asked how much it would cost, said that it would be about \$50 and added that the law would not let him carry out such work. That is fair enough, I suppose but when the law is changed the consumer will have the advantage of at least being able to obtain a quote to see whether it is cheaper to have the job done by the private sector. In this case, it would have been significantly cheaper.

I referred earlier to the lessons of budget juggling. I call on members to support a review of the system of accounting and reporting currently used by government. I am referring not only to this Government but to government generally. Currently, government operates under a cash system of accounting that would make a first year student blush with shame. One brings bills to account only when they are paid. Anyone in business knows that at the end of each month there is some money committed. However, in Government that is not recognised; it flows on into the next month.

If one wants to hold up the system or does not want to pay a few bills, it is never accounted until it is paid. That is an incredible system of disclosure and it should be changed. The Government talks about reducing the deficit, but only by way of taxation. What about containing expenditure? The Government is not noted for its straightforwardness when it comes to expenditure disclosure.

How much will the ASER development finally cost the people of South Australia? If one asks people in the street they will say it is something between \$160 million and \$180 million, but if one asks the contractors they will say it is something between \$200 million and \$250 million.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr INGERSON:** I am not knocking the project: all I want to know is how much it will cost. Will it cost \$160 million or \$250 million? All the public needs to be told is the truth. How much will the casino cost the people? It was originally said to have been \$15 million; the other day it was \$20 million, but how much is it today? How much will the aquatic centre cost? The Minister has already said it will be \$4.2 million, \$5.3 million, \$7.8 million, and now he does not know. How much will people pay for the Grand Prix?

I refer to an interesting document, a report to Parliament by the Public Works Committee, which states that the cost of the Grand Prix over seven years will be \$11.7 million. I also have a document produced by the Grand Prix Committee and called 'Adelaide Alive'. Published on the announcement of the Grand Prix, it states:

The South Australian Government has committed approximately \$15 million to the Grand Prix.

Suddenly, within a matter of three to four months, it has gone from \$11.7 million to \$15 million. I wonder why the Hawke Government gave this Government \$5 million. Was the \$5 million always included in the \$11.7 million, or have we been conned again? What is the true price of the Grand Prix? I believe that the public of South Australia ought to be told. I could go on forever, but I will give the House the

answer to all these questions: we do not know. The scandal is that we simply do not know.

What is the real budget deficit or surplus? When is it finally going to be presented? We do not have a clue, and the reason for that is twofold: first, Parliament has only one detailed report a year, at budget time, and not regular three-monthly reports as large businesses of this size would have, or as any small successful business would have. Secondly, expenditure, as I mentioned earlier, is only brought to account when payment is made. How can one possibly control expenditure when budgets merely show how much has been spent when the bills are paid. That is absolutely incredible. What about the \$1 million here and the \$5 million there? In fact, I just mentioned the \$5 million that suddenly appeared in the Grand Prix publication. Why were we not told about that? Perhaps the Premier will tell us after the election.

How big is the debt? How big is the Government's already horrendous deficit? No-one knows. This week we have seen members opposite giggling like schoolchildren over the election date. It does not take too much guessing to work out that the Premier will want to call the election as soon after the Grand Prix as he can—not because he will be swept to victory by its success, but because he must be quick before its full cost to the South Australian taxpayer is disclosed. By sheer coincidence, the full cost of the casino will not be disclosed by then, either. In fact, very few real costs of major developments in this State have been disclosed or are likely to be disclosed until after the election.

In his haste to secure the Grand Prix for the election month of November the Premier has promised the earth, as though the taxpayers of South Australia have unlimited funds. Originally we were told that the Grand Prix would cost \$11.7 million—now it is \$15 million. I ask my questions in vain because I know that a straight answer from the Premier is impossible. However, on behalf of the public I again ask how much the Grand Prix will cost. We do not know. The Premier probably does not know. That just serves to support my call for a review of the accounting system as detailed in the Premier's budget statement. We must have an accurate system of accounting to truly reflect—

**An honourable member:** Knock, knock!

**Mr INGERSON:** It is nice to hear the words 'Knock, knock'. Let us just wait until members opposite are sitting on this side of the Chamber, and then we will see what they say whenever they query expenditure. It is very interesting to see the reaction of Government members whenever a member on this side asks about the cost of anything. Let us have some credibility and accountability. As soon as we ask that sort of question we hear, 'Knock, knock', because members opposite do not want us to know. I am sure that the Government would want to free itself from criticism on this matter. As I said earlier, this Government is mortgaging our children's future.

I turn now to recreation and sport, and I am pleased to see the Minister of Recreation and Sport present in the Chamber. What has this Government, particularly the Minister, been doing? I think the Minister may have taken the recreation part of his portfolio a little more literally than the Premier had hoped. As I move among the sporting bodies, attempting to assist in this governmental vacuum, I hear one recurring theme.

The Minister will not make decisions—and I referred to that the other night—but, at last he has made one. Because of the Opposition's pressure, the Minister has now decided to recognise that 45 000 girls and women playing netball ought to be provided with grants. I congratulate the Minister on taking three months to make that decision. It is good that at last the Opposition has got the message through to the Minister.

Let us talk about the Minister's major indecisions. First, I refer to the TAB. He has been a Minister for three years. In opposition, he said that percentages should be fixed. What has he done? Nothing!

The Minister talked about wastage at the aquatic centre. What has he done? He has blown out the budget. What about the policy on subsidy reduction? He has purely and simply gone on with his subsidy reductions and done nothing about the associations or helped them in any way.

What about small lotteries? The Minister stood outside and said that there was no problem with small lotteries. Honourable members can ask the people who run small lotteries about their concerns regarding bonusing and the distribution of money from some of the social clubs. What has the Minister done? He has had a report since 1982, but he has done nothing about it. That report, which was presented to the previous Government, clearly sets out the problems in the small lottery area. The Minister knows that those problems still exist, because he has been advised by his committee, which has representation from the police and the Hotels Association. That committee clearly indicated that there were problems and that the Minister should do something about them. But it is too hard; it requires a decision.

Much of what I have said tonight has been from a business point of view. As honourable members know, I come from a business background. I mix with business people and, unlike members opposite, I listen to what they have to say. I ask what they want and what they can do. I know that they want less Government interference and a stable economy. The most immediate concern of business, both large and small, is that this Government would be so blind to the annual patterns of business turnover as to call an election in the last week of November or the first week of December. This seems to be an ignorance of socialists, because Hawke did the same thing last year, and the result for the retail industry was disastrous. The disaster does not stop there. It permeates every level of every business connected with the supply of goods and services to the retail industry. In the name of South Australian business, I call on the Government to announce that it will not jeopardise business and employment in South Australia for the sake of cheap political expediency. Let us see some leadership. Let us see the Government put its money in the place from which its election promises so glibly pour.

I trust that the Premier will contact the Retail Traders Association, the Chamber of Commerce and Industry and other industry and business associations and assure them that this will not occur. The Premier can be certain of one thing: if he continues to ignore the best interests of so many South Australians, those representative bodies will speak, and speak loudly, on behalf of the citizens. I am an optimist, but even I do not think that the Premier would be so foolish as to estrange such a large collection of voters. So let us return to what small business wants—a normal Christmas trading period with no election during December. Basically, small business wants to be left alone to get on with the job of operating successfully. Business people want the Government to get its sticky fingers out of their affairs and to mind its own business.

I cite the example of the restuaranteur who is about to open for business. These are the sorts of taxes and problems that he has to put up with. He must pay a licensed premises fee; a food licence fee; a liquor licence fee on beer and wine; payroll tax; E & WS charges; ETSA charges; rates and taxes to local government; land tax; sales tax; corporation fees, and so it goes on. At the end of the day, if he makes any profit at all, he then acts as a collection agent for the Federal Government for income tax. It is simply not good enough. With the exception of payroll tax, all charges have increased

significantly under the socialist hand of the Bannon Government. It was interesting to note that today during Question Time the Premier talked about payroll tax.

It just goes to show how much the Premier knows about small business. He said that I would know little about payroll tax, but I point out to the Premier a few hard facts. The sum of \$250 000 in wages paid requires the employment of 10 persons and, if the Premier knew anything about the statistics related to small business, he would know that 80 per cent of all small businesses employed fewer than 10 people. Therefore, the Premier should have known that 80 per cent of all small businesses do not pay payroll tax. However, the Premier is so inept in this area of small business that he goes on with all this nonsense of it being a tremendous advantage for small business. There is no question that the reduction in payroll tax is an important reduction for this State, and I commend the Government on that; but, to say that it affects small business directly, shows that the Premier does not know what he is talking about.

Another area to which I referred earlier involves voluntary contracts but, as I have spoken briefly about that already, I do not want to deal with it again. However, it is a change that small business would like introduced.

The next matter to which I refer is the magic holiday announced today, and especially the effect that it will have on business. My understanding is that, when the Jubilee 150 Board was asked to comment about a State holiday, it spoke against that suggestion, one of its reasons being the cost of the holiday to the community. What has this Government done? It has gone ahead and produced a half holiday here and a half holiday there. But who will pay for it? It will be the small business sector of our community. An extra holiday in a year costs small business dearly. We already have the Proclamation Day holiday. Why do we need more holidays in the Jubilee 150 year? This Government has only paid lip service to small business in South Australia. Indeed, it is too interested in what the unions want. However, South Australia is a small business State. As I said earlier, 95 per cent of business in this State is classified as small. Small business employs 60 per cent of private workers in South Australia, and small business is sick and tired of being ignored by this Government. I put the Government on notice: the new silent majority of this State is small business, be it from the corner deli to the backbone of our manufacturing industry, including farmers, and those people are not going to be silent any longer.

If small business ever needed a voice, it needs one now; and I intend to ensure that that voice keeps on coming before this Parliament. I am sick and tired of talk, of tokenism. It is patently obvious that no-one in this Government cares about small business. All it does is talk. At any time that positive suggestions are put forward the Government runs off to the unions to see if such action is okay. I care and a Liberal Government will care. This Government will ignore the groundswell of small business opinion at its peril.

**Mr GROOM (Hartley):** That was a very disappointing contribution by the member for Bragg. It was disappointing because it was notorious for its omissions. The fact is that in 1982 this Government inherited a very difficult economic situation, a deteriorating economy and a \$63 million deficit resulting from the policies of honourable members opposite.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** Honourable members opposite know that to fund its election promises the former Liberal Government transferred capital works money—about \$44.7 million of capital works money, which meant a loss of jobs in the community. Again in 1982-83, it transferred another \$42

million to balance the recurrent deficit. That is how the then Liberal Government managed the State's finances. Inbuilt deficits were accumulating in the system, and in October 1982 the Liberal Government brought down its October Budget and told the people of South Australia that it was a balanced Budget.

We know that the then Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Ted Chapman) during the election period gave \$9 million away in drought relief. I am not saying that those funds were not deserved, but the fact is that no budgetary appropriation was made.

*Mr Olsen interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** The member for Alexandra was reported in the paper as saying that the then Premier Tonkin gave him an open cheque book. He was writing out cheques like confetti, without budgetary appropriations, and at the end of 1982 the incoming Government found itself with a \$63 million deficit. That is the reason for the economic problems in South Australia. Members opposite know that, had the previous Government been re-elected to Government in 1982, it would have massively increased taxation, as there was nothing else it could do.

It is the present Government which has made the hard and responsible decisions that members opposite copped out of, because they were coming up to an election in 1982. I challenge members opposite to tell the House how they would have managed the State's finances after the 1982 election. I know that the member for Todd told this House two years ago that he would have immediately sacked 2 000 people in the public sector. I ask the member for Todd to tell this House how many teachers, nurses and other Government workers would have gone in that 2 000 cut.

*Mr Ashenden interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** The honourable member is on record, and he knows it. That is what they would have done. Many members of this House may have forgotten the Tonkin Budgets. This was the September 1981 Tonkin Budget—1 600—

**Mr ASHENDEN:** On a point of order, I believe that is not correct for a member to hold up and display such items as the honourable member is holding at the moment.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Ferguson):** I accept the point of order. No member of the House is allowed to display any material. I accept the point, and I ask the honourable member not to do so.

**Mr GROOM:** I accept your ruling, Mr Acting Speaker, and I hope that the member for Todd follows suit. I know that it is painful to the member for Todd to have to listen to details of the poor performance of his Party when in government. The fact of the matter is that in the September 1981 Budget 1 600 jobs were destroyed by the Tonkin Government. A Liberal Government would do the same thing again, because that is the way in which it manages the State's finances. Notwithstanding the propaganda that members opposite go on with, South Australians may well have forgotten that on 1 July 1980, when they were in government, members opposite increased electricity prices by 12.5 per cent. In the following year, on 1 July 1981, they increased electricity prices by 19.8 per cent.

*Mr Ashenden interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** I know this hurts, because the people of South Australia have not been told this. On 1 May 1982 the previous Government increased electricity prices by 16 per cent. What happened then? Members opposite had no courage when in 1982 they were coming into an election period and the previous Government was hit with that hike because of the arbitrator's decision to increase up gas prices by 30 per cent. Instead of appealing against that pricing decision, as the New South Wales Government did in 1983, members opposite did a deal with the gas producers and

entered into a commercial contract to raise electricity prices by 12 per cent every year after 1982. Members opposite know that that is the truth of the matter, but they do not like the public of South Australia being told these facts. It was a cop-out

**Mr Ashenden:** Tell us about the gas sales in New South Wales?

**Mr GROOM:** In New South Wales, Premier Wran appealed against the arbitrator's decision, and that is why New South Wales has lower electricity prices than we have in South Australia. I know that members opposite are trying to get out of it and provide some explanation: that is their prerogative. But, at least members opposite should have the courage to tell the people of South Australia that the electricity price rises that have occurred every year since 1982 are a result of the agreement that members opposite entered into in October 1982. That occurred because they were coming into an election period and they did not have the courage to make hard decisions. The Leader of the Opposition can laugh, but he was a member of the Government which put this State \$63 million in deficit.

*Mr Olsen interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** I will stay for your response; I have heard it before, so I know what the honourable member will say.

**An honourable member:** It's the same old thing all over again.

**Mr GROOM:** It is akin to *Blue Hills*. This Government was faced with a run-down of cash reserves which had been built into the system by the sale of the railways in 1975 by the Dunstan Government. We were faced with a worsening unemployment situation and also with closures, because a lot of firms were trying to help members opposite. Within a day of the election closures were announced and a large number of people were put off. In addition, we had the bushfires, and the Electricity Trust has had to arrange its finances to cope with that situation. That is the fact of the matter.

**Mr Baker:** That is not the fact of the matter; that is rubbish.

**Mr GROOM:** The honourable member will have his opportunity. If he wants to show that as being inaccurate, I welcome the honourable member's contribution. Members opposite did not make the hard decisions in government. They had a \$63 million deficit built into the system when compared with the budget surplus that had been left by the 1979 Corcoran Government. If honourable members opposite won the 1982 election, they would have increased taxation, because they would have had no alternative.

Since that time all the economic indicators show that the Premier has managed the finances of this State in the most responsible way. Over the past year employment has risen by 3.3 per cent compared with the average of 2.2 the year before. Unemployment has fallen in South Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** I do not know—

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable member to resume his seat. During the two debates for which I have been in the Chair I have been very tolerant to the repartee across the Chamber and the normal give and take has been tolerated. However, it has not reached and should not reach the situation where both sides are trying to shout each other down. I ask the House to come to order I ask that due deference be given to the speaker.

**Mr GROOM:** The fact is that the unemployment rate is falling; the employment rate is increasing. Job vacancies as appearing in the Adelaide *Advertiser* were 34 per cent higher in April this year than they were in April 1984. Over the past two years there has been a 100 per cent increase in private sector dwelling approvals compared with the

national average of 39.3 per cent. That is as a consequence of the activities of institutions like the State Bank and SGIC, which members opposite have earmarked for privatisation—a matter on which I will speak later.

*Mr Olsen interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** I have the honourable member on record as saying—

**Mr Olsen:** Who, me?

**Mr GROOM:** Yes, the Leader is on record, with the greatest respect, as saying that the State Bank and SGIC will be looked at. I will quote the honourable member: I will say a little about that in a moment. Our population has been increasing. Because of the dramatic boom in private sector dwellings and public sector constructions in South Australia, people are returning from Queensland. If one visits the building sites one finds out what tradesmen are working there now. One soon discovers people who have come from other States to obtain employment within the housing industry in South Australia. Retail sales are another economic indicator that has increased by about 5 per cent during the September 1984 quarter compared with the same period in the previous year. The *Bulletin* published on 6 August 1985 a poll which showed that, in the past 12 months, there has been a dramatic decrease in the cost of living in Adelaide compared with other States. In Adelaide the cost of living over the past 12 months has actually decreased.

*Mr Baker interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** I am merely reading out statistics which have been published by the *Bulletin* relating to an Australia-wide poll. If the honourable member wants to dispute it, he can do so. Inflation is falling, and economic indicators show that South Australia is performing better than any other State. Over the past 12 months there has been a \$22 fall in the cost of living in Adelaide; in Brisbane the fall was \$6; in Hobart the fall was \$8; in Sydney it was \$2; in Victoria the cost of living rose by \$13 and in Perth it rose by \$4. According to all the economic indices, South Australia is performing better than any other State. Those are the facts of the matter. Whether members opposite like it or not, that is occurring in South Australia.

Because of the good financial management here, and because this Government was prepared to make the hard decisions that honourable members opposite copped out of because they were coming into an election period, we have taken the flak in South Australia. The management of the State's finances undertaken by this Government has resulted in a package of \$41 million in tax cuts. We heard them complain about that. First, they said it was a con job; secondly, honourable members opposite said it was their policy and they would have done it in any event; thirdly, they said it was illusory. I just wish honourable members opposite would get a consistent position on the tax cuts. They are a result of a booming economy in South Australia, an improved economy—

*Mr Oswald interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! I call the honourable member to order, and I warn him.

*Mr Oswald interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** I have called the honourable member to order, and I am issuing a warning. I am quite serious about it. If the House is called to order, then I expect it to come to order. I ask that the honourable member cease interjecting and I call the honourable member for Hartley.

**Mr BAKER:** On a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker, could we have some clarification on your ruling? Are you warning the honourable member at the same time as you are calling him to order? Is that your ruling?

The **ACTING SPEAKER**: I ask the honourable member to resume his seat. I called the honourable member to order. I expect this House to show respect to the Chair. The honourable member continued along his course, even though I had called him to order, and my only alternative was to issue a warning. The answer to the question is, 'Yes, I have.' The honourable member for Hartley.

**Mr GROOM**: Because I have agreed to limit my time, I propose to deal very briefly but in some detail with the matter of privatisation. I predict that this policy will be the Achilles heel of honourable members opposite, and they know it. They have taken some policy from abroad—it is not a home grown policy or anything like that. It has not been examined properly or looked at. It has not got community support. No person employed by Telecom, Qantas, TAA, public transport, Public Buildings, postal services, E&WS, local councils (because honourable members opposite propose to use private contractors and replace jobs in local councils), the Woods and Forests Department, the Electricity Trust (the Leader of the Opposition got into a bit of political trouble about that and backed away from it, despite the fact he had power in his list), or in State banking will have a secure job under honourable members opposite, because they propose to privatise those industries.

At Federal level, what do they propose to do? Under their Federal policy, which has been imposed on members opposite by their Federal colleagues (and I know there is a bit of a disquiet about this privatisation policy because they know the dangers that are inherent in it and they do not have complete agreement), they are going to sell off Telecom, although Telecom has served this country well. During the 1983-84 year, Telecom had a profit of \$309 million, in addition to the \$597 million paid to the Government in interest payments. It has a capital budget of something like \$2 billion, and honourable members opposite propose to sell off this public utility to private enterprise.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM**: It is in the Federal policy of honourable members opposite, and I will quote it. That is the fact of the matter. The Thatcher Government in England has sold off British Telecom. It has retained in British Telecom an interest of about 49 per cent, but for those shareholders who have bought the other 51 per cent, they propose to give a 1 for 10 bonus issue in subsequent years. I suppose it is an incentive for people to hold their shares. In actual fact, the Thatcher Government has cost the British taxpayer something like 1.3 billion pounds, because it sold off Telecom too cheaply.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM**: The honourable member opposite knows that and I am quoting from an article, 'Privatisation in Britain' published by *World Business Review*, *The Economist*, of 23 February 1985. They floated a share issue and, of course, there were queues of people lined up to buy shares in British Telecom, because the speculators were there. They bought the shares, and, within a week, the shares had doubled in price. Part of the problem is that they undervalued the assets. It has been estimated in the *World Business Review* that, selling Telecom cheap cost British taxpayers \$1.3 billion.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM**: The honourable member opposite can laugh, but they are the policies into which his Party is leading this State. At the national level it proposes to sell off Telecom. In England now, because various private companies are responsible for the operation, installation and maintenance, if something small goes wrong with a telephone a contractor comes out after a week or so, he says he cannot fix it, and one then has to wait for another contractor. People in Britain have become so frustrated, because of the agree-

ment, that the only way they can get the telephone fixed is to pull it out of the wall.

*Mr Mathwin interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM**: The member for Glenelg knows that that has happened in Britain and that it was a disastrous policy. The British Government has done the same with other public institutions. The Leader of the Opposition knows that the British Government floated the shares and that the assets were undervalued. The real policy of members opposite is part of the movement towards the right. Because the Labor Governments in Australia, in South Australia and in other States, have the support of the business community as a consequence of getting this country back on its economic feet, honourable members opposite are aiming to regain that support by giving something to the business community. That is what they propose to do. They propose to sell off profitable public institutions such as Telecom and Qantas. Qantas has been earmarked by the Federal Government.

*Mr Mathwin interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM**: We will come to that. If they sell off the railways and the State Transport Authority, bus fares will go from 75 cents to about \$2.30 for an average trip. The railways are subsidised. If they sell to the private sector, there can be only one result: it will not run an unprofitable enterprise, but will make it profitable by increasing fares. The cost of telephone calls will double.

I know that this policy worries honourable members opposite because they are not fully convinced about it. The Leader of the Opposition has gone out on a limb.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM**: I will tell honourable members about Qantas, which has been earmarked for privatisation. In 1984-85 Qantas had a profit of \$147.9 million.

*Mr Ashenden interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM**: I know that it sold off \$80 million, but notwithstanding that sale, it sold old stock. It still had an operating profit of \$62.7 million compared with \$58.3 million for the previous year. That is not a bad record for a public utility because that money goes into general revenue, in the same way as does Telecom revenue. TAA has had only one loss in eight years, but honourable members opposite propose to sell it off. The State Bank has assets of \$3 000 million.

It is highly profitable and it is an essential part of our economic base because, in conjunction with SGIC, it has been responsible for the recovery, but the Leader has it on his list of enterprises to be looked at under a Liberal Government and sold off. There is also the Woods and Forests Department.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM**: I will quote my source in a moment if the honourable member will be patient. A number of articles have been published in the *Australian* in which the honourable member said that he will look at SGIC.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM**: I will get the clipping, because I am in fact quoting from that clipping. The Woods and Forests Department is an area at State level that honourable members opposite say they will look. Anyone who saw the program on Sunday night would have seen the remarkable ingenuity of this department that resulted in salvage of much of the State's timber supplies lost during the Ash Wednesday fires: something like 200 trucks a day, and they used private contractors, were ferrying logs to Lake Bonney. The department, in addition to salvaging the trees that were affected by the Ash Wednesday fires, is involved in replanting something like 20 million trees over the next eight years. Yet members opposite propose to sell off parts of the Woods and Forest Department!



Recently, \$5 million has been invested in upgrading the Central Linen Service, which employs 250 workers. It has increased productivity so markedly over the past two years that the laundry is the most efficient in Australia. One just cannot take policies from abroad and impose them on South Australians and expect them to work.

As I said, British Telecom has gone from 100 per cent public ownership (apart from the residual interest that has been held by the British Government, which it proposes to divest itself of by giving a one to 10 issue) to the private hands of a few per cent. I have already outlined the problems. There are other utilities in England: Jaguar, British Ports and British Aerospace. The public response to buying these shares initially was good.

**Mr Ingerson:** Very successful!

**Mr GROOM:** That is not the case. The member for Bragg had better do his homework because the shares have become concentrated now in the hands of just a few. In Jaguar within a few months the number of shareholders fell from 125 000 to 50 000, and it is shrinking. The assets were undervalued and people made a capital profit by selling their shares. Ultimately, all of these institutions like Telecom, TAA, the State Bank, Woods and Forests Department, the Central Linen Service, Qantas—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** If the honourable member wants to debate that, I will debate it on another occasion. If members want to meet the issue of privatisation, they should get up and indulge in this debate, but these very profitable public enterprises have fallen into the hands of a relatively few people, all for the sake of—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** Last year, members opposite were going to sell off public schools: that was the policy.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** The member for Torrens knows what I am talking about, because he got on the telex and had that policy cancelled because he saw the dangers of it. Members opposite may have forgotten the motion that I moved about that last year.

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will take his seat. I ask the House to come to order. All members believe that they ought to be heard in relative silence. I ask honourable members to give that opportunity to their opposite numbers. The member for Hartley.

**Mr GROOM:** I know that this is very painful and worrying to members opposite because they have fallen into the privatisation trap, which will be their Achilles heel. In the *Weekend Australian* of 13 October 1984 we saw the headline 'Liberals to sell schools under privatisation'. That came out of the same policy that resulted in this policy to sell TAA, the Commonwealth Bank—which has been a magnificent institution for Australia—parts of Telecom, Medibank Private, the Australian Industries Development Corporation, the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** The member for Chaffey knows that there is a proposal to sell off the Murray River irrigation scheme. I bet that he is not too happy about that policy.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** I am sure that he will. The honourable member should tell that to the electors of his constituency. I would like them to hear his remarks, because they have benefited from that scheme. Make no mistake about it. He knows they have benefited from it. However, at the same time we get a policy to sell off public schools.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** It is there; it was reported; it is in black and white. It came out of the Federal Liberal Party's policy,

but the member for Torrens was a wakeup, because he knows that a wide cross-section of the community participated in the development of those public schools and that they contributed many hours of voluntary effort. The member for Torrens saw the danger. When he saw that policy in the *Australian* and published in the *News* he panicked. He got on the telex and had it cancelled within 24 hours, because he saw the danger. He knows it. I know he can laugh, but he knows that is where he spent the afternoon—on the telex cancelling the policy.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** That is an example of the danger inherent in this privatisation policy. Over the next few months we will tell the people of South Australia what they can expect under a Liberal Government. I will show the Leader of the Opposition the newspaper clippings: I am not misleading him. He is on record; he is reported in the paper as being prepared to look at the sale of the State Bank and SGIC.

Let him get up and say it because, in relation to all those institutions the Leader of the Opposition has named in the newspaper stories, one by one he will say, 'We are not going to do that.' The public of South Australia will not stand for it. That is why the member for Torrens cancelled the policy of selling public schools to the private sector. He knows that: he knew that the school communities would erupt over that.

**Mr Mathwin:** The papers told us you were going to be on the front bench!

**Mr GROOM:** I think I can safely predict that honourable members will be right next year.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** Members opposite have been putting bets on me for the last two years. The fact of the matter is that the public of South Australia, the people who work in those industries—transport, public buildings, housing, Telecom, Qantas, TAA, housing and in councils—will be affected. It is only seeping through to local councils that people who are engaged currently with secure jobs will be replaced by private contractors. If one tries to change the status of people, what will happen to their superannuation entitlements and other accrued benefits?

I heard the honourable member on the Philip Satchell show on this issue. It was the only time I have seen him under pressure in the media for a long while. He was tackled on this very firmly and was found wanting, because Satchell said to him, 'You must be joking. The people of South Australia will not cop their status being changed without a fight. What do you expect?' He knows that that is his Achilles heel. He should go to the depots and councils and tell people that they will be replaced by private contractors: he should go out to Public Buildings, the Housing Trust and Telecom and tell the employees there. That is what honourable members opposite should do, but they will not.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** I will be another five minutes. If members opposite had not interrupted, I would have finished 15 minutes ago. However, this policy of privatisation will be the Achilles heel of members opposite. They have not even developed a coherent policy on it. All they say is that it will be done on a case by case basis following this principle: will the taxpayer and the consumer benefit? That is all they have said.

I hope that the Leader of the Opposition gets up and tackles this problem, because I challenge him to tell this House and the public of South Australia how the consumer and the taxpayer will benefit from the sale of Telecom, Qantas, TAA, Woods and Forests, E&WS, ETSA, Public Buildings, the Highways Department, the State Transport Authority and the State Bank, and from the use of private contractors to replace permanent employees at the Highways Department. In the Highways Department the Oppo-

sition proposes to replace people on permanent employment, as it does in Public Buildings, the E&WS and local councils.

They will seek to present this policy in the most attractive light. They will say, 'Queue up for a handout, come and get your share'. They pretend that in England everyone queued up out of good motives. The speculators queued up—that is what occurred in Britain! Very soon the holdings of these public utilities that have been sold off will become narrower and narrower, and these very profitable public enterprises will be lost. That will also occur here if honourable members opposite get the opportunity.

The selling off of public enterprises is nothing more than a scheme to try to win the business community back on side; it is nothing more than a scheme to sell off profitable public enterprises. It will lead to an escalation in prices. No person working in the public sector will have a secure job under the Liberals. The headline which the honourable member took a point of order on and which he did not like (he does not like being reminded) referred to the 1981 State budget and read '1 600 jobs to go in budget'. That is what we can expect under a Liberal Government. Let us not turn the clock back.

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Lands):** I move:

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

Motion carried.

**Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition):** The member for Hartley, whom I was pleased to step aside for in the order tonight at his request has, unfortunately, like many Government members, used statistics like a drunk uses a lamp post: more for misguided support than illumination. The contribution by the member for Hartley has missed a couple of basic points, that is, that the Government is totally hypocritical on the matter of privatisation. It was the Dunstan Labor Government that sold this State's asset in the railways to the Commonwealth Government. In addition—

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! I remind the House that I have had cause to issue warnings to members and, if the Leader of the Opposition's speech is drowned out, I have no other course of action but to issue warnings to other members.

*An honourable member:* Hear, hear!

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** I do not need any assistance. I request that the Leader be heard in silence.

**Mr OLSEN:** There are one or two other examples in relation to this Administration in South Australia. For example, today it is selling Health Commission assets worth \$20 million. If that is not privatisation, I do not know what is. In addition, the South Australian Housing Trust has divested itself of its commercial properties—privatisation indeed. In addition, the Government sold half the chartered bus operation of the State Transport Authority—half the operation has been divested by this Government.

Members opposite talk about selling off schools. I remind the House that it was a Labor Government that closed country schools and then sold the assets to the highest bidder. It is all very well for the honourable member to get up and talk about privatisation and misrepresent the position of the Liberal Party, because that is what he is trying to achieve. The honourable member referred to British Telecom. The fact is that 95 per cent of the employees of British Telecom are now shareholders in that organisation, against the wishes of the Labour Party and union officials in the United Kingdom.

Employees of British Telecom are its major shareholders, and that is the way it should be. If the offer is made and

they accept it—all well and good. It is interesting that Labour leader Neil Kinnock initially opposed that move and said when it was privatised, 'We will undo all that madness of privatising British Telecom'; over the past few weeks he has been saying, 'Seeing that 95 per cent of the workers have taken up their option for shareholding, that is no longer the case'.

*Mr Groom interjecting:*

**Mr OLSEN:** I was in the United Kingdom two weeks ago. The member for Hartley should check his facts and check the shareholding. He should check how privatisation works. He talks about the United Kingdom, but what about China, which privatises communal farming operations? What about France, West Germany, and Canada? Malaysian Airlines and British Airways have been privatised. Indeed, the United Kingdom is not an isolated case, as the honourable member well knows. It is a fact that if we are to give taxation relief to the majority of citizens in Australia and in the Western democracies throughout the world, Governments must curtail their expenditure. They must stop duplicating what the private sector can provide—and more efficiently. Only by that means will we provide meaningful taxation relief to Australians and South Australians in future decades.

Today the Premier talked about the tax effort. Indeed, this Government has really put effort into tax raising in South Australia, and I hope that the honourable member is at least prepared to sit through my comments, which pick up a number of those points. In addition, I refer to the State Bank and SGIC: I think that the honourable member referred to the Woods and Forests Department, also. I have made no comment about the privatisation of the State Bank or the SGIC. Where services are provided in the private sector, competing on normal commercial grounds, there is no reason at all for those instrumentalities to be privatised, because they pass the test, and the test is, 'Will the consumers of South Australia benefit? Will the taxpayers of this State benefit?' If that test is not passed, we do not further assess the privatisation of the instrumentality.

Let me take it one step further on the basis that the member for Hartley has totally misrepresented the position of the Liberal Party on privatisation, and I can understand why members opposite would do that. They know that they are on the run. The polls are pointing down and they are desperately trying to grab at anything that will create emotive fear in the electorate.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable Leader to refer to other honourable members by their district.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr OLSEN:** I have been referring to the member for Hartley, Mr Speaker, responding to his contribution in this House 10 to 15 minutes ago, replying to specific points made by him in this House. He totally misrepresented the policy of the Liberal Party on privatisation. I am responding to his remarks, clearly pointing out to the honourable member that he has totally misrepresented the position.

A number of public servants in this State in a range of Government instrumentalities are providing essential services to the State, such as education, health, welfare and police services. It is the Government's responsibility, indeed it is the Government's obligation, to provide the best and most efficient services for the citizens of this State. I want the best education for my kids: I want them to have job opportunities: I want them to have equality of opportunity later in life. The best way to achieve those things is to make sure—

*Mr Trainer interjecting:*

**Mr OLSEN:** Of course, we all want that I am no different from any other parent in this State.

*Mr Trainer interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable Leader to resume his seat. I ask all honourable members for silence. Other members have been heard in silence in this debate, and I ask that the Leader be heard in silence.

**Mr OLSEN:** Those responsibilities and obligations of government can best be discharged on the basis it is not distracted from providing them by getting into a range of commercial operations in which it ought not to be involved. The private sector can undertake those commercial operations. It is the private sector that provides two-thirds of the jobs. We must ensure that the private sector does not face unfair competition in the market place because, if that occurs, it cannot trade effectively and jobs will be lost. The Central Linen Service is but one of those areas, but I will take up that point in more detail later. We cannot have unfair competition working against the private sector. To do so merely ensures that that sector is operating effectively and efficiently.

I refer to the obligation that we gave in 1979-82 and the obligation that I now give. The commitment was honoured previously that not one person in the State Public Service would lose their job. We said that in reducing the size of the Public Service, in making it smaller, leaner and more efficient not one job would be lost and not one person would be sacked or retrenched. Indeed, I challenge the member for Hartley to give me but one example between 1979 and 1982 where that actually happened. I know he cannot do that because it did not happen. That promise was honoured.

Let me now state unequivocally the position as it relates to any future policy that we put in place in the next few weeks when occupancy of the Treasury benches changes this State. As to any policy that we put in place, I give an absolute commitment to any individual employed in the Public Service or any instrumentality in this State: no-one will have their job put at risk or put in jeopardy as a result of the privatisation policy, as the honourable member will well see as events unfold—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr OLSEN:**—between now and the election. We will give the examples, but of course a red herring was drawn across the trail tonight, and reference was made to Qantas and Telecom. The member for Hartley well knows that the next Liberal Government in this State would have no involvement with those Federal statutory authorities.

*Mr Groom interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr OLSEN:** The honourable member well knows that red herrings have been used to create a fear campaign, but his argument against our policies will not stand up in the electorate. Indeed, our policies have one objective: smaller, leaner and more efficient government and reduced expenditure columns.

That means that the people out in average households who have experienced the greatest hike in ETSA tariffs—and I will get back in greater detail to the member for Hartley's gas pricing comments later—will clearly demonstrate their feelings. I refer to the average household budget, to people on the average wage—the real salt of earth in this country—the people who have abided by the wages pause and whom salary and wage increases have been restricted in line with the need for Australia to become a little more competitive internationally. Those people have played their part, but the Bannon Government has not. It has not restricted its expenditure at the very time the people out there have had their pay packets restricted.

Their taxes have increased, including ETSA tariffs, water rates, bus fares—188 individual charges have increased,

with seven tax increases. Indeed, we had the first new tax in over 10 years, the financial institutions duty. That shows the capacity of this Administration, which promised before 1982 not to introduce any new taxes or increase taxes during its term of office. It is a broken record.

*Mr Groom interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable member to resume his seat. In line with my policy I now formally warn the member for Hartley.

**Mr OLSEN:** That is the track record of this Administration compared to the one before it. They are not my figures: the figures of the Australian Bureau of Statistics show a 50.2 per cent increase, and the member for Hartley well knows that. They are not mine: they are the figures of ABS, the Commonwealth Government, and they show a 50.2 per cent lift in taxation under the Labor Government. The honourable member well knows that between 1979 and 1982 South Australia (at 30 June 1982) was actually the lowest taxed State per capita in Australia.

That is the difference and people are judged on their track record. Indeed, there is no better way to judge any individual or Government performance than that. The Government's track record is down; indeed, Government backbenchers and the member for Hartley would well appreciate that. The honourable member himself was once in a marginal seat, but members in marginal seats now door knocking in their electorates are getting a message loud and clear—one they do not like. They are oncers!

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr OLSEN:** The members for Brighton and Unley well understand that, and they ought to enjoy their seats while they are sitting in them, because at the outside they will have them only for the next 12 weeks. The electorate has had enough, because the Government has squeezed household budgets to the point where the people cannot take any more. Then, of course, the Government brought in a \$41 million tax relief package, but what a con that is. The Government put up ETSA tariffs by 41 per cent and has then decided to cut the tariff by 2 per cent. We all know that the net effect of this on the household budget (and no Government member has denied this in the weeks since I first raised the matter) will be to reduce it by \$2 a quarter—a whole \$2 a quarter!

The Opposition put to the Premier that it was assumed that the remittance of part of the ETSA turnover tax to relieve the burden would be permanent, and we asked, therefore, where was the legislation before the House to reduce the impost on ETSA. The reply was that it would be for only this year. As it is an election year, the Government's tactics are quite obvious. ETSA will be given back \$11 million this year as a one-off payment, but the Government intends to reintroduce the impost next year (that is, if the electorate has the misfortune of the Labor Government being re-elected, although the polls certainly do not indicate that that will occur). That would be reintroduced next year, and it is a second con job.

Another example involves stamp duty. The Government intends to provide stamp duty relief of \$100 to other than first home buyers. That would have provided some relief, but the Lands Titles Office fees are to be increased by \$100. The Government gives back \$100, but it then takes another \$100. That is why the \$41 million package that was introduced is a con. The electorate will not buy it a second time around. The Government well knows what the reaction of the electorate is to the \$41 million tax package: they have seen through it. People will no longer accept the cynicism of politicians in trying to buy votes in the weeks leading up to an election campaign. There is no doubt that that was made well and truly clear to the Government in recent times.

I want to refer to one or two other points raised by the member for Hartley, although I realise that time is marching on. The honourable member said that the present Government had inherited a \$60-odd million deficit. That is factually inaccurate, as the honourable member knows. I draw to the honourable member's attention the statement that I made in this House in December 1982, a month after the last State election, on 6 November 1982. That statement contained Treasury minutes available to the former Liberal Government, legitimately as the Government of the day, and was signed by the Treasurer and the then Under-Treasurer. It contained details of the projected figure to apply in relation to the following 30 June budget: that was \$13 million, not \$60 million.

The honourable member did not go on to explain that his colleague the Minister of Health overspent in his department. Government departments overspent in the first two budgets to the tune of \$50 million. That is why the Government had a \$60 million deficit, and members opposite, three years after the event, cannot say that it was the fault of the former Liberal Government that put the State into bankruptcy. That is absolute nonsense, and members opposite know it. As Leader of the Opposition I have tabled Treasury figures in this House containing documents that had legitimately been available to us as the Government of the day. Although members opposite do not like the truth, that happens to be the truth of the matter.

*The Hon. Michael Wilson interjecting:*

**Mr OLSEN:** Yes, the member for Hartley said that we had passed the deficit on. However, he did not refer to the fact that the Government has expanded the size of the Government sector, that the growth it has permitted in the Public Service is a cost equivalent to twice the amount of FID revenue collected in this State. It would be interesting to ascertain the effects of the extra tax on small business and to see how many permanent jobs that has suffocated in the small business sector. It would more than outweigh, by two or three to one, those 3 000 jobs in the Government sector, and the honourable member well knows that fact.

As for inflation, he pulled some statistics out of a hat, and it reminded me of a drunk and a lamp post. I am sure that the honourable members understands the analogy. On Australian Bureau of Statistics figures, the fact is that Adelaide is the inflation capital of Australia. I will be pleased to provide the honourable member with a copy of the ABS booklet if he does not receive the quarterly assessments from the ABS. That publication nominates the reasons for the high inflation in South Australia as being the taxes and charges of the State Labor Government. It identifies the fact that taxes and charges in this State have risen higher than at any time in our history, higher than any other State in Australia. That is the net effect of the policies of this Administration and that has really impacted on the effects not of big business, not only of small business, but on the household budget of each and every one of us. For that reason, the electorate will no longer tolerate high taxing Labor policies.

I now turn specifically to the motion before the House. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. In doing so, I commend His Excellency and Lady Dunstan for their approach to their viceregal duties in this State. The viceregal office will have a very high profile during our Jubilee celebrations next year, and I am sure that His Excellency and Lady Dunstan will make their distinctive contribution to the very wide and worthwhile range of activities that are being planned.

Next year will also be an appropriate time for South Australia to consider the important issues affecting our State, issues like the future of our manufacturing industry in an increasingly competitive world; how we increase our

trade with the Asia-Pacific region, the world's most rapidly growing area offering massive potential markets right on the fringe of Australia; how we improve education and training opportunities for young South Australians so that they can respond to the challenges and opportunities of the next generation. How do we limit growth in taxation and reduce Government regulation and interference so that South Australians may have more control over their own lives? What can we do to ensure South Australia obtains maximum advantage in terms of job and wealth creation from the development of our natural resources in northern South Australia? How can we secure our water supplies in the longer term and find a permanent solution to the question of quality of River Murray waters?

These are vital questions which concern all South Australians. They are questions on which any responsible Government, after three years in office at this key time in the history of our State, ought to have clearly defined policies. This Government fails that test and fails it comprehensively. It is governing now by opinion polls. It knows that key Labor policies have been rejected by the electorate, so the Premier has abandoned his Labor mantle and decided to copy important elements of a winning strategy, and that is called a Liberal Government strategy.

They are the tax cuts; the changes to native vegetation clearance legislation; a youth employment policy; a comprehensive policy on women's issues; abolition of the unsworn statement and a recreational development and boating policy. All of these topics were mentioned in His Excellency's the Governor's speech and they are all issues on which my Party has already made specific commitments.

As 'Onlooker' stated in the *Sunday Mail* at the weekend, the tax cuts would not have been announced without Liberal Party pressure—and there is no doubt about that. The imminent changes to the native vegetation clearance legislation will correct flaws which the Liberals forecast when the Government introduced this scheme and will mirror the policy we announced almost two years ago. We had to wait two years, but the Government at least picked up our legislation after two years.

In relation to youth employment, we have already published a comprehensive policy document which has been supported by employers and by many people working to assist young South Australians caught up in the tragedy. This Government has had three years in which to take action, but it has completely failed to do so. Now, to cover its own inaction, it is to spend \$300 000 of taxpayers money on a hastily cobbled together advertising and public relations campaign as a substitute for a workable policy.

Our 64 page policy on women's issues is the most comprehensive statement ever made in this area by a political Party in South Australia. Like our youth employment statement, it has received support across a wide range of different interest groups. Amongst many other things, it reaffirms our commitment to abolish the unsworn statement as a means of redressing the current imbalance in rape trials.

This is something for which we have been pressing since 1979. On four previous occasions members opposite have opposed our legislation. Now, with an election but weeks away, just around the corner, this has been the subject of yet another about face, although that will be little consolation to those women who have been subjected to the indignity of a rape trial during the last six years of refusal by the Labor Party to support this much needed reform. I hope the conscience really pricks those members opposite who understand that issue better than some. I talk about the member for Brighton, the member for Mawson and some of their colleagues in the Upper House. They, above all, should understand. Yet they, above all, refused to back an

issue that women have been fighting for in this State for years.

The commitment in His Excellency's speech to action for recreational boating and fishing followed the details of a policy statement made by the Liberal Party in February this year. What is more, in the Premier's television advertising, the election advertising—according to the Premier, we are not having an election campaign, but it is interesting that they are out there advertising and dropping leaflets about the place—most of the projects covered are Liberal initiatives.

Let us have a look at that television campaign—the one where the helicopter does not get off the ground. I am sure people will notice that. It is like this Government; it will not get off the ground at the next election. The O-Bahn was a Liberal initiative. All the Government did was to complete the project and run it down, albeit delaying it for a couple of years. The shadow Minister of Education, then Minister of Transport, signed the contract with Pak-Poy to get the funding for the ASER project in March 1982 after Cabinet agreed to the approval. Ministers have the audacity to fly over Technology Park and say, 'This is ours'. The fact is it was the member for Davenport, as Minister of Labour in this State, who got that project up and running for South Australia.

They were all Liberal initiatives, not to mention Roxby Downs. What absolute hypocrisy for this Premier to allow advertisements to go into the paper and say, 'I support Roxby Downs'. What a hypocritical approach! I can well understand the member for Brighton's displeasure, after the news that honourable members got in Caucus this morning, at the current state of affairs about the place, and feeling that one might as well give up now because the going is getting pretty rough. In fact, 2½ years ago, the now Premier, then Leader of the Opposition, said, 'Roxby Downs is nothing but a mirage in the desert.' Some mirage! The man has the hide, the audacity, the hypocrisy to stand up and champion the cause of that project. I say that in the context of the duplicity of the man, not for the project. Let me say with each one of those projects—ASER, O-Bahn, Technology Park, Roxby Downs—that I am pleased at least that this Government is supporting them because they are good for South Australia, they are needed for South Australia and they need to be backed for South Australia. To that extent I welcome, belated as it is, the support of the Government.

It is interesting to note that there has not been one major initiative born of this Government. The major initiatives were born of the former Liberal Administration continued by this Government. That is good for South Australia. I welcome them being continued for South Australia's sake. I welcome the job opportunities, but let the electorate know who the entrepreneurs are, who the initiators are, who the people are, and which Party is able to get South Australia up and running. It is certainly not the current Administration.

I think we ought to pick up this theme about knockers. Despite all these Liberal initiatives, the Premier says, 'The Opposition is knocking.' We have heard it tonight. Certainly we have knocked the Government. We have knocked some common sense into the Government on issues that I have just listed and many others. The Government has changed its position, and I am pleased that it has.

The Premier can equate knocking his Government with knocking South Australia all he likes. He can go on kidding himself and his increasingly nervous marginal seat members, but he will not kid the public. They have already shown by their response to policy initiatives that we have announced so far that they are looking for a Government prepared to take firm and responsible action over the key

issues that affect them and their families in the future. They are looking to a Liberal Government after the next election as a force for change for a better South Australia—a better South Australia for my kids, their kids. That is what every member of South Australia ought to be striving for.

After the next election, as a force for change for a better South Australia, as a Government with a vision for a better South Australia, Liberals will ensure that we achieve that objective and will replace the Government with its eyes only to the next opinion polls, as this Government has resorted to. It is a Government to the next opinion poll. Without a doubt this Government is on the run. The Premier has started to panic. Nothing demonstrated that more than his press conference on Sunday, called to criticise the Liberal Party's television advertising. All that achieved (and I am pleased he did it for us) was some free spots for our message on prime time news service in South Australia and further confirmation of the Premier's double standards and hypocrisy. It was an ill-considered move, a tactical mistake and another serious error of this Administration, and it shows that the Government is on the run. Clearly, the pressure is starting to build up. Some of the Premier's vulnerable backbenchers have picked up the drift. The member for Unley—

**Mr Ashenden:** The temporary member for Unley.

**Mr OLSEN:** Yes, he is the temporary member for Unley, but we will not hold that against him at this stage.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr OLSEN:** The member for Unley has tried to distance himself from a number of actions of this Government in recent weeks. He is now criticising aspects of the Grand Prix. When they say, 'Knock, knock', they had better look to their back bench for 'Knock, knock', rather than over here. The member for Unley is knocking the Grand Prix.

The member for Henley Beach—another classic example—at the weekend called on the Government to restore the \$3.7 million funding cuts in preschool education announced by the Federal Government. The member is obviously concerned that the swing against the Government will engulf him also. The tide is rolling in. He is trying to build up a wall or barrier. He will not stem the tide with that one—he is six weeks too late. The honourable member's statement on Sunday was a carbon copy of an announcement made by the shadow Minister of Education on 26 June this year. On that occasion the Minister criticised my colleague for showing more interest in and concern about the issue than has the Government. His reply now to the same statement from his back bench colleague will be interesting indeed. We will see whether between 26 June and August the story has changed. We will give him the opportunity to explain that sometime.

With such nervous nellys on the Government backbench, it is easy to understand why membership numbers in the Labor Party in South Australia have declined dramatically over the last four years and why lay members are losing confidence in the Parliamentary Party. Labor Party membership has gone down by 40 per cent.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr OLSEN:** During the same period there has been a very significant increase—quite the reverse—in the membership of the Liberal Party of South Australia because it has ideas and a vision for the future of South Australia. This decline in the membership of the Labor Party, and therefore of Party finances, makes it obvious (and I note that your electorate, Mr Speaker, happens to figure in newspaper reports about the decline in membership) that that is why the Premier is using taxpayers funds most improperly to indulge in Party political propaganda. He is resorting to the Dunstan era tactic of dipping into taxpayers funds to

pay for advertising, no matter how much it costs. The only objective is to win at all costs. That is the Labor strategy, the Government will suck the taxpayers in the process. That is its policy and its direction.

It will learn in a very short time that the taxpayers of South Australia will not buy it—they have had enough. They are looking for an alternative and some long-term direction. They are looking for strength in leadership and decision making. It is interesting to note that the Premier will spend more than three times as much on his Party's political advertising of youth employment programs alone as the Liberal Party has spent so far this year in communicating its policies. Yet the Premier complains about our activities. The record drones on endlessly: 'negative', 'knocking'. He claims that we have no policies, yet when we announce and advertise them he complains that we are plunging the State into a premature election campaign that will affect business confidence.

I like his attitude on taxation! He wants it all ways: in this world one cannot have it all ways. I do not have to tell this House that we support the ASER development and the Grand Prix. Why should we not? We initiated the projects. The honourable member and the Government well understand the position. The current Minister of Transport can get the file out and look at the copy of the Cabinet document signed by the shadow Minister of Education, the then Minister of Transport. Then the reality comes home. The record speaks for itself. Unlike the Premier, we can easily stand on ours, and we notice that there is a splinter or two off the record under his saddle today. The reaction in Question Time with the Dorothy Dixers was clearly a response to the broken record commercial. They do not like the truth or the unadulterated facts being put to the electorate of South Australia, because it hurts. They will not get away with abusing the electorate in that way.

We supported the legislation on ASER and the Grand Prix when it was before this Parliament. At the same time, we will not renege from our duty to ensure that, in projects like these, involving the use of significant amounts of public money, the Government is held accountable over how that money is spent: that is the essential difference. Nor will we renege from our duty to ensure that South Australians continue to have a full appreciation of the economic problems as well as the potential facing South Australia.

The Premier claims in virtually every public statement that he makes that South Australia is leading the national recovery. That point of view needs to be put into proper perspective. There is no doubt that the Australian economy is on the move, and we welcome that. In large measure, this is the result of the ending of the 1982-83 drought, the benefits of the wage restraint initiated by the 1983 wages pause, and the impact on confidence and activity resulting from recovery overseas.

The South Australian economy has followed the national economy along the recovery path. As long as the national recovery continues, we will continue to benefit, and that is to be greatly welcomed. However, South Australia must continue to ask itself whether we are positioning ourselves to firmly grasp new and alternative opportunities, whether we are giving sufficient encouragement to industries with high growth potential and whether we are creating enough alternative employment opportunities.

I will address those challenges and give the full perspective to our current economic performance by looking at a range of indicators: first, job figures. Unemployment in South Australia three years ago was 5 800 less than it is now. The rate in July 1982 was a full half per cent less than it is at present. That certainly gives the lie to what the member for Hartley said earlier today: there were 5 800

fewer unemployed when the Government took office than there are today. They are the indisputable facts.

The member for Hartley can holler all he likes in this House, but it will not disguise those facts. The House may recall the press conferences that the Premier used to hold monthly during 1982, with his black marks on the South Australian map trying to highlight where unemployment was worst. Contrast that with what he is saying now, when the situation is far worse, despite the spending of more than \$100 million on job creation schemes.

If we look at the performance of the States over the past three years, we find that the 12.6 per cent growth in the number of South Australians out of work has been the third highest of the States. Even if that assessment is limited to the past 12 months, the 8.5 per cent in unemployment in South Australia has been bettered by Western Australia and Tasmania. Tasmania's reduction has been 20.2 per cent, the highest of the States and, significantly, over the past 12 months Tasmania has also recorded the largest increase in employment of the States—6.8 per cent. This is followed by Western Australia and South Australia.

Looking at employment trends over the past three years, we find that South Australia's growth of 4.5 per cent is less than that of Tasmania with 6.3 per cent and that of Western Australia with 7.1 per cent. Honourable members will appreciate from these figures that the Premier's claim that South Australia is leading the nation in employment creation is simply untrue, and we must not allow exaggerations like this to mask some of the hidden tragedies in our unemployment picture, such as the fact that 23.5 per cent of all South Australians looking for work are teenagers.

We share the highest rate in this area. For those registered as long-term unemployed, South Australia's rate is 33.3 per cent—almost 6 per cent above the national average—and is the highest rate of the mainland States, according to latest CES figures. Another factor that must be understood in any realistic assessment of South Australia's future economic prospects is the decline in employment in our manufacturing and rural industries.

It is generally accepted that those industries must continue to underpin our economic future, yet this Government has announced no overall strategy to assist our manufacturing industry. The Premier rarely, if ever, refers to the problems, and Federal and State Labor Government policies have positively devastated our rural industries. Since June 1982 the number of manufacturing establishments in South Australia has dropped by 120, at 5.4 per cent almost 1.2 per cent above the national decline in the same period.

During that time the number of people employed in manufacturing establishments in South Australia has declined by 14 482, or 13.9 per cent, according to official ABS figures. Again, this is above the national trend. Employment in our rural industries over the last three years is down by 2 100.

Let me refer to some other economic indicators that this House should not ignore. Population was another favourite indicator of the Premier before the last State election. The latest figures show that in the two years since December 1982 South Australia's growth of 1.7 per cent was the lowest of any State. The national average for the States was 2.4 per cent, with Queensland's growth rate at 3.1 per cent.

In retail sales the growth in total value in South Australia during 1984-85 was 5.8 per cent, which was lower than the national growth of 6.5 per cent and the lowest percentage growth in South Australia for five years. The latest figures for industrial disputes show that South Australia has about 1.7 per cent of working days lost in Australia due to industrial disputes. This is an excellent record, but it is completely misleading to suggest that it is solely due to a Labor Government. Indeed, the corresponding figures for the previous two years were 8.3 per cent in 1984 and 5.3 per cent in

1983. Compare those with the record of the former Liberal Government at 3.1 per cent in 1982, 3.8 per cent in 1981 and 1.8 per cent in 1980.

Never at any time under Liberal Governments between 1950 and 1965 did the number of industrial disputes in South Australia exceed our percentage share of the work force.

**Mr Hamilton:** What a comparison.

**Mr OLSEN:** So, the proposition that the Premier puts about that only a Labor Government can work with the unions is a myth. The figures speak for themselves, as the member for Albert Park would well understand.

**Mr Hamilton:** What an outrageous, stupid comparison.

**Mr OLSEN:** They are ABS figures: they happen to be Australian Bureau of Statistics figures, for the honourable member's benefit. I know he is a slow learner and is more interested in the Hollywood environment. However, at least he should understand that the Australian Bureau of Statistics, a Commonwealth Government statutory authority, releases these figures and it does not have political interference in so doing.

That is the track record and the performance on which we should be making the judgment. The Premier has also attempted to use this argument to suggest that under a Liberal Government South Australia would have no hope of obtaining the submarine project. That is just another example of his tactic of trying to divide the community for base political purposes or reasons. There is no doubt about that.

Last month I visited the shipyard of the two final tenderers for the submarine project. They are well aware of the ability of previous Liberal Governments to work with responsible members of trade unions. They are also well aware of the determination of the next Liberal Government to ensure that as much as possible of this contract is undertaken in South Australia.

The Opposition has also supported the priority this Government has given to housing and construction in South Australia. The rising level of approvals has certainly generated additional employment opportunities. It needs to be recognised that this revival began in 1981-82 under the former Government. In that financial year building approvals in South Australia increased by 4.5 per cent.

South Australia was the only State to record a rise in that period. Nationally, there was a decline of 11.5 per cent. The Government does not like the figures or the facts. It likes to abuse the electorate by telling people inconsistencies and half truths. The fact is that the momentum has continued from that time until now, and that is to be welcomed. It is something that we, the Liberal Party, support.

But, during the June quarter the number of approvals was down 5.3 per cent in South Australia on the same period for 1984, compared with the national growth of 0.4 per cent. So, we have turned around. It now appears that the number of approvals has peaked in South Australia and that we will slowly return to approval levels of around 8 500 per year, demonstrating the inherent cyclical nature of this industry. A new impediment to future growth in housing and construction is the escalating cost of housing, for which Government policy is at least partly responsible. Official figures published last week showed that the price of housing was rising at a faster rate in Adelaide than in any other capital.

I also showed during debate in this House last Thursday how Government imposts on home purchase have risen steeply. Previously, I have demonstrated how this Government's policy of enforced unionisation of subcontractors is pushing up the cost of constructing public housing. In addition, interest rates are at historically high levels in real terms.

At present, the real rate of interest for a building society loan is about 7.5 per cent—double what it was in 1982. Let us not forget that fact. Another indicator of concern is the cost of materials for house construction. Between May 1984 and May 1985 this price index in South Australia increased by 10.5 per cent. It was the highest growth of any State. At a time when the community has accepted the need for wage restraint, costs like these must price more and more people out of the home buying market, and place even more pressure on public housing.

Indeed, continuing wage restraint is under serious threat because of Government tax and pricing policies which have been a major source of inflationary pressure, particularly in Adelaide. Last financial year, Adelaide's CPI was 7.4 per cent, the highest of all States and well above the national average of 6.7 per cent (I hope that the member for Hartley is listening to these statistics, because he attempted to mislead the House and the gallery earlier this evening). Over that period, selected State and local Government charges contributed 1.1 index points to the all groups index, compared with a six State capital cities contribution of 0.7 index points. If the movement in charges in Adelaide had been in line with the national average, our CPI would have been 7.1 per cent—equal to Melbourne and Hobart.

Increases in ETSA tariffs, water and sewerage rates, housing Trust rents, motor vehicle registration fees, driver's licence fees and third party insurance premiums all contributed to a further erosion of South Australia's competitive edge. An analysis of the CPI subgroups reveals that Adelaide recorded the largest increase in five out of the eight categories. They were: food (up 7.2 per cent); clothing (up 6.9 per cent); household equipment and operation (up 6.2 per cent); transportation (up 9.6 per cent); and health and personal care (up 5.8 per cent). Newspaper headlines covering this and recent CPI results have described Adelaide as 'Australia's inflation capital'. That is not my view. That is the view of independent objective observers. And this Government's financial policies have made a major contribution to that. It is little wonder, with a record like this, that the Premier is again attempting to distort the tax debate, as he did before the last election.

Let me give just one example. The ALP is now distributing a full colour pamphlet, despite the Premier's statement in the *Advertiser* yesterday that we are not in an election campaign. I quote from that pamphlet, as follows:

And now John Bannon has won again in cutting Liberals' taxes. He's put the brakes on electricity charges that were biting hard.

That is a blatant untruth. The Premier implies that a Liberal Government put the tax on ETSA when it was the Dunstan Government. Not only that, the Dunstan Government introduced this tax in 1971 at a rate of 3 per cent of the Electricity Trust's turnover.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr OLSEN:** The Minister of Transport well knows that the Liberal Government cut taxes on succession duties, gift duty, land tax on the principal place of residence and that we abolished a whole range of other taxes. Remember the record: we abolished taxes and we took South Australia down to become the lowest tax State *per capita* of any State in Australia. In the first year we reduced taxes by 5.7 per cent. That must be seen against the Government's record of the addition of 50.2 per cent. Really, the Minister of Transport—

**Mr Gunn:** The sacked Minister of Correctional Services.

**Mr OLSEN:** He has been sacked from a number of portfolios. The Government keeps moving him around. I wonder what disasters he leaves as he moves to each new portfolio. That sort of untruth shows that the gloves are really off. The Premier will stop at nothing. There is no doubt that the Government was also responsible for mis-

leading figures that were published in last weekend's *Sunday Mail*: the Onlooker article suggested, for example (and the Premier referred to this today in the House—he just happened to have the figures available to reply to a Dorothy Dix question), that rises in State tax collections due solely to this Government's decision to increase the rates of seven taxes and introduce a new tax amount to only \$64 million.

The reality is that the impact is about double that. Let me explain why. In the last two Budgets, financial institutions duty has brought in \$40.5 million, and increased rates in the following taxes imposed by this Government have brought in these additional amounts: liquor licence fees, up \$5.8 million; tobacco franchise licence fees, \$33 million; petroleum franchise fees, \$26.2 million; stamp duty on insurance, \$18 million; reintroduction of the gas levy, \$4.8 million; and motor registration and drivers licence fees, an additional \$6.1 million. That adds up to \$134.4 million in additional revenue, generated by the taxation decisions of this Government.

Even when that is offset by \$8 million worth of stamp duty concessions, the total impact is still almost twice that which the Government attempted to suggest in the *Sunday Mail*. This article also sought to draw some comparisons with the record of the former Administration. It stated that in 1979-80 tax collections amounted to \$342 million, when they were in fact \$423 million. In 1981-82, they amounted to \$495 million, an increase of just \$72 million over those three years of relatively high inflation and wage movements.

We must judge it on that basis—high inflation and wage movements over three years. But under this Government, in a period of wage restraint, the increase in tax take has been more than three times as much, meaning disposable incomes have been significantly eroded. This has been imposed not to recover any deficit left by the last Government—because this Government has run up a record Budget deficit which it has done little to attack—but to pay for a high increase in Government spending. This Government has increased recurrent spending by 43.9 per cent. It has been the second highest growth of the States. And the reason the public can have no faith in tax cuts being maintained under a Labor Government is that Labor has no commitment to expenditure restraint. Indeed, its philosophy is the exact opposite.

I will quote from a document that the Premier circulated at the March special convention of his Party. It said that a Labor Government's attitude to the partnership between the public and the private sector is that the Government's role would be (and I use his words) 'activist, and interventionist', and that it will often be the public sector which 'directs' the course of events. This is what socialism is all about. Here is the Premier's own definition of big, interfering government—it is to be activist and interventionist.

Of course, the Premier will not admit that at the moment. For the purposes of this election, he wants to disown Labor. But the underlying philosophy to this Government, and to future Labor Governments, means that the taxpayers will surrender more and more of their own earnings to Government control. There is no other way in which a philosophy so starkly enunciated by the Premier can be implemented. That is why the Premier also supports a capital gains tax. That is why he has supported an inquiry into the introduction of a full range of capital transfer taxes, including death duties and wealth taxes—because at heart the Premier is a socialist with a firm commitment to full Government control of the economy and expropriation of more and more taxpayers' money.

The legacy of three Labor years is now firmly established. There have been record revenue raisings, yet also a massive increase in the total State public debt, because this Govern-

ment has hopelessly mismanaged the State's finances. Between 1980 and 1982 it went up by 2.4 per cent on a *per capita* basis. During the last two years, it has increased by 23.9 per cent—or by \$499.76 for every man, woman and child in South Australia. The public debt is now almost \$3.5 billion—the equivalent of \$2 589.73 per person.

I have referred to a range of indicators to demonstrate that the economic news is not as the Premier tells it. Some is good, and that is welcomed by the Opposition. That is undeniable, but our economic future remains clouded while Government policies put pressure on taxes, on inflation, on interest rates and ultimately on the creation of profits which industry needs for investment to create new jobs.

The Premier's completely selective use of indicators is not helpful to South Australia. To obtain broad agreement about the sort of strategy we need to secure our economic future, we must be aware of the problems as well as the potential. But the Premier wants the problems ignored.

As I said in my opening remarks, this Government has not addressed some of the key economic fundamentals: the problems facing our manufacturing industries; how we exploit the trade potential in the Asian-Pacific region; and how to support rather than destroy our rural industries.

In 1983 the Premier announced the establishment of the State Development Department to have the prime responsibility for implementing the Government's economic development policies. It is little wonder that the Government has no such policies, given the scant attention it has given to this department.

It is also little wonder that good people (I emphasise that) have been lost because they cannot tolerate working in a department which has been ignored and which has no access to the Premier. Put simply, this Government is ignoring the fundamentals of good public sector management. The present Government's proposals to abolish the Public Service Board and replace it with a much enlarged Department of the Premier and Cabinet will not work. Departments like State Development will be left even further out in the cold.

A super Premier's Department, which is the fear of very many senior, conscientious and responsible public servants in this State, will foster an elitism that has never before been seen in South Australian Public Service history—even in the Dunstan era. Nepotism, favouritism and patronage will run rife. Promotion and privilege will rest in the hands of a select few in the super department, to the detriment of the principle of promotion on merit. This is because the Government's proposals embrace two conflicting principles. On the one hand, the Government says it wants to let managers manage but, on the other hand, it will enable total control of the entire public sector by a single person at the head of the Premier's Department through centralised arrangements involving the proposed appointment of a board of management and the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment.

I make clear that a Liberal Government will not abolish the Public Service Board but will bring about other changes to enable the board to exercise leadership in public sector management without relinquishing the sector's existing accountability to government.

Our proposals will achieve a very substantial degree of delegation to departments and authorities so that executive directors will be held accountable for achieving government programs within required standards of effectiveness and efficiency. Our goals will be to ensure that Government departments and agencies are responsible to community needs, accountable to the Government for performance, and flexible in organising people in their work roles, so that work in the public sector is challenging and rewarding with substantial opportunity for promotion by merit.



When the Public Sector Management Bill is introduced, these are the criteria by which the Liberals will judge it. But based on what we know so far about the attitude of the Government, we can only regard some aspects of its approach with extreme distrust.

In closing, I return to the role of the Department of State Development which, under our proposals for public sector management, will allow the department to adopt a forward looking approach in assisting the economic development of South Australia. A Liberal Government will set the department a series of key objectives. They will include the following:

Policy development and implementation to make South Australia less vulnerable to national and international economic fluctuations.

Assisting the expansion of existing industry and developing new industries of benefit to the State.

Advice and assistance to industry to identify and develop new products and new markets for South Australian goods and services.

Increasing the competitiveness of South Australian industry through policies which further develop and improve the use of our labour skills and encourage the adoption of improved product and process technologies.

Strong encouragement of more regional distribution of business activity.

These are medium to longer-term objectives. They seek long-term solutions, rather than propose short-term, expedient decisions as a response to the fundamental challenge of strengthening the State's economy. They avoid the tendency to concentrate on attracting new industries at the expense of assisting those already in existence.

While we must go on seeking new enterprises which can operate viably in South Australia, and fill the gaps which exist, this must be accompanied by a restructuring of existing industry in order to achieve diversification of South Australia's industrial base away from its relatively narrow concentration on manufacturing.

For too long, the industry policy debate in Australia centred around corrective measures aimed at easing the effects of declining international competitiveness, rather than focussing on the causes of declining competitiveness. There has been insufficient appreciation of the potential within existing industry to achieve industrial diversification and employment generation through effective restructuring. More international competitiveness and gearing production for opportunities in national and international markets must be the aim.

Under a Liberal Government, the Department of State Development will help industry to achieve these objectives by giving priority to: increasing awareness of the importance of quality standards, product excellence and service to target markets; improvements in productivity, process technologies and management techniques; more coordinated planning to market South Australian goods and services nationally and internationally; helping innovators and entrepreneurs to find and develop markets for new products and services; and incentive programs which give a priority to increasing employment, improving technology and broadening our economic base.

The success of these measures will depend ultimately on establishing and maintaining a favourable investment climate in this State. Industry must be satisfied that it can make investment decisions with a reasonable expectation of gaining a return from those investments without undue Government regulation or inconsistent and illogical Government policies which impinge on its operations.

I firmly believe that South Australia has a depth of resources, skills and experience which offer immense oppor-

tunities for further growth and diversification through increased activity in exports, new technology and products, maintenance of our vital manufacturing and rural sectors and firm commitment to resource development.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION: GRAND PRIX

**Mr MAYES (Unley):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, while I appreciate that leave can be granted, it is more normal to take personal explanations at the end of a particular item of parliamentary business.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Unley approached the Chair and indicated that, during the speech that we have just heard (in relative silence I hope because of the order given by the Chair), he would be given this opportunity to make an explanation, and I rule accordingly. The member for Unley.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** On a further point of order, Mr Speaker, can members on both sides of the House in future be guaranteed that the same privilege will be offered?

**The SPEAKER:** No guarantee is offered or can be offered, as the honourable member well knows from his three years in the Chair. Decisions will be made on their relevant merits. The honourable member for Unley.

**Mr MAYES:** During his speech the Leader of the Opposition suggested that I was opposed to the Grand Prix. The Leader has totally misrepresented my recent press statements. I called for the Grand Prix traffic and parking committee to include Eastwood and Parkside in the restricted residential parking zone area. I support the Grand Prix, the jobs and the international attention that it will bring to South Australia.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Debate resumed.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON (Torrens):** I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and congratulate His Excellency and Lady Dunstan on the job that they are doing in leading South Australia. I believe that the Governor's appointment was one of the best appointments that has ever been made in this area.

Tonight I want to canvass some issues relating to education and I shall refer to some decisions that have been made during the term of the present Government. First, I want to put to rest some of the mendacious nonsense that the member for Hartley peddled in this place tonight. In particular, I want to place on record finally—and I hope that we can bury this matter once and for all—that there is no intention by the Liberal Party, when in government within a few weeks, to sell off public schools. I thought that the member for Hartley would retire hurt after the last occasion on which this issue was canvassed in this place. There will be no selling off of public schools as a deliberate policy of the Olsen Government.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable member to resume his seat. There are at least four members from both sides of the House who are about to be warned.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** In fact, the member for Hartley, like most members opposite, cannot realise that we on this side of the House are not directed by outsiders, our Federal or State Executives, or by Federal Parties. The

policy of this Party, which will be put before the people of South Australia at the next State election, has been evolved by this Party in this place. Members opposite cannot understand that we have this freedom in the Liberal Party and that we are not centrally directed. The sooner they wake up to that fact the sooner they may understand how this Party works. One of the first decisions made by the Bannan Labor Government—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask honourable members to come to order. The honourable member for Torrens.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** —was to introduce compulsory unionism into the teaching service. Teachers were told that, if they wished to apply for a teaching job in this State, they had to give an undertaking to join the appropriate union. What is more, at that stage their school principal was made responsible for ensuring that they gave that undertaking. The Minister made a statement in this House admitting that policy, although he kept talking about preference to unionists: of course, we know that that is nothing else but compulsory unionism. It is quite plain that the intention of the Government was to introduce compulsory unionism. When the Olsen Government takes office that instruction will be countermanded within its first few days. That is a definite commitment and it will occur.

In relation to the Teacher Housing Authority, the Minister previously gave a commitment to equitable country service. The Minister said that he believed it was necessary to provide incentives to entice good teachers into the country. How did the Minister demonstrate that commitment? He demonstrated it by a very large increase in Teacher Housing Authority rentals. There have been two very large increases in Teacher Housing Authority rentals of approximately 18 per cent and 14 per cent, followed by another recent increase of 8 per cent. That is how the Minister demonstrated his commitment to equitable country service. At the same time he gave a commitment that he would consult with the South Australian Institute of Teachers before those decisions were taken.

In August 1983 the South Australian Institute of Teachers publicly criticised the Minister alleging that he did not consult with it—so he broke his word on that occasion. More recently, the Minister issued an instruction through the Teacher Housing Authority which showed once again his commitment to teachers in the country. The policy states that teachers will be ineligible for accommodation if they, their spouse or dependents own accommodation within 40 kilometres of the school in which they work.

**The Hon. H. Allison:** Forty kilometres?

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** Forty kilometres of the school in which they work. The policy further states that teachers will be expected to move from Teacher Housing Authority owned or leased accommodation within two months unless they can demonstrate special circumstances. What is more—and this I find particularly offensive—principals were forwarded a request by the authority to survey their staff to indicate the location of the residence that they owned and the distance between residence and school. I do not know whether the Minister countermanded that direction or not, but that was definitely contained in the instruction sent out by the Teacher Housing Authority. Teacher Housing Authority accommodation is one of the main incentives used to attract teachers to country areas. The private investments of teachers are no business of the Minister or of the Teacher Housing Authority, and I find that a very strange way for the Minister to show his commitment to an equitable country service.

We have seen in the past two budgets a massive reduction in the capital works program of the Education Department. The school building and redevelopment program has been reduced by over 20 per cent in each of the past two years.

It will be very interesting to see on 29 August whether it is to be further reduced. Schools have been crying aloud for redevelopment, and some of my colleagues here tonight have made representations for redevelopment of schools in their areas. The Minister knows very well the pressure that is coming from the education community for redevelopment of schools, yet despite that he has reduced the capital works budget of the Education Department by these enormous amounts. When questioned about these reductions he said that this Government had a priority, one of putting all its money into the Housing Trust, of using all its money to create employment in the building industry.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** The honourable member used those words, or words similar to that. I would have thought that it is just as easy to create jobs by building schools, redeveloping schools or providing additions to schools as it is to build houses. This points out the fallacy of putting all your eggs into one basket.

**The Hon. H. Allison:** They wanted to inflate the housing figure.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** Indeed they did want to inflate the housing figures, as no doubt my colleague the member for Light will mention when I sit down. That is, of course, one of the prime objectives of the Bannan Government's policy in this area.

*The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:*

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** I gather from that interjection that the Minister is confirming what he said before in this place. He admitted that there had been this large reduction in the Education Departments capital works program. He is admitting by that interjection that all the money has gone into housing. Let us have a look at the saga of ancillary staff, which has plagued this Government for almost the whole three years of its existence. The Minister, we know, gave a commitment that the Government would not intervene in proceedings before the Commission for the removal of clause 13 (3) of the School Assistants Award. I think I am fairly accurate in putting it in that way.

That was fine as it was one of the Minister's election commitments, and we always like to see Ministers carry out their commitments. However, there was a cost penalty on that commitment, and the Minister knows what it is. The cost penalty is that there are a number of schools that are under entitlement for ancillary staff. The Minister has not been able to get the funds to make up that difference. That is a very serious problem because, by instituting that proposal (and the Minister prided himself on the fact that his education policy was all costed), he did not take that into account. It was a commitment with a cost penalty that has not been honoured. Therefore, many schools in this State are still under entitlement for ancillary staff.

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! I call the House to order.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** The Minister set up an inquiry into ancillary staff. That may be fine. I understand that that inquiry, which took an inordinate time to bring down its report (it was well over 12 months late), is in the hands of the Minister. Have we seen it? I do not know what distribution the report has. I have questions on notice to the Minister. When is the Minister going to make a decision? Of course, he is going to make a decision soon I expect—because we are in an election run up—and the incoming Liberal Government will have the responsibility of carrying out those policies.

For an inordinate time that committee of inquiry carried out its work. I asked the Minister a question on it before and he said that the committee had decided to go out and get some information, surveys and things like that. I would

have thought that that would have been one of the first jobs the committee did. I know from the membership of that committee that highly qualified people were involved. Nevertheless, I would have thought that the Minister would have pressed the committee to report earlier. I will come back to inquiries in a moment.

That is the problem, I hope that that committee of inquiry has addressed the question of under-entitlement schools. I would be grateful if the Minister would tell the House at some stage what are the recommendations of that inquiry and what action he is going to take, because people in the education community want to know about the Minister's deliberations.

We had an extraordinary situation a few months ago at the State ALP conference where it was decided by the convention that all school buses are to be air-conditioned. I would have thought that the Minister was in charge of education in this State, but that was not to be because the State ALP convention decided that air-conditioning of buses was to take place against the arguments of the Minister at that conference. If I had been there, I would have supported the Minister and, if I had been there, he might have won the day. There is no doubt that buses on some school routes in some areas of this State desperately need air-conditioning, and I would be the first to admit that.

*Ms Lenehan interjecting:*

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** It is the fairy ring at the back again. The Minister said at that stage that it would cost \$9 million to air-condition the school bus fleet. I rely on the figures that he gave. Of course, that money must come out of the capital works moneys allocated to the Education Department. What happens to the school building and redevelopment program then? It is extraordinary that a Minister who is running education in this State is told by a group of lay people—non-politicians, most of them—that he is to take a certain course of action that will change entirely the priorities not only of his own policy but of education policy generally.

One of the Minister's promises before the last election—and it was a very important promise—was that, in the retention of teachers in the face of falling enrolments, some 80 per cent of those salaries would be placed in primary schools. At the same time, the Minister promised that there would be an increase in non-contact time in the primary area. According to the figures that I have received, 60 per cent of salaries has been retained in primary education, and there has been no alleviation of non-contact time for primary teachers. In fact, the policy gives a number of teachers.

**The Hon. Lynn Arnold:** It does not give a figure for non-contact time.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** I am talking about primary schools. The Minister has also made statements about the need to alleviate teacher stress, which is a very serious problem. I have to say—and I will be quite frank here—that before I had this responsibility for the Opposition I had some doubts about teacher stress; but in going out and around the education community—the Minister is not the only one who visits schools in this State—I have found that it is an extraordinarily serious problem.

I have had discussions with many teachers, especially young female teachers, and I am extremely disturbed at some of the things that I have been told occur in the schools. Indeed, some of those teachers have been in only their first or second years. One of the greatest problems concerning teacher stress is the question of disruptive students. It is not my intention at this stage to canvass that question, but it is extraordinarily serious. I understand that the Minister has some people looking into the question of teacher stress, but I reinforce the enormous importance of this in education

because it affects not only teaching standards but student outcomes, and that is extremely important.

Having shown some empathy with the Minister on that matter, I now come to the question of the advisory teachers saga. A few weeks ago, one of the vice-presidents of the South Australian Institute of Teachers issued a press statement that indicated that there was to be a reduction of some 37.1 positions in the central support services at the Education Department. That was a fairly serious allegation, which the Minister denied the next day.

However, within 24 hours my office and the offices of my colleagues were deluged with telegrams and letters from the various advisory support groups. Of course, the Minister received them as well. We had letters from teachers of English, science, business education, technical studies and home economics, from the Women's Studies Resource Centre, the early literacy in-service program people at Wat-tle Park, and many more.

Naturally, I took it upon myself to try to ascertain what was really occurring. The Minister said, I think, that there had been no proposal to reduce advisory teachers by 37.2 positions, as he corrects me. The Minister has since made a more definitive statement (in the last week or so) that there would be no reductions. I do not intend to go into the intricacies of the central advisory services, because one can easily become confused: there are several layers of advisory teachers. However, the fact remains that the senior executive of the Education Department did put up a proposal to reduce advisory teachers by 37.

I have a copy of a memorandum from the Acting Director-General (Mr Giles) to area directors stating that there would be a reduction of 37.2 positions and that the decision was non-negotiable. However, upon making inquiries around the education community, people kept telling me, 'We know that the Education Department intends to do this but we believe a decision was made without telling Lynn about it.' That statement came from several sources. I am quoting verbatim, as those were the words used. The decisions were being made without telling Lynn anything about it. Another person would say, 'Look, we think Lynn has been led up the garden path on this.' However, of course, we know in this place where the ultimate responsibility is.

What worries me is that, despite the Minister's statements, only yesterday I received two more telegrams from central support organisations, and I received another one on Friday last, pleading with me to take action and to try to see what I could do to stop this cutback in advisory staff. Obviously, the position was being worked up in the Education Department without the Minister's knowledge. Otherwise, how could this confusion, which is still going on, have arisen?

It is widespread knowledge in the education community that the senior executive was making these decisions and that the Minister did not know anything about it. I am grateful that the Minister has, by interjection tonight, reinforced that there will be no cutbacks in central advisory staff, but I point out that all Ministers have to keep close control over what goes on in their departments. Ministers are not supermen; nevertheless, they receive the ultimate plaudits or condemnation for what occurs in their departments. It is high time that this concern in the education community was put to rest. I suppose that, if anything, the Minister will be remembered in his stewardship over education for setting up the Children's Services Office. He may or may not wish that to be his memorial, but I suppose, certainly in the short term, he will be remembered for that. I say here and now, as I said to a meeting of kindergarten parents last night in the Todd electorate, that we need now to support the Children's Services Office to try to make it work. However, I am still very concerned about it, and I

have put in writing that we will monitor closely the operation of the Children's Services Office.

I am pleased to see that the Minister has now seen to it that there is at least a majority of education trained personnel in the second rung of appointments that have been made in the Children's Services Office. That goes some way to redressing the balance of two out of six in the senior executive of the Children's Services Office. The Minister will be remembered for some time for the dissolution of the Kindergarten Union. I also hope that the Minister uses his good offices to support most of the recommendations of the report of the working party into the early childhood education course at the Magill campus. That will show good faith and dedication to the concept of nought to eight years childhood teacher education.

We will all have to work well to ensure that the Children's Services Office is able to provide the services that Ms Coleman allocated to it in her report. We also need to make sure that the relationship between the Children's Services Office, child care and the Education Department (child-parent centres) are in the best possible condition, that parents especially feel that people are concerned about them, and that something is done about the discrepancies that have existed and continue to exist in relation to the contribution that parents must make to early childhood education.

Of course, the proposition is exacerbated by the Federal cuts in child-care and preschool education. I did not wish to canvass that at this stage, but I really thought that I had to mention it as you were in the Chair, Mr Acting Speaker. It is absolutely unthinkable that the State Government should not make up the \$3.7 million in preschool education, which is the net effect of the Commonwealth cuts. That is absolutely unthinkable and the Minister knows it. As I say, knowing your deep interest in the matter, Mr Acting Speaker (and no doubt you have been lobbying the Minister very strenuously) perhaps we can look forward to some good news in the State Budget.

**The Hon. H. Allison:** Through the *Sunday Mail*.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** Yes, through the *Sunday Mail*. One of the problems last year was the funding of technical and further education. It has been estimated that it would take an extra \$1 million to bring TAFE back to where it was three years ago, let alone provide the funds that are urgently required for the sector to do its extremely important job as it should be able to do it, especially in regard to the unemployed. I will refer to the Participation and Equity Program on another occasion.

Despite the Bannon Government's promises in regard to taxation and charges, charges for stream six and pensioners attending TAFE were increased—and the Minister knows that very well. He has ensured that in future these charges will not increase greater than the rate of inflation, but, by the institution of the \$25 general service fee, there has been a massive increase in charges, and in many cases it has fallen on those who can least afford to pay it.

As I understand it, only one-third of the general service fee is retained by TAFE colleges. The \$25 general service fee was to provide for amenities at TAFE colleges, but I understand (and I am quite happy for the Minister to correct me if I am wrong) that the Treasury takes one-third and another one-third is forwarded to central office. That is my understanding, and that was certainly the information given to me by the TAFE sector some time ago. I have been told by pensioners that it would cost them \$50 a year to complete courses which, until then, had cost them nothing, and that experience was shared by my colleagues. The question of TAFE funding was very serious.

The Minister was finally able to convince his Cabinet colleague to provide additional funds to alleviate the

extremely difficult situation whereby TAFE colleges had to cut access courses, courses for the disabled and the handicapped, and adult literacy courses. I am glad that the Minister was finally able to convince the Cabinet that extra money should be provided. However, the funding situation was very serious. I understand that we will need about \$1 million extra just to get back to where we were.

Before referring to two matters that affect the Minister (or rather his office) more personally, I refer to funding for non-government schools. Once again, we get back not to the recent ALP convention, but to that which was held the year before. That convention resolved that there was to be a moratorium on any increase of funding for non-government schools. I understand that the Minister has interpreted that to mean that there is to be a moratorium in dollar terms on the *per capita* section of State funding for non-government schools. In other words, funding for non-government schools is divided into two sections—needs and *per capita*—50 per cent each. The *per capita* section is to be pegged in dollar terms so that over a period it will be reduced in percentage terms.

This Party has no quibble with a 50 per cent needs formula and a 50 per cent *per capita* formula. We believe strongly that there must be a needs input. We also believe that the *per capita* component must be strong because of the question of freedom of choice, and we give an undertaking that the moratorium on the dollar value of the *per capita* component will be lifted by the Olsen Government so that there will be an even split based 50 per cent on needs and 50 per cent on *per capita*, which will be as it should be.

In another place the Minister has been kind enough to mention for me (because I was not able to speak at the meeting concerned) that it was Liberal Party policy to increase the funding to 25 per cent of the cost based on the cost of educating a student in a Government school based, again, on the model school formula. We have maintained that commitment for three elections now and we will maintain it again. Of course, we make the proviso that the 25 per cent will not occur in one leap. Indeed, the non-government school community would not expect that, but the increase will be to 25 per cent based on a premise that includes the question of the betterment factor. If the Government sector maintains student numbers at present levels—

**The Hon. Lynn Arnold:** You mean teacher numbers?

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** I thank the Minister for helping me, because that is an important correction: as the Government seeks to maintain teacher numbers at current levels the betterment factor will increase; that betterment factor has to be taken into account in the 25 per cent. I mention that now because it is important that there be no doubt about that question.

*The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:*

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** I say this to the Minister: if we make a promise we will keep it. Now, I wish to canvass the complaints I have received from the education community concerning the length of time it takes to receive answers from the Minister to correspondence. I must be frank and say that I have not experienced any trouble in this area personally. The Minister has been always quite prompt, except in one or two instances. Generally he has been prompt in replying to me, but I have received numerous complaints from this side of the House. (Indeed, some members have detailed their complaints in speeches recently) about the length of time it has taken for them to receive replies from the Minister to correspondence.

I am not denying the volume of the workload, but it is extraordinary when the Minister had the temerity to criticise

my colleague from Mount Gambier when he was the Minister about the size of his ministerial office and the number of employees that he had. As I understand it, according to the figures provided by the member for Todd, the present Minister overspent his allocation for his ministerial office by 42 per cent last year, and I further understand that there is an actual increase in the number of ministerial officers under this Minister compared to that of his predecessor. Yet the Minister criticised quite vehemently my colleague the member for Mount Gambier for the complement of his ministerial office. Quite frankly, I find that hypocritical.

I want to refer to one matter in particular, and for what will become obvious reasons I will not go into the details of the particular case, but the Minister will know of the matter to which I am referring. The Minister received from my colleague the member for Coles a letter dated 18 April 1985, concerning an extremely serious matter. I am sure that the Minister has picked up this matter. It concerns a person in the Minister's employ. Serious allegations were made in the letter.

**The Hon. Lynn Arnold:** That is why I—

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** I am not really concerned about that. In relation to the sequence of events involved, in response to her letter of 18 April the member for Coles received from the Minister a letter, dated 3 July, indicating that the matter was being further investigated. It is now 13 August and the member for Coles has received no further reply.

**The Hon. Lynn Arnold:** They are very serious allegations.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** I find it quite extraordinary that it took the Minister from 18 April to 3 July to provide any response to the member for Coles on this matter and since then, and as at 13 August, there has been no further response from the Minister. As the Minister says, it is a serious matter. One would think that the Minister would have treated it in a more serious fashion, keeping the member for Coles informed at least of what was happening.

Finally, I refer to a matter that I have mentioned previously in the House. I would think that the Minister's stewardship of the education portfolio has been memorialised by the number of inquiries and working parties that have been undertaken. It would not be so bad if a proper result had been forthcoming from some of those inquiries but, unfortunately, some of them have taken an inordinate time to report. I have mentioned previously the report on the ancillary staff inquiry, and there is also the report on school busing, the inquiry which ran months and months over time. The Minister has been in office for nearly three years, and yet in relation to those two important items of ancillary staff and school busing no decisions have been made. It has become a benchmark of the Minister that in relation to a serious problem the relevant officers will not go out and consult with and talk to people and find out their views but a working party must be set up. The inquiry into school councils I think is going to take over three years.

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** It might even exceed the school buses inquiry.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** Well, of course, the problem is that once again it will be the Olsen Liberal Government that will have to look at those recommendations, receive those reports, and decide whether the proposals should be implemented.

If the Minister has had the reports relating to school buses and ancillary staff on his desk for several weeks, why have we heard nothing about them? The Minister knows that the education community is desperate to try and get some information and decisions on those two matters alone, let alone the other working parties and inquiries that he has initiated.

He has just announced an inquiry into the needs of primary schools. That is a tremendously important subject and I am glad that he has at least put a time limit of 12 months on it. I would have been more impressed if the Minister had said, 'Look, we have a real problem in primary schools. There is a large discrepancy in primary schools as opposed to secondary schools. There are very urgent needs in primary schools, including teacher development, teacher librarians and special education. Let us go out and talk about these needs and cost them, see whether we can afford them, go to Cabinet and make a decision. But of course we have another inquiry. At least this one will only be for 12 months.'

Once again we will have to deal with the recommendations. That has disappointed me. In fact, the Minister was described to me the other day by someone in the education community as the Minister for Inquiries and Working Parties. The lack of decision-making by the Minister has been his hallmark, because everything is referred to inquiries or working parties.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** I move:

That the debate be adjourned.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (18)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Becker, Blacker, Chapman, Eastick (teller), S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Ingerson, Lewis, Mathwin, Meier, Olsen, and Wilson.

Noes (20)—Mr Abbott (teller), Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon, M.J. Brown, Crafter, M.J. Evans, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Mayes, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, and Whitten.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Oswald, Rodda, and Wotton.  
Noes—Messrs Hoppood, Payne, and Wright.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** I support the motion. First, I would like to add my condolences to those of other members in relation to the loss that the past membership of this House has suffered in the death of Leslie Claude Hunkin and John Stephen Clark. In relation to Steve Clark, I made my thoughts known to the House on the occasion of his death. He was a personal friend and I believe I can claim that we had a mutual respect for each other. We served our community, the same community, over a very long period and in a variety of ways but we both believed that our efforts were to the benefit of that community.

In relation to the late Les Hunkin, I have a couple of very fond memories of contact with him. In 1983 the Roseworthy Agricultural College had its centenary celebrations and at a convocation held at the university during the course of those celebrations Sir Allan Callaghan, a former Principal of the Roseworthy Agricultural College, was the guest speaker. The meeting was attended by some 500 or 600 people. One of the persons present at that convocation meeting was Les Hunkin, at that stage into his ninety-ninth year. He was introduced to the meeting and made the statement which had been unknown to many people until that time that there was nothing in the world that was going to keep him away from the meeting that night because he was the one responsible for Allan Callaghan having been appointed to Roseworthy Agricultural College in 1932. At that stage he was in Government service and responsible for the Public Service Board at a time when the college was running through some considerable difficulties, there having been a strike and the dismissal of the Principal of the day because of incompatibility.

The college, according to the Government of the day, was likely to be closed unless their act was put into proper perspective at the earliest possible time. The decision fell to the late Les Hunkin, being in the position of decision maker at that time, who chose Sir Allan Callaghan, a former Rhodes scholar (and a person very much alive and alert even today), and told him that he had 10 months and that, if it was not fixed in that 10 months, they would pull stumps. I have had Allan Callaghan and Les Hunkin relate that story to me on several occasions.

That was my first contact with the late Les Hunkin. Subsequently, I had the pleasure, 15 or 18 months ago, of driving into Adelaide on the occasion of the launching by the Standard Book Company of a book by Stewart Cockburn called *The Patriarchs*. I had the opportunity on that occasion to pick up my father and, subsequently, Les Hunkin from where he was resident at Somerton Park. I drove them into Adelaide so that they could attend that function. Les Hunkin was very apologetic the whole time, particularly between the car park and the bookstore, because he felt that I was spending too much time looking after him—a person 99 years of age—and not enough time looking after the other young fellow—a chap about 84 years of age—who was tagging along behind. That was very much his nature. He was a delightful person who, on 12 January 1984, passed the century and, regrettably, not very long afterwards passed on. He was in this House for a century dinner for his hundredth birthday. I found him and his recognition of events during the course of that car drive to which I referred very vivid, very interesting and, to my own knowledge, very factual on some quite specific points.

I was not able to attend the opening of Parliament at which His Excellency the Governor presented his speech to the House because of duty on behalf of this Parliament at the Brisbane Constitutional Convention. As the Speaker and others have indicated, apart from the unfortunate press generated relative to that event, there was no argument at all that it was a very successful convention. It put on record a number of views on some quite vital issues and, if the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia is to be changed, at all (and no-one denies that a need exists for a change), that change will evolve from discussion, it will not evolve through someone locking it away in a cupboard and hoping that changes will come about. It will come about when people get around a table, or in a forum, discuss the various virtues, test the views of one another and eventually come to a decision that can be presented to the public in order to gain its support.

That is what took place in the most recent successes when three out of four got up. I would hazard a guess that, if the two referendum subjects had not been put forward at the time of the last Federal election—put forward in a political sense with some quite unreal promotion—both had every chance of being passed. The philosophy being put forward by the two subject matters was across Party lines. It was the method of projecting them into the public arena as part of a political election package that brought about their defeat. That was agreed by members from all political persuasions at the Brisbane convention.

I notice in the fourth paragraph of the document mention of housing and construction: I am very pleased that the 'pea and thimble Minister' is with us because I have a word or two to say about his attempts to mislead this House and the public of South Australia. The Minister was seeking, by way of a ministerial statement, to castigate me for having made statements to the press relative to the decision by the Government to hold Housing Trust rentals. Nobody was suggesting that the Housing Trust rentals be increased. The Government's being in a position to make such a decision, that was accepted, but it was necessary to point out that at

a time when the Housing Trust is attracting—the same as all other members of the community—increased council, water and sewerage rates, albeit, as the Minister would say, at around CPI levels, they are an increase to be met by the registered owner of the properties. The trust will have to find those funds for the E&WS Department and for the councils to fulfil its obligation to both organisations. Therefore, at a static rental level, there obviously will be less left over and therefore less to be put into the building program, whether it be held to the same cost of building or at the increasing cost of building, which is a fact of life.

The Minister suggested that, by good management and by having promoted to the Commonwealth the fact that the funds made available from the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, a percentage of which could be offset against the beneficial rental subsidy made available to people in necessitous circumstances, the trust was able to balance its budget. We should not fool ourselves: the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement gives us \$72 million, or whatever the figure was, and we put \$10 million of that aside to pay for the subsidy on rental of that 65 per cent of Housing Trust rental occupiers who need assistance because of illness, age or some other unfortunate circumstance: that is \$10 million that one cannot put into the building program.

Whether or not the trust's figures—and I have reason to doubt that it will show a positive, that is, in the black, overrun of income—eventually show that, when we see the Auditor-General's Report, it makes no difference. The fact is that there is a decreased sum available to go into the funds available for the building of Housing Trust homes.

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** Does the Minister not understand that?

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** This is where the pea and thimble act comes in: it is not a matter on which any member on this side would want to make political capital. Nor did they seek to do so. Members on this side, through myself, made an observation—which is a fact of life—that one cannot spend the same sum of money twice. If one uses money to offset the subsidy rentals being made available through bi-partisan agreement, one does not have that money to put into the building program, and the record will show that that is the fact.

**The Hon. T.H. Hemmings:** You're missing the whole point completely.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** The Minister will have the opportunity before the Estimates Committee to spell out his position. I suggest to him that he will want to do a lot better than he has done thus far, because he is a known misleader of the House and of the public of this State. For fear that he or any other member thinks that I am just having a go at him, I draw his attention to a statement he made in the House last week by way of an answer to a Dorothy Dix question, although the Minister may suggest that it was merely 'Dorothy' or 'Dix', because the member for Elizabeth asked it of him. However, it so happened that all the documents necessary happened to be spread out on the table in front of the Minister.

**Mr Whitten:** A well prepared Minister!

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** We will allow for it to be called good management. I am misleading the House now, and I am the first to admit it. There was a question from the member for Elizabeth in relation to housing matters but the question to which I want to refer was that from the member for Albert Park, which reads:

I ask the Minister of Housing and Construction a question supplementary to that asked by the member for Mawson. Can he say whether housing statements in a Liberal Party glossy campaign supplement have any credibility?

Then, of course, the Minister was moved to suggest that for some reason, of which nobody has any understanding, the

Labor Party has a mortgage on the term 'affordable housing'.

**The Hon. T.H. Hemmings:** Which we have.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** That is another matter that we will look into in the Estimates Committee, because I can show the Minister where the Housing Trust building program in the period of this Bannon Government has increased by 36 per cent at a time that the private sector has increased by only 16 per cent. The figures I use to demonstrate that matter are those available from the ABS: they are conjured up; they come from the Commonwealth statistical service. I trust that the Minister will check that out, to be spot on not necessarily to the respective decimal points but to the relative positions. Having tried to claim a right to use the term 'affordable housing' the Minister then said:

The Liberal Party's glossy pamphlet is full of falsehoods. Interest rates are not higher than they have ever been.

He talked a little later about a peak of 14.25 per cent under the Tonkin Government.

**The Hon. T.H. Hemmings:** Under local building societies. Read out exactly what I said.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I am quite happy to read the lot:

The Liberal Party's glossy pamphlet is full of falsehoods. Interest rates are not higher than they have ever been, land is not scarce through being rationed by this Government and the Housing Trust is not being restricted in its program by high Government costs. In fact, interest rates for local building societies reached a peak of 14.25 per cent under the Tonking Government.

**The Hon. T.H. Hemmings:** Building societies—that is the key. Building society interest rates under the Tonkin Government went to 14.25 per cent, and you know it.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** The Minister is misleading the House again. I wonder how many more calamities he can fall into before the Premier suddenly brings the axe down on the back of his neck, because the very next day, at page 160 of *Hansard*, in a question I asked about home loan interest rates, the Premier replied:

As the honourable member has pointed out, and as I have pointed out on many occasions, the real interest rates are at record heights.

Does the Minister now claim that the Premier misled the House, or will he admit, as he should, that he misled the House? No-one denies that rates went up to 14.25 per cent. No-one is attempting to draw that inference. The point that had been made was that real interest rates have never been higher. On that issue I give as my authority the Premier of this State, no more than 24 hours after the Minister had been grandstanding in this place and misleading the public of South Australia.

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** The Minister will not even look you in the face.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** No, because he has suddenly gone silent. Along with his pea and thimble trick and the misleading of the House on this vital matter relative to interest rates, how can there be any credibility in anything that the Minister says? We will also be watching very closely when the Auditor-General's Report is released to find out whether in actual fact there has been the highest total for 20 years in the number of public sector dwellings built this year to 30 June 1985.

Last year we found how the Minister was prepared to mishandle the truth on that matter in relation to the actual number of houses taken into stock. That fact is on the record. It will be interesting to see whether the figure he gives us this time is the figure he claimed last year less those taken into stock in the early days of July to give us an actual figure. Having disposed of all I want to say at this moment in relation to housing, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 11.54 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 14 August at 2 p.m.

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 13 August 1985

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

## GOVERNMENT CLEANING

1. Mr BECKER (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Which departments and statutory authorities within each portfolio under the Minister's control use—

- (a) contract cleaners; and
- 
- (b) employee cleaners,

and what was the total cost of cleaning contracts or employee cleaners for each department or authority in each of the past four financial years?

2. Have any cleaning contracts been cancelled in the past two years in favour of using Government employees and, if so, by which departments and authorities, why and what savings have been achieved?

3. What is the Government's policy regarding cleaning in departments and authorities?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. (a)	1981-82 \$	1982-83 \$	1983-84 \$	1984-85 \$
State Bank of S.A.—contract cleaners	460 900*	517 200*	568 400*	660 000
SGIC—contract cleaners	No separate record	No separate record	No separate record	186 000
Regional Cultural Trusts—contract cleaners	2 800	21 900	47 500	83 000
History Trust of S.A.—contract cleaners	14 200	14 200	14 200	19 800
S.A. Film Corporation—contract cleaners	26 900	38 300	31 800	34 200
State Opera—contract cleaners	1 400	2 100	4 100	4 200
Department for the Arts—contract cleaners	Figures cannot be isolated from PBD		29 000	41 800
Public Service Board—contract cleaners	2 335	2 025	2 100	600

\* These figures relate to the former State and Savings Banks of S.A.

(b)	1981-82 \$	1982-83 \$	1983-84 \$	1984-85 \$
Lotteries Commission of S.A.—employee cleaners	50 746	58 288	61 431	68 375
State Bank of S.A.—employee cleaners	386 900⊕	440 000⊕	469 200⊕	530 000
History Trust of S.A.—employee cleaners	7 000	7 500	8 000	8 000
Adelaide Festival Centre Trust—employee cleaners	339 400	317 700	291 300	295 100
Public Service Board—employee cleaners	379	349	400	5 600

⊕ These figures relate to the former Savings Bank only since figures for the former State Bank cannot be isolated.

2. No.

3. The Government's policy is to ensure that buildings under its control are cleaned adequately to provide a reasonable working environment.

2. Mr BECKER (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier:

1. Which departments and statutory authorities within each portfolio under the Minister's control use—

- (a) contract cleaners; and

- (b) employee cleaners,

and what was the total cost of cleaning contracts or employee cleaners for each department or authority in each of the past four financial years?

2. Have any cleaning contracts been cancelled in the past two years in favour of using Government employees and, if so, by which departments and authorities, why and what savings have been achieved?

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

1. (a)	1981-82 \$	1982-83 \$	1983-84 \$	1984-85 \$
Police Department	327 818	377 853	327 730	353 000
CFS	5 800	6 415	7 283	9 004
SAMFS	22 640	22 150	18 310	46 000
Department of Environment and Planning	27 400	34 100	94 500	111 600

(b)	1981-82 \$	1982-83 \$	1983-84 \$	1984-85 \$
SAMFS	7 000	10 700	11 300	11 500

2. No.

3. Mr BECKER (on notice) asked the Minister of Lands:

1. Which departments and statutory authorities within each portfolio under the Minister's control use—

- (a) contract cleaners; and
- 
- (b) employee cleaners,

and what was the total cost of cleaning contracts or employee cleaners for each department or authority in each of the past four financial years?

2. Have any cleaning contracts been cancelled in the past two years in favour of using Government employees, and if so, by which departments and authorities, why and what savings have been achieved?



**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** The replies are as follows:

(b)	1981-82 \$	1982-83 \$	1983-84 \$	1984-85 \$
Department of Lands (Rural Offices) . . . . .	6 941	8 436	9 000	9 716
Department of Marine and Harbors . . . . .	35 000	27 000	30 300	37 700
Woods and Forests Department . . . . .	35 157	41 414	48 619	59 240

2.	1981-82 \$	1982-83 \$	1983-84 \$	1984-85 \$
Department of Marine and Harbors . . . . .	11 680	13 926	13 248	16 000

4. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Which departments and statutory authorities within each portfolio under the Minister's control use—

(a) contract cleaners; and

(b) employee cleaners,

and what was the total cost of cleaning contracts or employee

cleaners for each department or authority in each of the past four financial years?

2. Have any cleaning contracts been cancelled in the past two years in favour of using Government employees and, if so, by which departments and authorities, why and what savings have been achieved?

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** The replies are as follows:

1. (a)	1981-82 \$	1982-83 \$	1983-84 \$	1984-85 \$
Kindergarten Union . . . . .	13 000	12 000	15 000	24 000
Education Department . . . . .	14.44 M	16.08 M	16.85 M	17.5 M
TEASA . . . . .	5 169	5 516	5 533	5 600
TAFE . . . . .	185 000	267 000	283 000	295 000

(b)	1981-82 \$	1982-83 \$	1983-84 \$	1984-85 \$
Education Department . . . . .	Not Available	23 000	28 000	27 000
TAFE . . . . .	1.65 M	1.88 M	2.06 M	2.16 M

2. There is one instance. During 1983 a cleaning contractor provided the cleaning services at the Port Adelaide Community College (TAFE), Grange Branch. This contract expired on 31 December 1983 and was not renewed as it was considered a weekly paid caretaker was more suitable. The appointment of the caretaker effectively costs approximately \$800 per annum more, but additional services and hours of duty make the appointment a more cost efficient one.

1. Which departments and statutory authorities within each portfolio under the Minister's control use—

(a) contract cleaners; and

(b) employee cleaners,

and what was the total cost of cleaning contracts or employee cleaners for each department or authority in each of the past four financial years?

2. Have any cleaning contracts been cancelled in the past two years in favour of using Government employees and, if so, by which departments and authorities, why and what savings have been achieved?

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** The replies are as follows:

1. (a)	1981-82 \$	1982-83 \$	1983-84 \$	1984-85 \$
Department of Transport . . . . .	1 200	3 434	7 770	6 840
Highways Department . . . . .	195 094	194 940	197 229	172 643
State Transport Authority . . . . .	33 400	30 700	27 800	34 000

(b)	1981-82 \$	1982-83 \$	1983-84 \$	1984-85 \$
Department of Transport . . . . .	20 026	20 058	24 361	24 200
Highways Department . . . . .	72 430	81 120	85 405	88 083
State Transport Authority . . . . .	179 000	209 000	228 100	194 900

2. No.

6. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy:

1. Which departments and statutory authorities within each portfolio under the Minister's control use—

(a) contract cleaners; and

(b) employee cleaners,

and what was the total cost of cleaning contracts or employee cleaners for each department or authority in each of the past four financial years?

2. Have any cleaning contracts been cancelled in the past

two years in favour of using Government employees and, if so, by which departments and authorities, why and what savings have been achieved?

**The Hon. R.G. PAYNE:** The replies are as follows:

1. (a)	1981-82 \$	1982-83 \$	1983-84 \$	1984-85 \$
ETSA .....	370 000	395 000	410 000	430 000
Pipelines Authority .....	24 072	25 090	28 945	30 000
Department of Mines and Energy .....	N/A	29 560	40 000	47 728

  

1. (b)	1981-82 \$	1982-83 \$	1983-84 \$	1984-85 \$
AMDL .....	98 000	105 000	115 000	119 000
Pipelines Authority .....	76 409	84 383	95 112	97 000
Department of Mines and Energy .....	9 608	11 142	13 241	15 008
ETSA .....	226 000	217 000	283 010	343 000

2. No.

7. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare:

1. Which departments and statutory authorities within each portfolio under the Minister's control use—

- (a) contract cleaners; and  
(b) employee cleaners,

and what was the total cost of cleaning contracts or employee cleaners for each department or authority in each of the past four financial years?

2. Have any cleaning contracts been cancelled in the past two years in favour of using Government employees and, if so, by which departments and authorities, why and what savings have been achieved?

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

1. (a)	1981-82 \$	1982-83 \$	1983-84 \$	1984-85 \$
Department for Community Welfare .....	143 752	143 518	154 302	164 235

2. No.

8. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. Which departments and statutory authorities within each portfolio under the Minister's control use—

- (a) contract cleaners; and  
(b) employee cleaners,

and what was the total cost of cleaning contracts or employee

cleaners for each department or authority in each of the past four financial years?

2. Have any cleaning contracts been cancelled in the past two years in favour of using Government employees and, if so, by which departments and authorities, why and what savings have been achieved?

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** The replies are as follows:

1. (a)	1981-82 \$	1982-83 \$	1983-84 \$	1984-85 \$
E&WS .....	44 737	58 608	72 770	104 577
TAB .....	141 541	159 717	165 964	164 400
S.A. Trotting Control Board .....	1 440	1 560	1 560	1 560
Betting Control Board .....	865	968	1 012	1 060
Greyhound Racing Control Board .....	Nil	1 574	1 863	2 800

  

(b)	1981-82 \$	1982-83 \$	1983-84 \$	1984-85 \$
E&WS .....	494 387	507 467	363 317	368 431

2. No.

9. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction:

1. Which departments and statutory authorities within each portfolio under the Minister's control use—

- (a) contract cleaners; and  
(b) employee cleaners,

and what was the total cost of cleaning contracts or employee cleaners for each department or authority in each of the past four financial years?

2. Have any cleaning contracts been cancelled in the past two years in favour of using Government employees and, if so, by which departments and authorities, why and what savings have been achieved?

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** The replies are as follows:

1. (a)	1981-82 \$	1982-83 \$	1983-84 \$	1984-85 \$
S.A. Housing Trust	85 620	108 103	123 315	
PBD	950 000	900 000	536 000	600 000
(b)	1981-82 \$	1982-83 \$	1983-84 \$	1984-85 \$
S.A. Housing Trust	41 596	46 731	52 125	
PBD	751 000	835 000	824 000	821 000

Note: The amounts listed above in PBD contract and employee cleaners incorporate the costs for all Government departments not referred to in questions Nos. 294-303, 305-306.

2. No.

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

1. Which departments and statutory authorities within each portfolio under the Minister's control use—

(a) contract cleaners; and

(b) employee cleaners,

and what was the total cost of cleaning contracts or employee

cleaners for each department or authority in each of the past four financial years?

2. Have any cleaning contracts been cancelled in the past two years in favour of using Government employees and, if so, by which departments and authorities, why and what savings have been achieved?

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

1. (a)	1981-82 \$	1982-83 \$	1983-84 \$	1984-85 \$
Courts Department	64 902	65 332	215 587	246 200

2. No.

11. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport representing the Minister of Health:

1. Which departments and statutory authorities within each portfolio under the Minister's control use:

(a) contract cleaners; and

(b) employee cleaners,

and what was the total cost of cleaning contracts or employee

cleaners for each department or authority in each of the past four financial years?

2. Have any cleaning contracts been cancelled in the past two years in favour of using Government employees and, if so, by which departments and authorities, why, and what savings have been achieved?

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** The replies are as follows:

1. (a)	1981-82 \$	1982-83 \$	1983-84 \$	1984-85 \$
Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science	15 532	19 301	16 922	21 000
(b)	1981-82 \$	1982-83 \$	1983-84 \$	1984-85 \$
Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science	157 164	189 844	189 512	197 296

2. No.

12. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier representing the Minister of Labour:

1. Which departments and statutory authorities within each portfolio under the Minister's control use—

(a) contract cleaners; and

(b) employee cleaners,

and what was the total cost of cleaning contracts or employee

cleaners for each department or authority in each of the past four financial years?

2. Have any cleaning contracts been cancelled in the past two years in favour of using Government employees and, if so, by which departments and authorities, why and what savings have been achieved?

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

1. (a)	1981-82 \$	1982-83 \$	1983-84 \$	1984-85 \$
Department of Labour	3 912	4 392	7 006	9 300
Department of Agriculture	31 604	37 229	39 622	47 529
Department of Fisheries	Nil	760	1 040	100
Correctional Services Department	9 076	7 837	7 002	10 000
Metropolitan Milk Board	4 588	5 197	6 036	6 100
South Australian Egg Board	8 160	8 896	8 740	9 900
South Australian Potato Board	5 612	5 877	6 290	6 500
Citrus Board	—	—	1 980	1 080
(b)	1981-82 \$	1982-83 \$	1983-84 \$	1984-85 \$
Department of Agriculture	51 371	69 282	78 485	79 238
Correctional Services Department	—	—	800	11 000

2. No.

13. Mr BECKER (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport representing the Minister of Tourism:

1. Which departments and statutory authorities within each portfolio under the Minister's control use—

(a) contract cleaners; and

(b) employee cleaners,

and what was the total cost of cleaning contracts or employee

cleaners for each department or authority in each of the past four financial years?

2. Have any cleaning contracts been cancelled in the past two years in favour of using Government employees and, if so, by which departments and authorities, why and what savings have been achieved?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. (a)	1981-82 \$	1982-83 \$	1983-84 \$	1984-85 \$
State Library and Public Libraries Division .....	126 500	140 700	141 000	143 500
Department of Tourism .....	11 231	17 591	21 959	30 000
(b)	1981-82 \$	1982-83 \$	1983-84 \$	1984-85 \$
West Beach Trust .....	64 000	59 000	74 000	94 000
Parks Community Centre .....	201 740	220 984	267 726	260 736
Enfield General Cemetery .....	3 466	3 560	3 984	5 000

2. No.

#### BROKERAGE

22. Mr BECKER (on notice) asked the Treasurer: What rate and amount of brokerage were paid by the South Australian Government Financing Authority for funds lodged in Public Bond Issue No. 1 to each of the following—

(a) the underwriters to the issue;

(b) the brokers to the issue;

(c) branches of the State Bank of South Australia;

(d) branches of the Commonwealth Bank of Australia;

(e) SAFA's inscribed stock registries;

(f) members of the Stock Exchange in Australia; and

(g) the Australian Merchant Bankers Association?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: For reasons of commercial confidentiality, it would not be proper to release details of fees or commissions paid by SAFA in connection with SAFA Bond Issue No. 1. However, the prospectus for the issue indicated that in respect of applications lodged through members of a recognized Stock Exchange in Australia or of the Australian Merchant Bankers Association, SAFA would pay brokerage of 0.25 per cent on the value of the applications.

#### COMPENSATION

44. Hon. D.C. BROWN (on notice) asked the Premier: What compensation will be paid to the South Australian Jockey Club by the Grand Prix Board for the running of the 1985 Grand Prix and on what basis was this compensation calculated?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: None. However, the Grand Prix Authority has agreed to reinstate the cross-overs to a standard jointly agreed between the South Australian Jockey Club and the Grand Prix Office. The Grand Prix will also rent various facilities and reimburse costs, actually and necessarily incurred, when running the event.

#### MINISTERS' PROFILE

113. Mr BAKER (on notice) asked the Premier: Does the Premier's demand that his Ministers take a higher profile in the public arena commit the Government to increased public relations expenditure?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No.