

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 20 August 1985

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

PETITIONS: PRESCHOOL EDUCATION

Petitions signed by 367 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the State Government to request the Federal Government not to reduce expenditure on pre-school education were presented by the Hon. J.C. Bannon, Mr Becker, the Hon. B.C. Eastick, Mr Mathwin, Mr Oswald, and the Hon. Michael Wilson.

Petitions received.

PETITION: PORT AUGUSTA BOTANIC GARDEN

A petition signed by 177 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to establish an arid lands botanic garden at Port Augusta was presented by the Hon. G.F. Keneally.

Petition received.

PETITION: UNSWORN STATEMENT

A petition signed by 45 residents of South Australia praying that the House support the abolition of the unsworn statement was presented by Mr Olsen.

Petition received.

PETITION: VOLUNTARY SERVICE AGENCIES

A petition signed by 17 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to subsidise charges to voluntary service agencies and to keep any price increases within the parameters of wage indexation was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

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 28, 43, 53, 54, 85, 91, 92, 95, 96, and 154.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Deputy Premier (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—

Pursuant to Statute—
Workers Compensation Act, 1971—Silicosis Scheme, Subscription Rates.

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

Pursuant to Statute—
Fisheries Act, 1982—Regulations—Investigator Strait Experimental Prawn Fishery.
West Coast Experimental Prawn Fishery.
Scheme of Management, Tuna Fishery.

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

Pursuant to Statute—
Food and Drugs Act, 1908—Regulations—Residues in Food.

Local Government Act, 1934—Memorandum of Lease—Jolley's Boat House Bistro Pty Ltd.

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

Pursuant to Statute—
Rules of Court—Supreme Court—Bail Act, 1985—Bail Reviews.
Classification of Publications Act, 1974—Regulations—Agricultural Video Information Digest.
Unleaded Petrol Act, 1985—Regulations—Dispensing Equipment.

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

Pursuant to Statute—
River Murray Commission—Report, 1984.

QUESTION TIME

WORKERS COMPENSATION

Mr OLSEN: Will the Premier give a guarantee that both Houses of Parliament will be given sufficient time to debate and to vote on legislation to reform workers compensation before the State election? The Premier has so far given no timetable for the introduction or debate of this legislation. However, there have been suggestions that its introduction may be delayed because Caucus and the union movement are divided on some key elements of the scheme announced on Sunday.

Eighteen months ago the Opposition announced the principles upon which it believes this reform should proceed in view of the rapidly escalating premiums that employers have been forced to pay and the effect that this has had on job creation. In view of the importance of the legislation to the State's economy, I ask the Premier to guarantee that Parliament will have an opportunity to consider and vote on it before the election.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: If it does, I expect the support of members opposite to ensure its speedy and successful passage. It is a matter of some urgency that we get a new system instituted. I find it extraordinary that Opposition members are urging haste on this matter when they sat on their hands for three years in government and did nothing, and when one remembers that in fact they inherited a report which had been commissioned by the then Minister of Labour (Hon. J.D. Wright) that looked comprehensively at a replacement scheme, and they did nothing about it.

It is the same tired old hacks sitting on the front bench who are part of that inactivity. They are now asking us to get on with it. As is well known, my colleague the member for Adelaide, as Deputy Premier and Minister of Labour, in the period we have been in government has worked unceasingly to ensure that an agreed system can be reached; that the trade union interests and those of employees and the interests of the employer organisations can be personified in a replacement scheme which will substantially reduce premiums and ensure that benefits are more certain.

That program has been published. It is interesting that since its publication the various vested interest groups, those who have indeed profited very substantially from workers compensation, most notably the insurance industry, are attempting to suggest that there is something wrong with the scheme. On the one hand they are saying that it does not provide enough benefits for workers and, on the other hand, they say, 'Leave it to the 47 companies currently operating in this field and we will improve the system.'

The big question that has to be answered is: why have they not done this in the past; how have they allowed the situation to get out of control? I suggest that is the prime reason for us to move to the sort of system that the Gov-

ernment has proposed. We are moving with all possible speed. We believe it is a matter of urgency.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: These interjections are laughable, as they come from the very same people who have sat on their hands after being confronted with the report. We lost three years because they refused to take action.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Premier to resume his seat. I call the Leader of the Opposition to order. Having done that, I again remind the House that the next step is a warning to the next honourable member who transgresses, and the normal steps will follow that.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The process has begun. Let us hope that we can introduce legislation into Parliament soon. I call on those members opposite to not protect vested interests and those who wish to profit out of the system, but to support the employer organisations and the trade unions in this matter and ensure that the system is introduced as speedily as possible.

GRAND PRIX

Mr TRAINER: Will the Premier give the House the most recent information available on the impact of the Grand Prix on South Australian businesses? In this morning's news, I noticed that the member for Davenport had stated that South Australian firms had been betrayed in the letting of contracts. A similar article appeared in yesterday's *Advertiser*. Will the Premier clear the air on this issue and give this House an indication of the situation in regard to contracts?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is depressing to see the continuing sniping and scepticism that have marked the Opposition's approach to this massive event. 'Mockery' is the word. A Grand Prix board has been established with a number of leading citizens and active committed South Australians on it in the majority whose whole aim and object is to ensure that maximum benefits from this event come to the people of South Australia.

Where it is possible for contracts to be undertaken by South Australian firms, that is where they go. Where it is not possible—it may relate to either the capacity of the infrastructure or skills in South Australia in a very restricted area, or it may relate to large discrepancies of cost for whatever reason—the board is charged with two responsibilities in this area. On the one hand, naturally, it has to ensure that there is a maximum opportunity for employment and investment in South Australia and, indeed, it is discharging that responsibility. On the other hand, it would be quite irresponsible for it to run up costs and expenditure that eventually would have to be matched by the South Australian taxpayer, irrespective of its economic effect. Members opposite would be the first to criticise if that occurred.

I am advised that, in relation to engineering and construction contracts, of some 24 that have been let (and we are talking about nearly \$6 million—perhaps a little more), 21 have gone to South Australian firms. In relation to licensing contracts to produce goods, 32 have been let and 20 have gone to South Australian firms. This is for an international event, I might add.

The particular matter raised by the member for Davenport in his attempt to knock and undermine the Grand Prix is the car plate auction. The majority of cars being auctioned will be from interstate, and not from South Australia. Very few South Australian cars are being offered as part of this exercise. Secondly, the auction is being conducted in asso-

ciation with the Down Under Expo being organised not by the board itself but by a private concern. It will be a fantastic event—a great display case for South Australian industry and goods. There are aspects of it which the organisers—not the Grand Prix board—have put out to those who can best achieve it. In this case a New South Wales firm has won the contract as it has the most comprehensive list of cars in Australia and access to them. It is as simple as that. It is not a detraction from or deterioration of South Australian involvement in it.

It is about time honourable members opposite looked realistically at benefits we are getting from this event in economic, employment and investment terms and also in terms of international notice. We cannot build a moat around South Australia and say that nobody can have any involvement in the Grand Prix unless they are from South Australia. To the maximum extent possible it will be a South Australian event, but let us get it into perspective: it is an event for Australia and internationally also, and Adelaide will succeed by getting the best as well as our local products.

WORKERS COMPENSATION

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Premier arrange to have tabled immediately in the House documentary evidence to justify the Government's costing of its workers compensation proposals? I ask my question in view of the continuing debate and dispute over workers compensation changes introduced in Victoria. The Liberal Party has announced a policy—

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: What's it got—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: —to make very significant reforms and savings through a scheme that will be fully funded; in other words, it will pay its way. However, the debate in Victoria is based largely around the cost of the new scheme—the cost down the track, in some years time. Independent actuarial assessments in Victoria indicate that the new single insurer scheme in Victoria will have unfunded liabilities to the tune of \$230 million after one year of operation.

I understand that the Victorian Premier has agreed not to change premiums for five years so that, after five years, the accumulated unfunded liability will be quite enormous. That has been done by more than one independent actuary. To prevent a similar occurrence in South Australia, I ask the Premier to table any relevant documentary evidence that he has so that the Government's costings can be subjected to independent analysis.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Such an analysis has taken place. An independent costing was done by Dr Trevor Mules, of the University of Adelaide. The costings have been extensively considered by employer bodies, such as the Chamber of Commerce, and have stood up to the test. The cost estimates have been accepted by organisations such as MIASA and the Chamber of Commerce. On the other hand, the Insurance Council of Australia has been asked for its detailed costings of proposals and we have not seen those.

An honourable member: Which proposals?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Insurance Council has made suggestions that it can introduce a scheme that will preserve the role of the Insurance Council and presumably the profits of its members and at the same time reduce premiums. Those costings have never been placed before the various parties concerned. Ours have been, in some detail, and they have been gone through. They will certainly be put into parliamentary purview when the legislation is introduced, because it is an essential part of it. I would suggest, incidentally, while we are talking about it, that if

the Liberal Opposition—which is claiming that it has a proposal that will cut premiums—is so confident of it, it will table its costings at the same time. Let me make the point that this scheme as proposed is a funded scheme, and deliberately so, in order to ensure that we do not see liabilities building up and foisted upon future generations.

HOUSING SECTOR

Mr FERGUSON: Can the Minister of Housing and Construction say whether statements made over the past six months by him and the Premier promoting the rejuvenation of the State's housing sector can be confirmed by hard statistics? Although many of my constituents have benefited from the State Government's housing policies as public housing tenants, home buyers or private tenants, the Opposition continues to pick at the most successful housing recovery in the State's history. During the Supply Bill debate and the Address in Reply debate, the member for Light has chosen to criticise significant housing achievements. For the benefit of my constituents, could the Minister provide some hard statistics?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I thank the honourable member for his question. I agree that there have been continual statements in this House in an attempt to play down this Government's achievements in the housing sector. The member for Light has even said that I am the 'pea and thimble' expert in misleading the House. I can only describe the member for Light as an expert at drawing red herrings across the housing path when he is continually proved to be wrong in this area.

I am only too pleased to provide the hard statistics for the honourable member. The June 1985 report of the Indicative Planning Council for the housing industry, a body which advises the Federal Government, in outlining short term prospects for the industry provides wonderful statistics for South Australia. Total dwelling commencements for the 1984-85 year are expected to be 14 000, the highest since 1976-77. The figure is also a 15 per cent increase on the 1983-84 figure and, I might add, 100 per cent above the figures when the member for Light failed to gain a position in the Tonkin Ministry.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: That's a new one.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Thank you. Mr Brian Martin, Chairman of the South Australian committee of the council, believes that commencements should ease in 1985-86 to 11 200 as the pent up demand left by the Tonkin Government is gradually satisfied. It is not 8 500, as stated by the Leader of the Opposition in his Address in Reply speech in yet another attempt by the Opposition to talk up a slump in the building industry. Today, at the ceremony at which the Premier laid the foundation stone at Golden Grove, members of the building industry told me that they deplored that statement and that in the past members of the Opposition and critics of this Government had attempted to talk up a slump in the building industry. They asked me why the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues in the industry were now talking up a slump. The figure is not 8 500; the Indicative Planning Council says that the figure for 1985-86 will be 11 200.

Those statistics confirm that South Australia's housing sector is the healthiest in the nation, and we have now reached the highest level of housing industry activity for eight years. In addition, the Indicative Planning Council's report addresses other issues on which the Opposition has sought to make political mileage. The Opposition has claimed, in its notoriously misleading *Sunday Mail* colour brochure, that land is scarce because it is being rationed by this Government. Mr Martin, a well respected figure in the

industry, says in his report that the stock of vacant allotments in Adelaide was 17 086 as at March 1985: 15 087, or 88 per cent of those allotments, were in private or company hands and the Government owned the few remaining blocks. The Opposition knows that the Bannon Government has taken a number of initiatives to ensure that there is an adequate supply of land for private developers to subdivide. Currently, there are about 12 500 allotments in the subdivision pipeline.

WORKERS COMPENSATION

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Can the Premier guarantee that all members of the Labor Party Parliamentary Caucus will support the Government's workers compensation reform proposals?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I rule the question out of order for two reasons: first, it is beyond—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: He can't answer it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw the Deputy Leader's attention to Standing Order 169, which he might bear in mind over the next few minutes. I rule for two reasons: first, it is not within the ministerial responsibility of the Premier; secondly, it is implying that the vote of any member can be predicted by the Premier, and that is a logical impossibility.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Mr Speaker, I will rephrase the question. My question is to the Premier.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will follow the practice of the House and seek leave to rephrase the question.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I seek leave, Mr Speaker, to rephrase the question.

The SPEAKER: I grant leave.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Will the Premier say whether the Government's workers compensation reform proposals are in conflict with official ALP policy? The June convention of the ALP voted to retain the common law right of workers to sue for pain and suffering.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Mr Groom!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Torrens.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: The Opposition's policy also proposes the retention of an element of common law to allow individual workers to sue for pain and suffering, but the proposals announced by the Premier will completely eliminate that right. While the Premier has said he is confident that the plan will get the backing of business and unions, there appears to be no guarantee that it will have the full support of all Government members in this Parliament.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Premier to ignore the last phrase, but otherwise invite him to answer the question.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I apologise for my inattention. The answer is 'No'.

SENTENCING PROCEDURES

Mr MAYES: My question is directed to the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Attorney-General in another place. Will the Minister ask the Attorney to undertake a review of the current investigations and sentencing procedures of the unsatisfied judgment jurisdiction of the Local Court? It has been brought to my attention by a constituent that there may be an overwhelming need to review the current unsatisfied judgment summons jurisdic-

tion in the Local Court and the process by which justices of the peace sit in this court. I have been further advised that orders have been made against pensioners for \$5 to \$10 a week, to be paid from their weekly pensions. Orders for a suspended sentence or imprisonment have frequently been made against people who as a consequence have been threatened with gaol. I have also been advised that, without further inquiries being made in the normal process and practice of the court, decisions have been made by the court which have resulted in suspended sentences. Will the Attorney urgently review these procedures?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question. If the honourable member will give me the details of those judgments to which he has referred, I will ensure that the matters raised are investigated and that due consideration is given to law reform in this area if indeed these orders are becoming intolerable for clients of the debtors courts.

WORKERS COMPENSATION

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: In relation to the new workers compensation scheme, will the Premier say whether the Government will still proceed with legislation to overhaul the present workers compensation scheme if major unions continue to oppose key elements of the scheme announced by the Premier on Sunday afternoon? A large advertisement (funded by South Australian taxpayers) was published on page 8 of this morning's *Advertiser* which states that business and unions agree to the proposed new scheme. However, that statement is highly misleading.

Also on page 8 of the *Advertiser* an article above that advertisement headed 'Union condemns new compo plan' states that one of the State's largest unions, the Australian Workers Union, yesterday condemned several key elements of the new scheme. The article states that yesterday the Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council, Mr John Lesses, said that the proposals did not have the full support of some sections of the trade union movement. My understanding of the statement made on radio was that the proposals were not to go to the trade unions until Friday and that some opposition was expected.

It has also been reported to me that another very large union in South Australia, and a very influential one—the Amalgamated Metals Foundry and Shipwrights Union—is also strongly opposed to vital aspects of the scheme. In these circumstances, the Government's advertisement appears to be a blatant attempt to pre-empt union consideration of the scheme. Therefore, will the Government still proceed with legislation even if the main unions oppose it? I also remind the Premier that the Insurance Council of Australia has presented to him its detailed costings. That was first done in December.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now debating the matter.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I appreciate your ruling, Mr Speaker: I am pointing out two facts—

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member continues in that vein, he will be potentially in difficulties.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I am simply pointing out to the House that I have been advised that in December last year the Insurance Council of Australia presented the Premier with detailed costings, and it did so again in a personal meeting six weeks ago. The Premier has had before him those details of costings for something like eight months. However, he has not produced his own costings to this House, as requested earlier this afternoon.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In asking the question and explaining it, the honourable member has conveniently

omitted to read any other statements that have been made on this scheme which, in fact, support the advertisement that has appeared. The Trades and Labor Council and the Chamber of Commerce and Industry have been actively involved in the assessment and development of the scheme, which in large part is embodied in the proposal that the Government has published. Obviously, those and other organisations need to examine the proposal in detail and respond formally to it.

However, there is no question that the proposal that has been produced is one that business and the unions, as represented by the steering committee of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the United Trades and Labor Council, support, and the Government intends to introduce reforms to the workers compensation legislation as a matter of urgency.

VIOLENCE IN SPORT

Mrs APPLEBY: Can the Minister of Recreation and Sport say whether the recent State and Federal Ministers conference on sport and recreation considered potential violence in junior sport? From a press statement which appeared in the *Australian*, the South Australian Minister said he would call on other Ministers to give financial commitment to an advertising campaign perhaps along similar lines to the 'Life. Be In It.' campaign to discourage violence in sport. It has been put to me by a number of parents and persons involved with youth sport that it would be prudent to establish an education program that would encompass participants, spectators, coaches and club officials involved in youth sport to place priority on the skills, rules and involvement in sport rather than debilitating other participants with physical force.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I thank the honourable member for the question because it is of sufficient interest even for Opposition members whose *de facto* spokesman, I believe, supported my comment in relation to having a media awareness campaign to try to minimise as much as possible, or even eliminate completely, both spectator and participatory violence in sport. The recent conference of Ministers of Recreation and Sport held in New Zealand discussed this matter at some length and it was agreed that a national study of violence in sport should be undertaken. That study will involve researching available statistics, identifying trends, and recommending strategies for implementation by both State and Federal Governments. I have expressed my interest in this matter and my department has become involved, as a result of which one of my officers (Mr Rod Martin) has been asked to conduct the research and prepare a national paper by December 1985 for the Sport and Recreation Ministers Council, which will meet in Adelaide in that month to take note of that paper and pay attention to the increasing trend of violence in sport.

There are two aspects of the matter to be considered. The first is participatory violence, and in this respect I consider that body contact sport is an increasing trend that must worry all those who are involved in the junior sport specifically referred to by the member for Brighton. I hope that this will never happen in Australia, although trends are developing in relation to spectator violence. We are all aware of the situation that has developed overseas. I believe that the Government has a responsibility, although sporting organisations administer and make the rules and therefore have the ultimate responsibility in administering their own sport. It is not intended that the Government should interfere in that prerogative, but we have a responsibility, especially in relation to junior sport, to encourage coaches and

officials and to try to impart to people who play junior sport the spirit of sportsmanship. In this respect, I am talking not only of violence but also about encouraging and bringing back this spirit into all types of sport.

The Leader of the Opposition can laugh, but I hope that that situation also applies to the political scene in South Australia. The incidents and violence in sport that we see from top class competitors are emulated by junior sports people. That should not be the case, but junior sports people tend to emulate what they believe to be their adult superiors and, as a consequence, we are trying, on a national basis, to encourage people who play, particularly junior sports people, to enjoy the game. Unfortunately, in many instances, because of the strong belief by coaches and officials that it ought to be a competitive situation, that philosophy is not followed. I do not agree with that. I believe, as I am sure all members of the House believe, that, at that age, people should be enjoying the sport instead of being pushed into a highly competitive situation. That can follow later.

The first important point is to learn the skills of the game. Coaches and organisations have a responsibility to ensure that that takes place. I hope that we can encourage as much as possible sporting organisations and individuals who play not only top level sport but sport in general to play the game as it should be played, without malice and without the sort of body contact and injuries which follow that are occurring at present. I think that that situation should be eliminated completely. The responsibility for ensuring that sport should be played competitively but should still be enjoyed rests with all those who are involved. I thank the honourable member for her question and advise her that the matter is still under consideration. It will again be taken up at the Sports Ministers Council in December of this year.

WORKERS COMPENSATION

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I ask the Premier whether he misled the House in his answer to my previous question. I asked him: some of the Government's workers compensation reform proposals are in conflict with the official ALP policy, to which the Premier answered, 'No.' ALP policy on workers compensation was laid down at the special March and June conventions of the ALP. At the special March convention the following resolution was adopted:

That the right to sue for compensation at common law be maintained unless a no-fault package which provides for superior benefits can be implemented which has the approval of the United Trades and Labor Council.

Subsequent to that, at the June convention, the following rider was added to that motion:

And which (1) does not have the consequence of encouraging the independent contracting or subcontracting system of work; and (2) retains the right to sue for pain and suffering.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No.

DELFIN ISLAND BUS SERVICE

Mr HAMILTON: I ask the Minister of Transport to advise if and when the State Transport Authority intends extending the existing bus service into Delfin Island, West Lakes. The House will recall that, for many years, I have endeavoured to obtain a suitable bus service into Delfin Island via Corcoran Drive so as to assist the families and retired citizens who are resident in this area. Constituents on Delfin Island have repeatedly raised this matter with me over a period of four years. I would therefore appreciate an

affirmative response from the Minister, whom I advised previously that I was going to raise this question today.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I am delighted to be able to give the honourable member the affirmative response that he seeks. I commend the honourable member for his dedication in representing his constituents in relation to this matter. I think that all members of Parliament are aware of the number of occasions that he has brought this matter before the House.

I guess that the previous Minister of Transport is as aware as I am of the personal representations the honourable member has made on behalf of his constituents, including three senior citizens villages. I would hope that his constituents make use of that facility that I am sure the representations made by the honourable member have been helpful in achieving for them.

In early 1986, in conjunction with the introduction of the north-east busway services, significant changes will take place in many public transport corridors throughout metropolitan Adelaide. As part of these changes, services on the existing city to West Lakes via Crittenden Road bus route will be extended to Delfin Island. During shopping hours, buses will travel to and from West Lakes Mall via Turner Drive, West Lakes Boulevard and Corcoran Drive to a turnaround facility already constructed at the northern end of Corcoran Drive. Outside shopping hours, buses will not deviate from West Lakes Boulevard to the mall. The extended service will become route 29L. These changes to public transport routes and services will significantly enhance public transport services in many parts of metropolitan Adelaide, including West Lakes, for the benefit of travellers, including constituents of the honourable member.

ABATTOIR DISPUTE

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Will the Premier seek an undertaking from the AMIEU, storemen and packers, transport and wharf labour unions that in South Australia there will be no further rolling 24 hour work bans in sympathy with the Mudginberri meat workers dispute? We are in the twentieth week since the Mudginberri dispute first arose in the Northern Territory. In the meantime, there has been considerable disruption within the Territory meat industry with litigation involving court orders to return to work which have been ignored and, out of so-called sympathy for the employees in that situation, meat workers, transport workers, storemen and packers and wharf labourers have been adopting *ad hoc* work bans in other States.

In South Australia on 25 July SAMCOR employees failed to attend their place of employment. On 7 August the storemen and packers and wharf labourers failed to attend their places of employment. On 2 August all SAMCOR employees were again involved in an illegal work ban. This was followed on 9 August by a strike amongst not all but most of the transport union employees, seriously disrupting livestock, wool and other produce deliveries. Collectively these actions have been creating considerable public cost and industrial disruption, and the action of the unionists is unrelated to any South Australian based dispute.

The public cost involved at SAMCOR has been reported to me as being significant and, although not easily measurable, calculations based on one day out of the five day working week, that is, 20 per cent of total weekly operation costs in the two weeks surrounding the disputes, will amount to many thousands of dollars, particularly when one recognises that the penalty rates payable on the days prior to and subsequent to strike action involved double payment for all employees on special duty.

The SAMCOR employees' wages ordinarily range between \$290 and \$350 per week. During the penalty payment periods these figures accordingly increase to a range between \$580 on the bottom of the scale and \$700 per week for the majority of workers who are at the top of the scale. The penalty rate employment policy adopted by SAMCOR management has been exercised around the strike periods in order to minimise disruption to the meat industry between the paddock and the customers.

I am informed that a South Australian meat industry union delegate is meeting in Sydney today with all State AMIEU union colleagues and it is alleged that further action is being planned for ongoing disruption. In the interests of all South Australians any action taken by the Premier would be welcome. As far as I can ascertain, his Minister of Labour, the Hon. Frank Blevins, has not so far been involved in any discussions with AMIEU, Transport Union or Storemen and Packers Union officials regarding this issue.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is a national dispute that is being handled by the Federal Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. I noticed that last week the Federal Government in fact offered to act as a negotiator and that the Prime Minister was prepared to chair a conference, but that the National Farmers Federation representatives refused to be part of it. That was two weeks ago. All efforts are being made obviously at the national level to arrive at some settlement of this matter. I think that the last thing required would be for State interference in it without fair consideration of the question. However, I do not pretend to have any close knowledge of the details of the case, so I will refer the matter to the Minister of Labour for a report.

CHILD CARE FACILITIES

Ms LENEHAN: Can the Minister of Education outline clearly to the Parliament the Government's policy on the provision of child care facilities for TAFE colleges in South Australia?

Members interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: I would like to have an opportunity to explain my question.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member.

Ms LENEHAN: I ask this question, first, because the Government has provided excellent high quality child care facilities for the Noarlunga TAFE College as well as for other TAFE colleges in South Australia. Secondly, as a member of the Noarlunga TAFE College Council, I am aware that the South Coast branch of the Noarlunga College of Technical and Further Education presently has an application before the department for funding for child care facilities at Victor Harbor and other areas within the southern Fleurieu Peninsula. I also understand that discussions are currently taking place about the provision of child care facilities for the Kingston College of TAFE. Finally, I note in the policy statement of the Liberal Party on issues of special interest to women that a Liberal Government also will maintain child care facilities at TAFE colleges as these services are important in enabling women to train and retrain. I therefore ask the Minister to outline clearly the Government's policy.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I can certainly advise honourable members that the thrust of the policy that we will be putting for the next four years is in fact a development of the policy that we have had for the last three years: it has been one of positive creation and development for child care centres within TAFE colleges on the premise that the provision of child care facilities within TAFE colleges is in fact essential in terms of access questions. That matter is something that we have adhered to for a long period of

time. We promised before the 1982 election that we would ensure that over the three-year period every TAFE college would have child care facilities developed within it. We have not been able to adhere to that at this stage; we have not yet been able to provide them in all the TAFE colleges. However, we have done a significant amount, both by the addition of extra money into the TAFE budget and by reallocation of resources within the TAFE budget. There is certainly still more to be done.

I can give the guarantee now that, within the next four years of a Labor Government, we would have in fact extended that to all colleges, as we promised to do, with trained staff being the core of support for all those child care centres. What I propose to do at the time of the Estimates Committee is to come down with a schedule detailing what we have already done, which is a significant and impressive amount, and detailing an actual program so that individual colleges within the TAFE system will know where they are placed with respect to the development of those facilities over the next four years. That is a policy of definition and one of growth and development of an essential service within the TAFE sector.

In her explanation, the honourable member referred to the Liberal Party policy on TAFE colleges and child care facilities and in fact quoted from that policy one paragraph:

A Liberal Government also will maintain child care facilities at TAFE colleges as these services are important in enabling women to train and retrain.

I might say that that is quite a considerable *volte-face* for the Liberal Party, because it is quite considerably different from the policy that it had when in government between 1979 and 1982.

I do not want to criticise that somersault or change of direction because, as far as it goes, it is certainly better than the policy they had, which was one of refusing to provide the facility. Members need only take themselves back to the debates that took place in this House or during the Estimates Committees to see how the member for Mount Gambier—the former Minister—absolutely dug his feet in trying not to provide any child care facilities at colleges.

He went into great arguments as to why it was not TAFE's responsibility to do that and how there was no relevance to the provision of TAFE education. At the time that caused considerable community concern. I remember that the member for Mawson was very involved in this matter through her community groups and in hearing their points of view that they did not want at Noarlunga to be referred to as the childless persons' college, because those people were all that the college could provide access for.

The former Minister indicated at that stage that he might want to back down and said that, if space were found within the college and the facility were staffed by volunteers, maybe it was on. In fact, we had a policy that the core of support for child care centres at TAFE colleges should not only be paid but that they should be professionally trained people. However, other colleges now need to be considered, and we have introduced the facility at a number of colleges in this State and have seen it developed. We acknowledge that more needs to be done, and we will expand the service.

The Liberal policy does not say that: it says 'maintain'—keep it at the present level, we know that we will buy too much of a fight if we cut it back, so we will maintain it. But, there is no promise to expand or develop it. Equally, there is no indication or commitment as to how the Opposition will maintain it. The Liberals do not comment on the staffing of child care centres or maintaining them with professionally trained people, or follow the former Minister's dictum that volunteers should staff such centres. The Opposition does not comment on how it will go about funding

those centres. It certainly owes a commitment with respect to those areas.

As I said in the Estimates Committee, not only will I provide advice on what we have done over the past three years, which is considerable—and more than the former Government did—but also I will give a detailed program of what the Labor Government will do with respect to providing child care at TAFE colleges.

EARTH LEAKAGE CIRCUIT BREAKERS

Mr ASHENDEN: Will the Acting Minister of Mines and Energy indicate to the House whether he is now prepared to require installation of earth leakage circuit breakers in all new homes and buildings? On 4 April, I wrote to the Minister of Mines and Energy on behalf of a constituent of mine pointing out the inherent dangers of the fuse system for protection against malfunction in various electrical circuits.

In that letter I pointed out that, although fuses work in most cases, there are times, particularly with faulty earthing, when fuses will not break a circuit that is not operating correctly. Recently, a school child was killed in Port Pirie because of such a malfunction. My constituent has pointed out to me that circuit breakers will immediately activate themselves as soon as any fault occurs in a circuit. He states that, if a circuit breaker had been installed on the circuit that killed the child, the accident would never have occurred.

Further, my constituent acknowledges that the installation of circuit breakers costs more than the present fuse system. However, as he says, a life is worth far more than the few extra dollars involved. My constituent has made a number of representations to me, and my letter to the Minister of 4 April sets these out in detail. In light of these facts, will the Minister reconsider his earlier response to me where he refused to alter the present regulations, and now require the installation of circuit breakers in all new homes and buildings?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I am aware that there has been some discussion and a good deal of investigation into this matter. However, no specific recommendation has been put before me during the time I have been acting on behalf of my colleague. Therefore, it is necessary for me to get the information for the honourable member.

NURSING HOME PATIENTS

Mr PETERSON: Will the Premier tell the House what advice we can give to constituents who are patients in nursing homes or to their relatives who find that they can no longer afford nursing home fees? As all members should be aware, changes in the cost structure of nursing homes have resulted in an escalation in the approved fees at those homes to a level where all governmental sources available to pensioners for payment of fees do not meet the bill.

Many people have approached me about this matter after unsuccessfully contacting Federal and State organisations, including the office of the State Commissioner for the Ageing, and receiving no help whatsoever. As no help or constructive advice has been forthcoming from these sources, will the Premier tell the House what alternatives are available to South Australian nursing home patients who cannot meet these payments?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I will take this question, as I represent the Minister of Health in another place, who I know is having discussions this week with Senator Grimes about the very issue the honourable member has raised. I will immediately refer the points made by the honourable

member to the Minister and bring back a response for his benefit and that of the House.

CHILD ABUSE

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Given the assurances made by the Minister of Community Welfare and his Director-General that they accept the validity of a psychologist's report which confirmed that a four year old girl under the family day care scheme had been sexually assaulted, and given the Minister's advice to the House last week that the various authorities involved in this case have not only revoked all relevant licences but also outlined the circumstances to the parents of a child currently in the care of the molester under private arrangements, will the Minister indicate whether he will name the molester in order to protect children from further risk; continue for the rest of his term in office to advise individual parents of the risks involved if they leave children with the molester; or wash his hands of the whole matter and hope that it will go away?

An honourable member: Shame!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: The shame rests with him.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Coles.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, on what premise did you—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order while I listen to the member for Torrens.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: On what premise did you warn the member for Coles when the Premier and the Deputy Premier had interjected immediately before she spoke?

The Hon. D.C. Brown: We've got a biased House now.

The SPEAKER: Order! The implications on the Chair are getting very close to being in breach of Standing Order 169, and they will not continue. The honourable member for Torrens took a point of order and then asked a question. Therefore, technically, I do not need to say anything, but I will. Since I gave the warning to the whole House early in Question Time the honourable member for Coles has interjected consistently, and that was the basis.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Leader.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Standing Order 169 states that if any member consistently obstructs the business of the House the ultimate consequence will be that the member is named. I do not believe that the member for Coles had been called to order once during this Question Time. I know that I was, as well as one or two other members on this side of the House. No-one was warned. It has been the continuing practice in the interpretation of Standing Order 169 to call a member to order and to then warn that member if there is consistent disobedience to the Chair. However, out of the blue, without having been previously called to order, the member for Coles has been warned. That is quite inconsistent with what has occurred not only during Question Time today but, indeed, to my ken, for the past 15 years.

The SPEAKER: There are two matters. First, I was referring not to the member for Coles but to certain other members who were coming perilously close to reflecting on the Chair. That was the distinction there. Secondly, if the honourable member is saying (and I assume that he is) that only one member was called to order, I think that today is at least the eighth time that I have explained to the House in detail that, as soon as I call one honourable member to order, the whole House is called to order. I am not especially

concerned whether or not it is within the honourable Deputy's ken: the fact of the matter is that it is within the Standing Orders and it is within the practice of those Parliaments within the Westminster system. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: On a point of order, Mr Speaker. In elucidation of your—

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the Deputy resume his seat. Order! Now, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: In further elucidation of this point of order, before the—

The SPEAKER: Order! Is the Deputy now taking a point of order?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, Mr Speaker, under Standing Order 169. The Premier and other members on the Government side interjected immediately prior to the first interjection from the member for Coles. If your warning is to the whole House, Mr Speaker, why was the Premier not warned and the member for Coles was?

The SPEAKER: Order! I have maintained a careful observation of the behaviour of honourable members on both sides. For instance, I can indicate the number of interjections from both front benches throughout today's proceedings: the honourable Deputy has interjected over a dozen times and the honourable Premier, I think, four or five times.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Daventryport has no cause to be smiling.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! When the House is ready to proceed: I am carrying out the orders of the House. I have made clear that I am referring to two distinct things: the honourable member for Coles was warned on one matter and I drew the attention of honourable members to another. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the member for Coles for her question and for the opportunity to explain further developments in the case to which she refers. I was notified late last evening—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the Minister resume his seat. I ask that the House maintain some semblance of dignity in the face of the community present. This is lower than one would expect in a second rate Hollywood movie, in a serious matter affecting young children. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. This is a serious matter, and I treat it as most serious indeed. Late last evening I was advised that the person involved, who is the husband of a former family day care giver, was interviewed by the police and made admissions to them about matters relating to abuse of children, and that person has subsequently been charged. I have no details of the offence or other relevant details but, obviously, it is for the court to decide whether or not that person's name shall be released. With respect to persons who have doubts about the ability of people to care properly for their children, or other persons in the community who harbour fears whether these children are being cared for in a licensed situation or under a private arrangement (many thousands of children are cared for by others under private arrangement), they should contact the Department of Community Welfare or the Children's Services Office and report those fears so that they can be investigated quickly and any relevant information that may assist those families to resolve their doubts can be attended to by the various authorities, including the police, in whom is vested a responsibility. With respect to this issue, I assure the honourable member and all other honourable members, that I will take every step possible to

ensure that the systems that are developed within the Department of Community Welfare, and indeed within the community, respond quickly to reports such as this and that wherever it is possible for us to set up practices that will minimise this sort of happening they will be given the highest priority. Unfortunately, I cannot stop this form of criminal and deviant behaviour in the community (no-one can), but I assure honourable members that we shall do everything that we can to discharge the grave responsibilities that are vested within officers of my department relating to the welfare of children.

NATIVE VEGETATION MANAGEMENT BILL

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister for Environment and Planning) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to control the clearance, and to facilitate the management, of native vegetation; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The aim of this Bill is to separate the existing vegetation clearance controls from the planning system, provide for the management of areas retained from clearance, and provide for financial assistance to landholders refused approval to clear native vegetation. Controls on the clearance of native vegetation in the agricultural regions of the State were introduced by regulation under the Planning Act, 1982, on 12 May 1983. There has been a widespread, bipartisan acceptance of the need for controls (over 80 per cent of the native vegetation in the agricultural regions having now been cleared), but some aspects of the legislative and administrative arrangements, and the absence of any readily available financial assistance for those disadvantaged, have produced a divisive controversy, culminating in late 1984 in a successful challenge to the controls before the High Court of Australia.

In the wake of the High Court judgment the controls have been maintained by a suspension of section 56 (1) (a) and (b) of the Planning Act, but the suspension will expire on 31 October 1985. In view of this, a Select Committee of the Legislative Council was set up on 6 December 1984, to take evidence and report on the legislative, administrative and compensation aspects of the controls. More recently, officers of the United Farmers and Stockowners of S.A. Inc. and the Department of Environment and Planning have negotiated an agreement, the principles of which have been accepted by the Government and embodied in this Bill.

The Bill provides for control of clearance in a manner similar to that already existing, but decision making on all applications will become the responsibility of a five-member Native Vegetation Authority. The authority will comprise one nominee from the United Farmers and Stockowners of S.A. Inc.; one from the Nature Conservation Society of South Australia; two Ministerial nominees with one having expertise in conservation and one in rural matters; and a Chairman, being the Chairman of the South Australian Planning Commission. The authority will have exclusive responsibility to make decisions on all applications, but with the power to delegate.

Landholders refused approval to clear native vegetation will become eligible for financial assistance, as long as they agree to enter into a heritage agreement providing for the on-going management and conservation of the vegetation retained. The assistance will take two forms. First, payment will be made to cover any decline in land value as a result of the controls. Secondly, assistance will be made available to landholders to fence and manage areas retained from clearance. To minimise the cost to the State in any given year, most of the payments will be made as annual instalments over an average period of ten years. Interest will be paid with the instalments to offset inflationary effects over time. Similarly, the cost of fencing will be spread over a period of time, with areas receiving attention on an assigned priority basis.

Financial assistance will only be made available where a landholder is required to retain native vegetation over and above an area equivalent to 12½ per cent of the holding, and the land in question must have been acquired prior to 12 May 1983. Any land not capable of management for permanent agriculture if cleared will also be excluded from payments. Highly significant areas of land refused clearance approval may be considered for acquisition by the National Parks and Wildlife Service. The Bill also provides for the establishment of a Native Vegetation Advisory Committee of eight members. The committee will advise the Minister on policy matters and will have a membership reflecting rural, environmental, local government and hydrological interests. One of the members will also be a member of the Native Vegetation Authority.

The Bill is the outcome of much detailed discussion and negotiation between a range of interested parties and it is gratifying that a consensus has been reached. At the same time, a number of the provisions of the Bill are novel, and there is a need to monitor closely their effectiveness once the Act is in force. To this end I have (whilst not including it as a formal provision of the Bill) agreed to a review of the first 12 months operations of the Act carried out by a working party made up of officers from the United Farmers and Stockowners and the Department of Environment and Planning.

With the introduction of this Bill, I am confident that a new and favourable climate has been established for native vegetation retention and management throughout the agricultural regions of the State. I commend the Bill to the House.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 provides definitions of terms used in the Bill. Clause 4 gives the Governor power to exclude parts of the State from the operation of the Act by regulation. Clause 5 provides that the Crown will be bound. Clause 6 provides for the establishment of the Native Vegetation Authority. Clause 7 provides for membership of the authority. Clause 8 provides for proceedings at meetings of the authority.

Clause 9 preserves the validity of acts of the authority and protects members from personal liability. Clause 10 prevents a member from participating in a decision of the authority if he has an interest in the matter under consideration. Clause 11 provides for remuneration and expenses of members. Clause 12 sets out the authority's role in advising the Minister. Clause 13 is a delegation provision. Clause 14 provides for the appointment of a secretary and other staff.

Clause 15 provides for the preparation and tabling before Parliament of an annual report. Clause 16 establishes the Native Vegetation Advisory Committee and provides for its membership. Clause 17 sets out the functions of the committee. Clause 18 makes available to the committee the services of Government departments. Clause 19 is the principal offence provision in the Bill. The maximum penalty

that may be imposed is \$10 000 or, where the number of hectares on which an offence occurs is greater than 10, the maximum penalty increases in proportion to the area involved.

Clause 20 sets out circumstances in which native vegetation may be cleared. Subclause (2) provides that only the owner of land on which the vegetation stands may apply for clearance. Subclause (4) prohibits clearance of native vegetation from land that is subject to a heritage agreement unless the vegetation is cleared in accordance with the agreement.

Clause 21 sets out a number of general provisions. The authority must, when considering an application for consent, have regard to the development plan. Conditions imposed on consent bind subsequent owners as well as the owner who obtained the consent. There will be no appeal from a decision of the authority. Clauses 22 to 25 set out enforcement provisions similar to those in the Planning Act, 1982. Clause 26 provides definitions of terms used in Part V.

Clause 27 sets out the basis on which landowners will be entitled to payments to compensate them for the reduction in the value of their land resulting from a decision of the authority. The owner must enter into a heritage agreement in the form in the second schedule or in any other form agreed with the Minister. Subclause (4) sets out circumstances in which payment will not be made. Subclause (5) provides for reduction in the amount payable if the land is owned by a number of co-owners some of whom acquired their interest in the land after 12 May 1985. Clause 28 provides the basis for assessing the amount to be paid. The formula in subclause (2) reduces the payment by a proportion that is equal to the proportion that 12.5 per cent of the holding bears to the land in respect of which payment is made.

Clause 29 provides for assessment by the Valuer-General of the amount payable with a right of appeal to the Land and Valuation Court. An owner considering entering into a heritage agreement may request the Valuer-General to give him an estimate of the amount of the payment that he will receive. Clause 30 provides for the manner of payment and for the payment of interest. Clause 31 provides for inspection of land.

Clause 32 is a regulation-making power. The first schedule sets out transitional provisions. Clause 5 will enable a landowner who was refused planning approval to clear native vegetation under the Planning Act, 1982, to claim a payment under this Act. Alternatively he can apply for consent under this Act in respect of the vegetation to which the previous refusal related. The second schedule sets out the form of heritage agreement.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON secured the adjournment of the debate.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HERITAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister for Environment and Planning) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the South Australian Heritage Act 1978. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The aim of this Bill is to provide consequential amendments to the South Australian Heritage Act, 1978, in support of the proposed Native Vegetation Management Bill, 1985. The Minister who will be responsible for the administration of the Native Vegetation Management Act, 1985, is constituted as an authority under the South Australian Heritage Act, 1978, and will enter into heritage agreements with landowners in respect of native vegetation under both Acts. The Minister will also take over the responsibility of the existing Native Vegetation Retention/Heritage Agreement Scheme. The Native Vegetation Authority will replace the Heritage Committee in most circumstances as the advisory body on heritage agreements to protect native vegetation and the authority will administer the scheme.

Importantly, these consequential amendments to the South Australian Heritage Act, 1978, provide enabling provisions to exempt heritage agreement areas from the payment of State and local government rates and taxes. Hitherto the holders of heritage agreements have been reimbursed by the Department of Environment and Planning for the cost of such charges over native vegetation areas. The new proposal is to have these charges waived over heritage agreement areas and in respect of local government rates, for the decline in revenue to be offset by a marginal increase in the rate per dollar levied on all landholders within a council district. This is entirely consistent with the philosophy that native vegetation is a resource of benefit to the whole community and that government at all levels—local, State and Commonwealth—should help the landholder in maintaining and managing it for the future.

The proposal also embraces a principle of equity—landholders who have in the past cleared much of their vegetation and thereby avoided the controls will now make a contribution to those who still have vegetation and have been affected by the controls. To ensure that local government has the opportunity to restrike its rate on the remaining council area—and therefore, if desired, attract the same funds—a decision to waive rates under each individual heritage agreement will not come into effect until after the passage of one full rate year. The contribution from other ratepayers will, however, be small. Within the District Council of Kingscote on Kangaroo Island, for instance, the additional costs in rates for a landholder with a property valued at \$200 000 will be \$10 (an increase from \$780 to \$790). This figure also assumes that all the remaining native vegetation within the council area will become subject to heritage agreements, an unlikely event, and the actual rise is likely to be less. Similar calculations carried out for the District Council of Lincoln and the District Council of Tatiara indicate a likely annual increase of \$18 for a \$200 000 property.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 includes the Minister for the time being responsible for the administration of the Native Vegetation Management Act, 1985, in the definition of 'the Authority'. This term is used in Part IIIA of the principal Act dealing with heritage agreements. Clause 4 amends section 16a to provide for the making of heritage agreements by the Minister administering the Native Vegetation Management Act, 1985. Clause 5 amends section 16b of the principal Act. Paragraph (b) provides for a term in heritage agreements releasing a landowner from the obligation to pay rates and taxes in relation to an item. Paragraphs (a) and (c) are consequential provisions.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON secured the adjournment of the debate.

PLANNING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 4)

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister for Environment and Planning) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Planning Act 1982. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The Planning Act Amendment Bill (No. 4) 1985 has been drafted in association with the Native Vegetation Management Bill 1985 and seeks permanent repeal of section 56 (1) (a) of the Planning Act, the so-called 'existing use' provision. This provision is currently suspended until 31 October 1985, following a decision by the High Court on the effect of the provision. By majority the High Court held that section 56 (1) (a) enables expansion or extensions to existing activities, without planning approval, irrespective of the impact on adjacent land users. This interpretation undermined the vegetation clearance controls, but also had substantial impact on the full range of planning controls, as uncontrolled expansion of any existing activity could result in significant undesirable impacts. As the Planning Act only controls changes in use of land, not land use *per se*, and therefore a statement protecting continuation of existing activities can be dispensed with. The Bill therefore proposes permanent repeal of section 56 (1) (a). While the proposed Native Vegetation Management Bill, 1985, will overcome the difficulties of section 56 (1) (a) in respect of native vegetation, permanent repeal is essential to maintain proper controls over other forms of development.

The Planning Act Amendment Bill (No. 4), 1985, also replaces the current paragraph (b) of section 56 (1). The intention of the provision was to ensure that valid planning approvals could be acted on irrespective of subsequent law changes. However, the High Court extended this interpretation so that development projects that did not need planning approval at a particular time could continue to be undertaken without planning approval notwithstanding changes to planning controls. This effectively undermined the provisions of the Act which enabled the development plan to be amended and led to suspension of the provision until 31 October 1985. Accordingly the Bill replaces section 56 (1) to ensure the original intention. I commend the Bill to the House.

Clauses 1 and 2 of the Bill are formal. Clause 3 replaces section 56 of the principal Act with the new provision already outlined.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 15 August. Page 349.)

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): As I was saying last Thursday at the time the House adjourned, I wanted to mention a number of things, one of which was the way in which privatisation would benefit South Australia. I also drew attention to a pamphlet which had been published by the Labor Party and in which was mentioned the names of a variety of members in marginal seats. The one I was quoting was the district of Norwood.

One of the things I drew attention to was the disgusting and scurrilous statement made in the pamphlet relating to ETSA charges. It is grossly inaccurate and wholly untrue. It says, 'ETSA charges cut'. The pamphlet states:

John Bannon has taken the bold step of cutting ETSA charges. Like hell! The pamphlet further states:

They became far too high under an agreement signed by the Liberals.

That is a fib. The former Labor Government signed the agreements which had the effect of increasing prices prior to the time we came to office. Since the Bannon Government came to office charges have been deliberately increased by the Government and that has placed a straight-out percentage receipts tax on the Electricity Trust thereby using the trust as a tax collector for itself. It is a straight-out flat rate tax on consumption of electrical energy. The pamphlet goes on to state:

John Bannon has told ETSA to cut its rates this year.

Further on it states:

The November ETSA tariff will actually be less than last year's.

I cannot imagine in what circumstances that will occur, unless you simply switch off your meter. It is blatantly untrue. If the same amount of power is used this year as was used in the same quarter last year, it will in fact be dearer. The pamphlet states:

That has never happened before.

It probably has not, but even if it were true, it jolly well ought to be the case. The pamphlet then states:

Next year ETSA has been told its rates must be frozen below the inflation rate.

Presumably, that could mean that ETSA simply has to lose money and borrow on the open money market at debenture and higher interest rates to finance its losses. If its costs escalate above the inflation rate, how else can it possibly finance the deficit? If ever there was a piece of blatant political grandstanding and manipulation through misinformation and untruths, that would be it.

Having refreshed honourable members' memories as to the topics I was discussing last Thursday, I also referred to a number of other matters, including the hypocrisy relating to Roxby Downs. I also drew attention to an article which appeared in the *Herald* where members of the Labor Party from rural constituencies expressed their dismay at the indifference of that Party, with its lower membership, to the needs of people living in rural communities in particular, but South Australia's overall welfare in general.

I received a message on my telephone answering service at home on Friday last and again today regarding a brochure called 'Newsletter Vol. 11 No. 2' from the Women's Studies Resource Centre. When I finally received a copy of that publication I was appalled and disgusted. The front page lists the contents of the publication, and it states:

Contents: Kid's Books, Migrants in Australia, Patterns, Children's Services Office, Lesbian Resources, Acquisitions, Lesson Ideas.

If one turns to pages 1 and 2, the Women's Studies Resource Centre, or whatever it is called—the queers outfit, anyway—is complaining about staff and funding cuts, and it explains what people should do about those cuts in the way of lobbying Government and the department. Frankly, given the kind of reaction there has been from the people I represent and who have seen this publication, I think the whole budget should have been slashed if that is the kind of stuff that they are spending it on. If there are any further transgressions in that direction, the Government of the day should simply cut all funding and, if the Resource Centre closes down, in my opinion, so much the better.

I received a letter on 15 August and, without revealing the identity of the person who wrote it, I shall read from it as follows:

I am writing to you as a concerned parent. The enclosed document Women's Studies Resource Centre Newsletter is, I gather, circulated to all schools and kindergartens. Part of the newsletter I consider to be necessary and proper—

I agree with that statement—

as I am strongly against sexism in all its forms.

I also agree with that statement. The letter further states:

But the last section that concentrates on Lesbian Resources, etc., I consider to be very ill advised. If this is the normal style for this newsletter I would go so far as to suggest that the proposed cut was very right and proper and that the money would be far better spent supporting childhood services or providing much needed teacher advisory services in the country.

The passage to which he is referring is on pages 17 to 22. Let us take a look at some of that passage. On page 17 the book states:

South Australian teachers and education workers have been and continue to discuss their support for a union policy—

that refers to SAIT—

that advocates equal rights for its lesbian and male homosexual members and curricula that counter stereotypes and redress prejudice against male homosexuals and lesbians. Yet how much do heterosexual teachers know about lesbians?

This was reviewed by Annie Dugdale, whoever she is. The book goes on to state:

Stepping Out of Line; a workbook on Lesbianism and Feminism. Includes a workshop script and stories from many Canadian lesbians involved in organising for change: as parents, workers, teachers, children.

The book then has the following titles:

Our Right to Love; A Lesbian Resource Book; Demystifying Homosexuality; A Teaching Guide About Lesbians and Gay Men; Now That You Know; What Every Parent Should Know About Homosexuality; Society and the Healthy Homosexual; Growing Up Free; Raising Your Child in the 80s; The Coming Out Stories; Lesbian Studies: Present and Future. This is a collection of writings mainly aimed at tertiary teachers but including some useful sections for secondary teachers, lesbians in education, homophobia in the classroom and sample syllabi from courses on lesbianism.

There is then a little box at the bottom of page 19 with the duplicate feminine symbol as the signatory to it in which the SAIT Council policy is outlined in relation to lesbians and homosexuals. On page 19: *Young, Gay and Proud.* The next title is *Changing Bodies, Changing Lives: A Book for Teens on Sex and Relationships.* The last title is *Girls are Powerful: Young Women's Writings from Spare Rib*, by Susan Hemmings, described as:

A great collection of stories by young women about their experiences of a homophobic and sexist world. Includes writings by young lesbians and deals with many issues including school, unemployment, motherhood and families.

If that is the sort of stuff on which our taxpayers are spending money—publishing and circulating to kindergartens, primary and secondary schools in this State—it should be stopped, and the sooner the bloody better! It is appalling!

I turn now to an item that I see as being included in the Taxpayers Association of South Australia *Tax Talk*, volume 1, No. 2, published this year. It arrived in my box here at the House only last week. It points out that the State Government spent \$6 million promoting its departments and various Government agencies during 1983-84. The heading of the article to which I refer is, 'Hey, Big Spender'. Referring to the Bannon Labor Government, it states:

This figure does not include three major government instrumentalities, which for reasons of 'commercial confidentiality' would not reveal details of their advertising budgets. The Government's advertising razzamatazz was brought to light during Question Time in the House of Assembly recently. But there's one question *Tax Talk* would like to ask; is there any way the Government could zip up its pockets and save on costly advertising? Although advertising is a legitimate activity, there is often

a fine line between legitimate and overspending. The biggest spender was the South Australian Department of Tourism.

It goes on to detail the whole thing. We know that this Government in the past has not been shy of using taxpayers' funds to conduct market surveys to determine the popularity of its own Ministers and policies, particularly the Minister of Health, under the guise of obtaining what it called information about the services provided by the Health Commission. The Health Commission is a real fat cat when it comes to PR and promotion, having chalked up \$500 000 in PR expenditure last financial year, apparently.

One of the agencies handling approximately half the Government's advertising business—just over \$4 million—is owned and controlled from outside South Australia, so the money is not going to South Australian business. Whether of course the competence of that firm is greater than that of all South Australian advertising agencies is a question. I very much doubt, of course, whether its prices are competitive. I would not mind betting that agency does the ALP's advertising and when it comes time for election campaigns, we will have that confirmed again. The article states:

The need for proper promotion of Government services is not in question: the proper disposal of revenue dollars, and their responsible use, is.

Small wonder that the brochure *Tax Talk* includes comments like that.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Which union movement is that—the AMIEU?

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Yes, that dispute is going on now—

Mr LEWIS: It is a shocking thing, with devastating consequences for export industries in Australia as we fail to meet our contracts overseas, and the tragedy of it is that it is having the greatest impact on our primary industries which underpin our balance of payments position as well as our economy more especially than any other industry. We are seen as unreliable suppliers because of illegal actions by bloodyminded unionists who will not accept either the law or the umpire's decision and who believe that, just because they cannot get an increase in their membership, they should black ban any industrial development taking place in those circumstances.

Mudginberri is a case in point. They do not have an argument when it comes to award rates, as all the chaps are paid award rates. There is no argument on that score. There are two main reasons for the dispute: one I have already outlined, namely, that they are not getting any more members; secondly, that the chaps who are non members and who have negotiated their own deal with the proprietor/manager of Mudginberri are making more money than anyone else in that union in any other meatworks anywhere in the Commonwealth.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: With the full support—

Mr LEWIS: Yes, with full support. It is appalling that this Government and the Federal Government not only condone it but stand by idle, allowing it to happen, knowing the consequences for Australian export industries and Australia's reputation overseas as to its reliability to supply meat contracts.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: As well as that, disruption from the paddock to the plate.

Mr LEWIS: Yes. I will certainly allow the honourable member to outline in the course of his remarks later the way in which it disrupts the whole process of getting produce from the paddock to the plate.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Alexandra has already spoken in the debate.

Mr LEWIS: Whilst the member for Alexandra has spoken in this debate, I guess he will have opportunity, during the

course of grievance debate on the budget, to say something about it then. We can support demonstrations on the road to Roxby Downs and ruin the prospect of that industry becoming as strong as it might have been, or at least putting it at risk!

I now turn to the benefits to be derived from privatising enterprises that belong to Government. By and large the contributions made on this topic by members opposite illustrate their ignorance, in which I am sure they are very blissful. If they are not ignorant—and some are more intelligent than that and have read more widely, so they cannot claim ignorance in this instance—they are blatantly untruthful and seek to misrepresent the position. All who have made contributions in this debate on that topic have inaccurately, erroneously and deceitfully introduced the subject of whether or not TAA, Qantas or other Commonwealth owned enterprises will be privatised by the Olsen Liberal Government after we come to office in the next few months. Of course, that is just not on, because they are not part and parcel of State Government responsibility.

This parliamentary Party—the Liberal Party in the South Australian Parliament—has no policy in relation to those federal instrumentalities. It does have a policy in relation to State instrumentalities, designed to ensure that State owned enterprises, and more particularly the people who work in them, will have their viability and job security assured for ever. They will be able to enjoy the profits of their labours. They simply have to buy those State owned enterprises from the States, from South Australia in particular. The benefit they will derive from it will then be the profits they can make. They claim that they generate revenue for the State Treasury, and that I do not doubt. They could make a better fist of it, I am sure, if they were given the chance to make decisions about the commercial direction those enterprises should take. They could do it far more effectively than could Ministers on the bench opposite or any of the Ministers' private staff advisers. Not one of them has had any experience whatever in any private enterprise operation.

It would not therefore surprise me—indeed, it does not surprise me—to hear workers from State Government instrumentalities saying that they could do things more efficiently if only they were allowed the freedom to do so. Well, we will give them that opportunity. They will be able to buy those instrumentalities themselves as cooperatives, and I am sure that the State Banking Corporation will assist them in the process.

There is a scheme known as the Kelso scheme which was put together, as it were, to refloat firms which were in the hands of liquidators or receivers in the United States, and it has a very high percentage success rate. When a firm gets into trouble or shareholders' funds are lost, the value of assets therefore only equals the value of liabilities, and there is nothing left for the shareholders' funds, so the shareholders have no interest; it is gone. If the firm then is handed over to a board of management elected by the workers, who become cooperative owners of it and define the direction in which the business goes from that point forward, they have in the main become profitable. Well over 95 per cent have come back from the brink of complete annihilation to profitability, growth, strength and expansion.

In the case of the Kelso scheme, a trust is established. That trust is guaranteed by all the members of the cooperative, the workers in the plant, business or firm. They guarantee it collectively (and by that I mean in legal terms what is called jointly and severally), and the trust then borrows money to continue its production operations. The workers pay back, by a contribution from their pay packets on a weekly basis, the money which is owed by the trust to the lender to that trust to keep the business going. By the

same principle, ESOP (Employees Share Ownership Plan) could be readily, simply and admirably applied to State enterprises which can be privatised. By that—

Mr Ferguson: The Government Printer?

Mr LEWIS: Yes, why not? Do not the printers believe that they are commercially competitive at their rates? Do they not believe that they could hold up their heads in the real world of competition and indeed expand staff numbers? Have they such a poor estimation of their competence that they think themselves incapable of surviving as workers in the private sector?

Mr Ferguson: So you are going to privatise the Government Printer?

Mr LEWIS: I did not say that the Olsen Government is going to privatise the Government Printer. I am just saying that I believe that the people who work there believe themselves to have the competence to survive in a privately owned enterprise. In my personal opinion, I would give them the opportunity, but I have no idea whether or not that will occur. I put to the honourable member that, as a matter of principle, there is no question about the fact that the people who work in State owned enterprises would be better off if they owned the enterprise that they worked in, and the State would be better off because there would not be a need at any time in the future for any contribution from general revenue to those enterprises.

Mr Hamilton: What about the Film Corporation?

Mr LEWIS: If the Film Corporation were to be owned by its employees, would they run it into bankruptcy within 12 months? Does the honourable member really have such a poor opinion of their management, their creative abilities and marketing abilities, or does he believe that they should have the right to contribute to the State taxes that they would pay if they were the owners of the enterprise in which they work, in the same way as does any other film company that pays taxes or makes fruit boxes or shoes, or prints newspapers, for that matter? Those enterprises pay their State taxes like any other enterprise in the State economy. They make profits and distribute their profits to their shareholders. It is my judgment that in the future the enterprises that will survive and be strongest in our economy in the middle and long term will be those enterprises that are substantially owned by the people who work in them, whether one or two people or 1 000 or 2 000 people. They will be the ones that go, because they will be the ones that are not hidebound in the ideological argument of adversary advocacy that presently bedevils our industrial relations scene.

I know that honourable members opposite do not like that kind of argument, because it completely destroys the power base which they have in the ALP as it stands in its present composition. The unions have the substantial majority of votes in determining the preselection of people who get endorsements in that Party and, therefore, when they are elected to the Parliament after being endorsed as ALP members, any policy decision that is made by the Party has to take into account the fact that the union movement is determined to survive for its own sake, not for the sake of increasing the prosperity of the population at large, the workers who do the work in the community—no, for its own sake.

In the kind of industrial society that I am advocating, there would be no necessity for a trade union where the shareholders of the business are indeed the people who work there, by and large. The rest of the capital that they need is borrowed from the money market by the trust which they set up as the funding operation, and they borrow that money in the form of debentures and go into the open money market to do so in competition with everyone else who wants to borrow that money.

It is interesting to me that members opposite have gone very silent, very quiet. They obviously have not thought it through or, in thinking it through and understanding the truth of what I am saying, it is an embarrassment to them politically. I can accept that that is so. In time, that will happen, in spite of anything they or I may do. The firms that will survive will be the firms that are substantially owned by the people who work in them.

I want to give some examples of cases where privatisation has been outstanding in socialist and capitalist governments—that is, conservative governments or left wing governments elsewhere in the world. Of course, the classic example at the present time is the Spanish Government, which has already privatised a lot of firms and intends to do more so. An article by Tim Brown, of *The Sunday Times*, states:

Spain's avowedly socialist Government is planning further sales of State-owned industries to private companies.

When we look at comments about that from Government supporters, the leader of the socialist General Workers Union, Mr Nicholas Redondo, says:

I'm not saying that this Government is following a reactionary line, but in some cases it coincides with Ronald Reagan's—

this bloke supports it—

Soon after coming to power 2½ years ago, the socialist Prime Minister, Mr Felipe Gonzalez, told corporate executives in Madrid: The public sector cannot be the graveyard for white elephants.

Is that what honourable members opposite really want? Look at the Riverland Cannery, the Clothing Factory, the Glove Factory, and things like that. Do they really want the public sector to be the graveyard for what were private sector enterprises that came unstuck, for white elephants, indeed? The final paragraph in that article is a comment attributed to Mr Celedonio Martinez:

'We're no longer for nationalisation', the general secretary of the socialist Chemical Workers Association, Mr Celedonio Martinez, said. 'I don't think it solves anything.'

That is his opinion of it, but the facts remain that the Spanish Government has made an outstanding success of privatisation of companies in Spain. Privatisation has been successful with AMDEL during 1985, where the State and Federal Governments jointly got together to do that. If that is valid in the context of AMDEL, how can members opposite in the Government at the present time argue philosophically that it is invalid, that it is inappropriate, that it is unwise or unfair, unjust or uneconomic, or that it is not going to benefit the State?

Why did the Government do it then, if it is all those things? I am saying to members opposite that it is commonsense to do it, and the sooner we do it the better, because it gives relief from dependence on taxpayers in the very same industry in the private sector which is running at a profit and which has to pay taxes to prop up inefficient Government enterprises in the public sector which are in competition and cannot make ends meet. If that is not the scenario there should not be any hang up about privatisation, anyway.

Of course, in the mini-budget in May, Paul Keating said that he would transfer administration of the defence service home loans scheme to the private sector. He also said that he would sell off the huge Belconnen business complex in Canberra to the private sector: in fact, it has been advertised for sale. He also said that the planned Tuggeranong shopping town would be developed and operated by private sector interests, thereby avoiding the need for additional Federal borrowings to fund the project.

In other words, it would be done by viable entry into the money market—national or international—to get the funds necessary. In West Germany, France, Turkey, Italy, Cuba and Spain that has been done. I have seen it myself in

China while I was there just 10 months ago. In the Middle East some public hospitals are contracting out all the ancillary services, including management functions. In the United States, Canada, Holland, France, Belgium and Denmark there has been privatisation, in whole or in part, in the delivery of public health and hospital services.

Those examples come from all around the world where this policy has been tried, not only in the United Kingdom where it has been an outstanding success. There is a huge list of enterprises which have been very successful after privatisation and which were a burden to the taxpayer prior to it. Other countries, as I said, have followed this policy and have demonstrated its success. After coming to office at the next election, the Liberal Party intends to follow precisely the same line here in South Australia for all the very good reasons I have outlined.

In the time left to me, I simply wish to say something about the Murray Valley management review functions and how much I applaud what is going on, but how much I regret that I was not notified of the meetings.

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

Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the motion and also extend my sympathies to the families of the two former members who have passed on. I refer in particular to Leslie Claude Hunkin and John Clark, who of course was the member for Elizabeth during my time in this place. To all who knew him, he was a man with a very sharp wit. Although he and I clashed on a number of occasions, nevertheless he was a good politician who served his constituency for a long time. Also, I wish all members who are to retire—my parliamentary colleagues on both this side and the other side of the House—a long, healthy and happy retirement. In particular, I refer to Allan Rodda, the member for Victoria—my colleague and friend—who I suppose could be termed the father or elder of the House, because he has been here the longest and will be missed. Allan is always willing to step in and help, and one can go to him for advice and guidance. Indeed, he was very good to me when I first arrived in this strange place. He is also a colleague of mine on the Public Works Standing Committee—the senior committee of this Parliament, although not regarded as such in some places. That committee, which has operated very well over many years, is a non-political committee on which all of us who are members have a job to do for the State, no matter what our politics may be.

That brings me to mention my old friend George Whitten, member for Price and Chairman of the Public Works Standing Committee, who will also be retiring at the end of this Parliament. I say to him the same as I say to my other colleagues: we have had some very good times while, on occasions, we have fought it out tooth and nail here, sometimes winning and sometimes losing. Nevertheless, outside this Chamber one is no longer the enemy one appears to be inside it when possibly trying to get a point across.

The Hon. Jack Wright, Minister of Labour and Deputy Premier for so long, will also be retiring. I appreciate his friendship: he has been very good to me, especially at times when I may have needed the words of encouragement he offered. I have always appreciated the manner in which Jack Wright has given that encouragement, advice and help.

I also wish you well in your retirement, Mr Deputy Speaker. You came into this place in 1970 at the same time as I became a member, when a number of other new members also entered Parliament. I am quite sure that you are well satisfied with your time here, and you should be quite happy in that those for whom you have worked—your constituents—would thank you for a job well done.

The Address in Reply to the Governor's speech, of course, sets out Government policy. Although it does not state it directly, in many instances it means that the Government will be taking taxes from the people, irrespective of what is said about giving some tax back. The Labor Government, like all socialist Governments, is a high taxation Government. Socialism means high taxation, and it is Labor philosophy to be able to spend people's dollars for them better than they themselves can spend the money. Therefore, a Labor Government has to rip more off the taxpayers. When a Labor Government is not getting enough (which is usually the case, because it is always in trouble trying to balance the books) it has to find other ways and means of getting more money from taxpayers' pockets.

This has been proved to be the case throughout the world. The United Kingdom has had doses of socialism from time to time when those Governments, which have eventually been overturned, have hit the people's pockets hard. It is then left to right of centre governments to bring things back to the proper perspective. After all, whether in Australia or in other parts of the world such as the United Kingdom, businessmen of any acumen rarely figure in Labor Party ranks or on Labour Governments' benches in Parliament.

I am glad that the Whip, the member for Ascot Park, agrees with me; indeed, from where I stand, I see very few members on the other side who have ever been in business. They might have had many other careers: they might be what one could term 'intellectuals', but few have had actual business experience, which is what one needs in government. After all, running the State is the biggest business in the State, and running the country is the biggest business in the country. Therefore, one needs some idea of business—not just being able to add up figures and think that that is it.

Of course, experts undertaking various intellectual pursuits profess to know all the answers. People may be very clever, but in reality one must have experience to know what a business is all about and how to operate it. With all due respect to the Premier and his team, they really could not conduct a business, and I think they would find it difficult to run even a cake stall.

Mr Trainer: Tell us about the business you were in, John.

Mr MATHWIN: I began with an apprentice, and at one stage I had 11 people working for me. We were involved in the building industry, in which it was hard to keep going and to keep one's head above water. However, we were able to do so and the chaps who worked for me were able to earn a very decent living.

Mr Trainer: Why did you give it up?

Mr MATHWIN: One has to proceed along the various walks of life and meet different people. I thought, 'What better place to come to in order to meet people from all walks of life, whether they be teachers, engine drivers, porters, or industrial engineers?'

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Appleby): Order! The honourable member should be making a speech, not answering questions.

Mr MATHWIN: In relation to the Governor's speech, which, of course, outlines Government policy, on page 5 His Excellency stated:

Amendments will also be made in the coming session to the Mental Health Act.

I wonder how far those amendments will go. I suppose that when the Bill is prepared it will be released to the media. On a Sunday morning we may be able to read all about it in the paper and, finally, the Bill will be presented to us here. That is different from the way it used to be. Bills used to be first introduced in this place and then fully explained in the second reading explanation given by the Minister introducing the Bill. In those days Ministers had to read

the whole explanation. However, we are now cutting corners, and, in the same way that a smoker sitting at a table might get upset if refused permission to smoke, a Minister gets upset if refused leave to insert in *Hansard* a second reading explanation without his reading it. It may be considered that such refusal is wasting time, but at least the explanation gives members some idea of the content of the Bill.

In relation to the Mental Health Act amendments, I hope that consideration will be given to cases involving people who are in correctional institutions. There are a number of prisoners at Yatala whom no-one wants: they are not wanted in the correctional institutions, because they are hard to manage or handicapped in some way, and they are not wanted in the hospital attached to Yatala Labour Prison because they are too hard to handle. The people concerned are somewhere in between, but they really need some medical treatment. I could cite a number of instances where people have quite wrongly been kept at Yatala and in that type of environment, when they really should have been in a secure mental institution. In some cases this has caused quite a deal of hardship.

I refer to the case of a fellow who was once in Minda: he strayed and was then put into what was previously called the McNally Training Centre. Because of a behavioural problem he was not acceptable there and, because the applicable Act allows this, he was placed at Yatala before he was 18 years of age. He caused a problem there, and the authorities tried to get him hospitalised in the medical section of Yatala. That section would not have him and so he was taken back to Yatala, but he was unable to obtain the required treatment there. It was quite wrong for that young boy to be placed in such an environment, and everyone should be aware of what can happen to young people in prisons. I hope that this problem can be dealt with in the amendments to the Mental Health Act, as I believe there is an urgent need to do something about this matter. In his speech, His Excellency stated:

An office will be established within the Department for Community Welfare to enable non-government agencies to work closely with Government in developing policies and practices to assist those in need.

I hope that this deals not only with certain sections of community welfare but with that part of the department dealing with correctional services, although my personal opinion is that that department should not be handling correctional service matters. I came to that conclusion after undertaking a study tour involving correctional services, juvenile delinquency, and so on. For example, in Canada, juvenile correctional services are managed by different organisations, whether it be the YMCA, the YWCA, or the churches. I visited the Catholic Church in Winnipeg, and in Vancouver programs provided for young people in institutions were far better than anything that could be provided by a Government department and indeed were far cheaper.

In relation to involving Government agencies in community welfare matters, I think that correctional service matters should also be embraced. I think that that is very important indeed, in view of what I have seen operating in other parts of the world, particularly in Canada and Israel where services are provided by agencies other than Government agencies and far more cheaply. His Excellency stated:

My Government recognises that an efficient and effective transport system is necessary for the continued economic development of South Australia.

That is all very well, and it is certainly needed in the southern parts of Adelaide. An extension of the railway line from Hallett Cove to Reynella is a necessity. That work should be undertaken fairly quickly before the massive building programs to be undertaken in the southern areas

are completed. The Deputy Premier, as local member for the area, would be aware of the big increase in building activity at places such as Seaford, Reynella and Morphett Vale. Action must be taken fairly soon to avoid clogging of the roads. Of course, the Government's shocking decision to axe the north-south corridor will only make matters so much worse. In fact, conditions will quickly become completely unbearable. There is another aspect of the provision of services that I want to refer to, and it involves an elderly couple in my constituency. The wife is in a wheelchair, and if her husband wishes to take her interstate by rail it is impossible for him to get his wife on to a train.

Mr Hamilton: How's that?

Mr MATHWIN: This man is able to get the wheelchair on to the train at Brighton, but it cannot be taken across the line when they get off at Keswick. So, the man and his wife must continue to Adelaide, where they are faced with the problem of getting back to Keswick by bus. As the wheelchair cannot be taken on the bus, they cannot return by that method. In any case, such a prolonged trip would cost this pensioner couple \$3 or \$4.

This gentleman, Mr Preston, wrote a letter to the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity and visited that office, as this matter related to facilities for a handicapped person. He complained about the attitude of Australian National and the State Transport Authority. All members, including the member for Albert Park, realise that AN and the STA do not talk to each other: they do not get on. If one gets an idea, the other will not take it up. Of course that is all wrong and should not happen. So, in May, Mr Preston went to the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity and later received the following letter from an officer of that department:

I will therefore explain to you in writing the information I received from the General Manager of Australian National Railways. Mr Williams explained to me that there is a difference between the trains at the Keswick railway terminal and the trains at the Adelaide station. The Keswick railway is owned by Australian National Railway and the Adelaide station is owned by State Transport Authority. Before the Keswick railway had been built, people using trains were able to get off the trains owned by State Transport Authority and change to trains owned by the Australian National Railways, all at the one terminal. Unfortunately passengers now have to disembark at the Adelaide station and be transported by bus, as you stated in your complaint.

This is a fine state of affairs: one would think that they were enemies in the middle of Lebanon. The letter continues:

I discussed the possibility of running a train from the Adelaide station to the Keswick station, but Mr Williams explained that this would cost approximately \$1 million dollars as the gauge for the trains would need to be altered. He did not think this was a viable project for a limited number of travellers. Whilst Mr Williams was sympathetic to the plight of disabled travellers, he was not able to supply me with an acceptable proposal. The Commissioner for Equal Opportunity stated in her letter of 20 February 1985, she was willing to take up the matter with the Australian National Railways on an educative basis.

Educative basis! The fact is that it will cost \$1 million or, alternatively, they should talk to each other and sort out the matter. The letter continues:

Unfortunately there does not seem to be a reasonable solution to the problem.

I have never heard so much balderdash in my life. It is codswallop.

Mr Hamilton: It certainly is.

Mr MATHWIN: I am glad that the member for Albert Park and I are on the same frequency. Having inspected the site at Keswick, I believe that a break could be made in the fence and a track laid at the bottom end by the bridge so that people could alight at Keswick station from a train running from the south to Adelaide and proceed to the terminal without having to cross another railway track.

Mr Hamilton: Why not run a service train straight in there?

Mr MATHWIN: Quite, but I do not want to make it hard for AN and the STA because they do not talk to each other. I agree with the honourable member that the best and easiest method would be to run a train in there. The honourable member has more experience than I but, even with my limited experience, I believe that that would be possible. However, because AN and the STA do not talk to each other, that cannot be done! So, the fence should be broken and a track laid so that a pusher or a wheelchair could be run across from Keswick station to the interstate terminal. That would not cost \$1 million.

Mr Hamilton: Not only wheelchairs, but aged persons, young mothers, kids, and everyone.

Mr MATHWIN: That is correct, including anyone with that type of problem or anyone with a massive amount of luggage. Such a solution would satisfy everyone and it would be cheaper because it would eliminate the cost and inconvenience of returning from Adelaide by bus. I see nothing difficult in that. It is about time that someone did something about it. I realise that the member for Albert Park raised this matter some time ago, but it is only now that I have had someone come to me with a problem. I have now inspected the site and I realise what a problem it is. It is unfair to allow it to continue. To say that it will cost \$1 million to solve is absolute rubbish.

Mr Hamilton: It was poor design in the first place.

Mr MATHWIN: Of course it was. It did not cost much, either—about \$20 million!

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The **ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Glenelg does not need any help from the honourable member for Albert Park.

Mr MATHWIN: The honourable member is helping me, and I do not mind that at all. Paragraph 20 of His Excellency's speech states:

My Government has over the past year brought forward measures designed to ease congestion on the roads leading to the southern suburbs and thus shorten travel times for the residents of the south.

That is a misstatement: it is nowhere near the truth. The axing of the north-south corridor is causing dramatic problems in the south and will continue to do so. For the previous Minister of Transport to say that the Government is merely looking ahead 10 years puts him in the same category as another former Minister (Hon. Geoff Virgo) who said that there would be no movement at all for 10 years. It is ridiculous to say that the present steps will ease the congestion. A fly-over at Darlington may ease congestion to a certain extent, but it will be insufficient. The problem will grow and will be big indeed. It is no good leading people on by including in the Governor's speech a statement that something will be done. The north-south corridor must be completed quickly. The Government must not sit around spluttering about it for the next two or three years.

It is causing massive problems on Brighton Road; it is causing massive problems, and will continue to do so on Morphett Road and in the southern area. It has to be completed as quickly as possible. The Government has said that it realises something must be done, and it will be done at the right time, but the time has long passed for it to take that sort of action. The Governor further said:

My Government will continue to give a high priority to the protection and security of individuals within the community.

I hope that that involves the police. The *News* of 14 August under the heading 'Local bobby will soon be back on the beat' stated:

It will result in a Police Force that is more responsive to local needs and more actively involved in the local community, he said.

That refers to Dr Hopgood. The article further states:

The restructuring involved setting up 16 subdivisions in metropolitan Adelaide to replace the existing 18 sectors. Each subdivision would incorporate a community based police station operating 24 hours a day.

The locations are then mentioned. The article states:

The eight stations now open 24 hours a day were Adelaide, Christies Beach, Darlington, Elizabeth, Holden Hill, Para Hills, Port Adelaide and Stirling.

I hope that the Minister, when he is considering this matter, will look at the situation particularly in the Hallett Cove area, which is a fairly new area where there is a need for a police station. Although the problem of vandalism is not acute, it is bad enough. I believe that, because of the upsurge in housebreakings and the like in the area, a police station should be erected possibly in the vicinity of the new shopping centre. In my opinion, a police station helps give encouragement and confidence to the local constituents. They know that, if help is needed, it is there. Whilst we know that the police cannot be everywhere, I am still of the opinion that the local police station is of some assistance to the community. It certainly gives people confidence to know that, if assistance is required, the police can arrive quickly.

Over the years the trend seems to have reverted to mobile cars and the like. I suppose that that has followed world trends and is part of normal progress. Nevertheless, I understand that in the United Kingdom and Scotland they are returning to the bobby on the beat. There is nothing like having a policeman at hand. It is a good name; it is an honoured name and I think any member of the force would be honoured to be called a good policeman. I think that the return to the stations within different areas is a step in the right direction.

A recent publication by the Victims of Crime Service, of which I am a member, has an article relating to this topic and it states:

... intrusion into our home space is a violation of one's self. I know some victims who finally had to move because of the fear that they would be broken into again. I know some folk who rarely go out at night because they fear having to return to a dark empty house. I know people who have spent considerable sums of money trying to make their home a fortress within which they can be safe from aggressors. Housebreaking is not the same as shoplifting and other property offences which cause little fear in the community. Stealing a motor car seldom causes any great change of lifestyle afterwards, but burglars do. Yet I notice that some housebreakers are being given community service orders as appropriate punishment for their crime. When community service orders were first introduced it was stated quite categorically they were for minor offenders only.

I agree with that. As is stated by Mr Whitrod in that article, housebreaking is not a minor offence. Because not much money is stolen, or only money is stolen, some people might regard housebreaking as a minor offence, but for the victims it is a serious matter which affects them for many months afterwards, if not for all time.

In some cases I believe the courts are far too lenient when they order the continual housebreaker to perform only community service work. I believe that is wrong and that is not what the legislators had in mind. I agree entirely with the sentiments expressed in the article. Some statistics are also listed in the publication relating to housebreakers.

The establishment of a local police station would give the people within the community some hope and confidence and it would be a good public relations exercise. The publication also deals with the Criminal Law Consolidation Act and states that amendments will also be made to the Evidence Act, with which I am quite familiar, because I have

twice tried to amend it myself. The amendments suggested are as follows:

To abolish the right of an accused to make an unsworn statement, except where it is demonstrated to the trial judge that the accused person would be unfairly disadvantaged by being subject to cross-examination by reason of their diminished intellectual capacity or inability to express themselves.

That has been the argument all the way through. I have twice presented a Bill to this House in an attempt to abolish the unsworn statement and all the wrongs associated with that practice. The last time I brought the Bill before the House I could not even get the support of the two female members on the other side of the House for the abolition of the unsworn statement, but at last, after four attempts by the Opposition in both Houses to get the Bill passed, some action is going to be taken. The previous Attorney-General, Mr Griffin, in the other place, and I in this House attempted to get the Bill passed, and at last it is going to be placed before us by the Government, which has now accepted that it is quite wrong for a person, particularly where rape is concerned, to be able to give an unsworn statement and is not able to be interrogated or cross-examined on that statement. Without reflecting on any member, but referring particularly to the two female members of the Labor Party, why has it taken them so long to realise that this practice is quite wrong?

Ms Lenehan: We were not prepared for a quick and cheap solution.

Mr MATHWIN: At the Victims of Crime shelter the member for Mawson said, 'We will see how it works first'. The member for Mawson must have known the dramatic effect unsworn statements had on rape victims and yet, when she had an opportunity to support in this House the abolition of unsworn statements, she failed to do so. I am glad there has at last been a change of heart, because the Bill will now go through this House and become law. That, I believe, is a fine thing. Even a newsletter from Victims of Crime states:

Heard on the 6.30 news the Attorney-General is to move to abolish the unsworn statement. Congratulations to everybody and many thanks.

It was signed by Ray Whitrod. I am sure he must have felt as frustrated as did we on this side of the House that it did not happen years ago, as it ought to have done. So much for that matter.

I hope that the Government and the Premier would do something in this next session in relation to the building regulations and the Building Act. The situation prevails whereby, if anybody wants to build an extension, a new house or a new building, they have to go to ridiculous ends to get it approved through the council and the powers that be. I will quote two instances.

The first refers to a friend of mine who has a big house with very large foundations—far bigger foundations with more rods than those in my house. It has a cellar underneath, as it is on high ground. My friend and his wife decided to have an extra bedroom built upstairs. It was a timber frame extension, no weight at all. He put in an application and the council said that he must obtain an engineers certificate.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Just to put a room upstairs?

Mr MATHWIN: Just to put a room upstairs. The engineer procrastinated, said that it was a big problem and that a soil test was necessary. The house has been there for 24 years and there is hardly a crack in it. So, they had a soil test done. It cost \$2 000 for the services of the engineer. All engineers have to cover themselves because of court orders that have been made as well as challenges in court, and so on. The extension involves a staircase, and anyone who has been in trouble or in a bombing raid knows that there are

only two places to go—by the fireplace or under the stairs. If the building is flattened, those two areas remain—a strong staircase or a chimney. He said that a big pillar would have to be put into the centre of the house.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: This is the engineer. He said that the pad for the pillar had to be four foot square and six foot six inches deep, dug out and filled with concrete, with all the rods. It makes it look like a U-boat pen to hold off 5 000 pound bombs. Having got the pad fixed it is necessary to bolt on an RSJ—a pillar up the centre. This friend of mine is a layman, a chemist, and he asked why it had to be so strong simply for a bedroom. He was told that when the bedroom was built he would be able to have 50 people in it. Who wants to be in a bedroom with 50 people? Imagine this fellow, having a quiet talk or watching television with his wife, with 50 of his friends there! He could tell them that they could jump around as much as they liked, as they would be quite safe in the bedroom. The specification was for 50 people. If it were not so serious you could tickle yourself to death! He is now saddled with that great expense to build a small timber bedroom of no weight.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: But he can have 50 people in bed with him!

Mr MATHWIN: Yes, 50 people in bed with him or sharing his bedroom. It would be a crush, but at least it would be warm.

My daughter, who lives next door to me, built a house on stilts because of the terrain and wanted to enclose one part of it to make a bedroom underneath. The foundations were down, the RSJs were there—the lot. She and her husband went to the council and were told to get an engineer's report and a soil test. Although a soil test was done five years ago when they built the house, they had to have another in case the soil had changed. It takes 20 million years for soil to go to sand, but I suppose that is fairly quick. That was another few hundred dollars. It took months and nobody wanted to make a decision. Finally, they said that they would have to do all sorts of things to the building itself.

The foundations were down. The foundations were a third as wide as mine, deeper, and had more rods than my house foundations, and the RSJs were holding up the building in any case. This was all to put up one course of bricks: brick veneer, with timber inside, filled in around the girders.

It is an absolute farce, ridiculous, and it is making building so expensive that it is impossible for young and old alike to do any extensions or building. There must be an easier way. People are suing councils, engineers, and the like, but the poor people who want to build an extension or new house are having to pay tens of thousands of dollars more than they should. There must be an easier solution than going through all that palaver and time in trying to get a little job done.

Mr S.G. Evans: No one will believe you—I have been trying for years.

Mr MATHWIN: They will have to believe me; it is crazy, ridiculous. No wonder people are becoming frustrated in trying to build extensions onto their house. There must be an easier solution, an agreement to be signed. Heavens above, five amateurs and I poured the foundations for my house. The only crack in my walls is where I happened to put a conduit in the wall facing the wrong way, with a join on the outside resulting in a crack in the plaster. It is ridiculous to go to several lengths to try to fix a situation where there is no problem at all. I hope that the Government will see fit to do something about that.

I hope the Government will do something about the increasing problem of young people on drugs. People are

beginning to regard it as less of a problem, saying that it is no worse than smoking, and so on, but of course, it is. I saw the problem six or eight years ago in America with a new drug now appearing in Australia—angel dust, a synthetic drug now being brought into Australia. It is cheap to make and terrible to use. I was given a report from an American paper that I would like to relate to the House, as it is very true. A judge was imposing a sentence of one year's gaol on a 17 year old youth in America. In handing down his sentence, and speaking directly to the youth, the judge said:

Do you know who is going to serve that year? Not you; your mother and father will serve that year. Your body is in the stockade for a year, but their souls are tormented for a lifetime.

I have not spent five cents raising you. I did not know you from Adam. But your mother and father have put their lives, their hearts, their sweat, their money and everything else they have into bringing you up. Now they have to sit in this court and listen to a total stranger, who had nothing to do with your upbringing, scold you and put you in goal.

This is a time when phoney kids your age are yelling, 'You adults have your alcohol, we want our drugs: you have polluted our water and air, you have polluted this and that and all the rest of the garbage that comes out of your mouths. I want you to hink of this for one year, and the reason why I say it: if you are sick, a doctor will treat you, and he won't be high on drugs; the lawyer who represents you won't be high on drugs and the people in whose custody you will be won't be high on drugs.'

Your astronauts are not on drugs, your President is not, and your legislators are not, and your engineers who built the bridges you drive across and the tunnels you drive through are not on drugs, and those who built the planes you fly in and the cars you drive are not. But in the world of the future, the same may not be true. Teachers, doctors, lawyers, legislators—products of the new drug-oriented generation—may well be as high as kites. You won't know whom to send your child to, or whom to trust your life to. Let's see what kind of a world you leave your children before you talk about the world that we left ours?

That is so true, and I believe that some young people in this present situation, when talking or thinking about going on to drugs, ought to look at the situation in that light, and maybe it would dawn on them that what they are doing to themselves and to our great country of Australia is quite wrong.

Another area which was not mentioned in the speech but which I would like to bring to the attention of the Government is the allocation, which I hope will be increased greatly, to the Surf Life Saving Association of South Australia, and in particular the State centre. At present the State centre of the Surf Life Saving Association receives \$38 000 in a grant from the Government for 19 clubs. Let us compare that with the position in other States. New South Wales has an allocation of \$400 000 for 123 clubs; Victoria has an allocation of \$145 000 for 26 clubs; and Western Australia, with 18 clubs—which is one fewer than South Australia—has an allocation of \$60 000. Tasmania, with seven surf life saving clubs, receives \$15 000, and Queensland receives a massive \$360 000 for 52 clubs.

I know that the system there is different, because they have a subsidy. For each \$1 raised by the surf life savers in Queensland, the subsidy is 75 cents. I believe that the Surf Life Saving Association in South Australia would be happy to have an arrangement for this Government to provide them with a subsidy. To compare that allocation of \$360 000 against our meagre \$38 000 shows a grim situation because, after all, the surf life savers provide a community service. Last summer they effected 112 rescues, provided first aid to 450 cases and performed preventive action in 350 cases. Further to that, they provide education to people within the State, speaking at schools and different organisations such as the scouts and the guides. They give instruction to teachers on surf awareness, and I believe that is a community service. I think that they have been short changed considerably, with an allocation of just \$38 000 in

comparison with those in the other States, especially when the Surf Life Saving Association has such a great record.

I read in the paper that the Premier has decided that, if people give promises, they can make a list of these promises. However, if we had done that at the last election, we would see that the Bannon Government has broken every promise that it made, because we all well remember that, prior to the election and in his election speeches, the Premier, then Leader of the Opposition, promised that there would be no increases in taxes and charges. Up to now we have had 188 increases in taxation. The extra tax, a brand new one, was the FID, which brings in a colossal amount, at a higher percentage than those in the other States. We have had a massive hike of 41 per cent in electricity charges. The Premier has already promised, as a great public benefactor, to give back 2 per cent. The history of the electricity charges goes back to 1972. It was the brain child of Mr Dunstan and Mr Hudson—the brains of the outfit, the economist—who decided to rip off 3 per cent. That went so well and so quietly and brought in so much finance that it was decided to increase it to 5 per cent. That was done. Now the Premier says that he knows it is wrong and so this year—and it happens, coincidentally, that it is just prior to an election—he will give back \$2 a month, but it is a one-off situation. Water and sewerage charges have increased, water costing 50-odd cents per kilolitre, motor vehicle, licences—you name it, there are 188 of them.

As I said when I commenced my speech, the Labor Government, the socialist government, is a high spending government. It always is. It wastes money and overspends. The Ministers cannot run their departments but allow their departments overspend, as they did in very large lumps in the first year in which they came to office. Indeed, the overspending in health and other departments was \$50 million. They have extended the Government departments. They have gone bigger and bigger, taken on more personnel, and taking on more personnel means having to find the money to pay them.

The money for any Government comes from the taxpayer. Although the Government and the Premier might well say that as far as they are concerned there will be no further increases in taxation, who can possibly believe the Premier when he gets up in front of the public and says, 'Maybe I made a mistake last time and did not play the game properly: maybe I was wrong; maybe I have changed my mind. I will be good from now on. You put me back at the next election and I will not increase taxes at all.'

An honourable member: You couldn't be good.

Mr MATHWIN: He could not keep that up, because it could not happen. The honourable member would know that. It will not happen; it is impossible. Government expands—departments grow bigger, and that costs money. We know that it is having problems within the organisation although my opponent, who stretches the truth to its nth degree—

Ms Lenehan: Oh!

Mr MATHWIN: He does. The member for Mawson attended an open meeting with me and my opponent and described us as 'my colleagues.' I am not the colleague of a person who stretches the truth in the way he does, because my opponent peddles untruths blatantly. So, as far as I am concerned I do not want to be described as the colleague of that gentleman. Whether or not the honourable member does is her problem, not mine.

I am the honourable member's parliamentary colleague, and I appreciate the way in which she works in her district. In fact, I have said that publicly. However, the member for Mawson should not class me with my opponent, because he tells blatant untruths. I will say no more about that. If the honourable member wishes me to discuss it further, I

will in a grievance debate. However, she must know that membership of the Labor Party is down 40 per cent. That is why we have compulsory unionism: it brings in money to the Labor Party. People have to pay a levy.

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

Mr KLUNDER (Newland): During this Address in Reply debate I will discuss the question of accountability for Commonwealth transfer payments to the States. I intend to divide my speech into several sections: first, with an examination of the definition of accountability and its relevance to Commonwealth transfer payments; secondly, I will give an outline of the scope of Commonwealth transfers in the South Australian scene; and, thirdly, I will discuss possible options for greater accountability.

In talking about the definition of accountability I am not interested in an accountant's definition; I am interested in accountability from the parliamentary perspective. There is not much sense in talking about compliance auditing: that can be left to Federal and State Auditors-General.

Where once I was content to look to Ministers and senior departmental executives to be accountable in a *post facto* manner, I have gradually come to the conclusion that this is insufficient to meet the needs of the Parliament. I am sure that in stating definitions of accountability, the best known will be those outlined by Gracey in his report on Ministerial Responsibility and Public Bodies in Victoria. To paraphrase from that report, accountability relates to a duty to inform and is *post facto*. The report also contains a valuable explanation of the interrelationship between the terms accountability, control and direction, as follows:

The line between control and direction can become very imprecise. The distinction between the three concepts—accountability, control, direction—is important, however, in any descriptive or prescriptive discussions of Ministerial responsibility for non-departmental bodies. If the relationship between Ministers and such bodies is strictly an accountability relationship, responsibility resides with the body and the Ministerial responsibility is limited. If the relationship is strictly accountability-control the Minister has some responsibility but the onus of responsibility resides with the body. If the relationship is accountability-control-direction then responsibility is shared in roughly equal fashion between the Minister and the body.

It is probably reasonable to interpose that one problem for our politicians is that the voting public not only does not make such fine distinctions but it would argue that the Minister always had total direction, control and accountability and that the public consequently holds the Minister accountable. Regardless of the actual circumstances, an escape from prison or a charge made by a statutory authority are both treated as though the Minister is totally responsible.

To some extent, the public is justified in its view: after all, politicians make the rules by which the game is played and they are, therefore, in the control-direction game to the extent that they want to be. However, the extent to which the mechanism for Commonwealth transfer payments overrides this accountability-control-direction relationship between the Minister and non-departmental bodies has important implications with respect to accountability to Parliament.

To this extent at least, State Parliament does not control its own destiny and it is therefore reasonable to claim that the public is wrong to take such a facile and simplistic view of ministerial responsibility. I would extend also Gracey's analysis to contend that there can be similar implications with respect to departmental bodies which might additionally be considered to be covered by the accountability net.

I now turn my attention to the actual scope of Commonwealth payments. The States receive money from the Commonwealth through a number of avenues, including the State share of taxation revenue through tax sharing grants,

Loan Council borrowings, capital grants and specific purpose payments. I am particularly interested in specific purpose payments as this appears to me to be an area where the State Parliament exercises inadequate control over monies being spent in and on behalf of the State.

State funding can be divided into basically three categories: programs where the funds are incorporated in the State budget through Consolidated Account; secondly, programs where funds do not go through the budget—that is Consolidated Account—but which are paid to State departments or authorities and are subjected to reasonably close departmental or ministerial control; and, thirdly, programs where funds come from the State but in respect of which the State acts virtually as a post box by simply passing funds on to statutory or non-government bodies.

The third category, in particular, is one which raises several questions about the extent to which Parliament is getting sufficient information on the accountability model. In 1983-84 specific purpose payments in these three categories totalled \$472 million for recurrent and \$218 million for capital purposes. By further subdividing those payments using the categories I have just outlined, in category 1 (the money that goes through the Consolidated Account) payments amounted to \$247 million for recurrent funds and \$39.5 million for capital purposes.

The payments in the second category (where the money does not go through the Consolidated Account but goes to organisations which are under reasonably close ministerial control or direction) amounted to \$9 million for recurrent purposes and \$149 million for capital purposes. The payments in the third category (where the State acts as little more than a post box) amounted to \$311 million in recurrent funds and \$29 million in capital purpose funds.

I point out that the figures I have just given are in total larger than the overall amounts of the specific purpose transfers I mentioned as a total. This occurs because some payments fit into more than one category and I have not found it practicable or indeed necessary to isolate individual components for categorisation as the principle is not affected by the arithmetic.

As can be seen, the majority of the payments coming into the State do not pass through the Consolidated Account and are not subject to State parliamentary scrutiny through the budget process. Without wishing to enter into a prolonged debate on the matter of Commonwealth control of finances, I think it would be useful to summarise the arguments about the advantages and disadvantages of the present state of inter-governmental financial relationships in Australia. The basic strength has been seen to derive from the ability gained by the Commonwealth to promote economic stability and growth. The institution of uniform taxation is also cited as another advantage of Commonwealth control in that it permits similar treatment of all Australians.

Speaking from the perspective of a State parliamentarian, I can cite some of the disadvantages which can result: the lack of independence by States in the allocation of expenditure; a mismatching of priorities for expenditure between the States and the Commonwealth; and a potential for neither State nor Commonwealth to accept responsibility for the provision of certain services. In federal finance, Mathews and Jay argue:

A practical effect of this is that such important Government services as education, health, law and order, roads, housing, water supply and sewerage are inadequately provided. The problems of large cities are especially said to be a by-product of the present system of divided responsibility.

Specific purpose grants in particular can be seen to have a detrimental impact on State decision making, particularly where the Commonwealth provides funds under conditions

whereby the States are required to match either the whole or a portion of the grant from their own resources. The tying of grants in this way raises some interesting questions of accountability. If the States are not involved in the decision to allocate funds or to generate the taxes to raise funds for a particular purpose, then they have no responsibility to justify expenditure in those areas.

For example, it is very easy for a State to agree with community groups that not enough money is being spent in a particular area. While the service is largely funded through specific purpose payments from the Commonwealth, the State can merely turn back to community groups, indicate its agreement that more money is required and urge them to exert pressure on the Federal Government. The State is not required to balance the expenditure in that area against other needs to be met from within the State budget.

Without dwelling on possible solutions to this matter, I think it is sufficient to say that from a State perspective there is a lack of accountability for these forms of Commonwealth transfers. I note in passing though that, while one option touted for the States to gain control is to refuse the Commonwealth funding—what one might call negative accountability—I can think of no example of this being put into practice.

I have already mentioned the extent to which the mechanism of Commonwealth funding through specific purpose payments can result in a cop out for the various State Governments. It could certainly be an easy means of governing to disavow responsibility and proceed merrily to spend whatever money is available. However, I believe that State Parliaments need to scrutinise all expenditure, even that falling from the heavens, because of the impact that this can have on the State's own finely tuned development and expenditure proposals. Nor can it be assumed that the manna will be everlasting. This is another important reason for States to examine carefully whether the expenditure proposed is consistent with the State's own priorities.

As a case in point, I cite the example of the School Dental Service in South Australia. I am sure that members will have no difficulty whatsoever in thinking of any number of similar examples. In the case of the School Dental Service, prior to the injection of federal funding, this service in South Australia was proceeding, albeit at a much slower rate than subsequently occurred. What is important is that expenditure was in line with the priorities determined by the State and approved as part of the Budget processes in Parliament. The injection of federal funds meant that the program could proceed more rapidly both in terms of staff training and capital expenditure on clinics.

However, the subsequent withdrawal of the Commonwealth from this program meant that the State was left holding the bag—probably a much larger bag than it originally wished to hold at that time. This is not to say that the scheme would not have developed in a similar vein. What is doubtful is whether the State would ever have had the funds available to finance expansion at the rate at which it took place. Consequently, at the time when Commonwealth funding was withdrawn, the State was left with the responsibility for a much larger organisation.

Federal funding may release some State funding for other purposes and the State may undertake an obligation which otherwise it would not have accepted. The danger in relation to that is that if the Federal Government then withdraws its funding, the State Government is faced with having to continue the obligation which voluntarily it undertook while also providing the funding for the undertaking originally funded by the Federal Government. Given the level of commitment in which the State can then find itself both in terms of capital and recurrent expenditure, I believe that it

would have been valuable for the Parliament to have taken a stronger role in scrutinising expenditure and questioning whether the funding program matched the State priorities.

A second example relates to the the Highways Fund. That fund is a special case. The Parliament has decreed that certain State charges and taxes should not pass through the Budget, but should go directly into the Highways Fund, by means of a process of hypothecation and, further, that the Highways Fund shall be under the control of the Commissioner of Highways. As well as this, the special grants from the Commonwealth also bypass the Parliament and go directly into the Highways Fund. Here then is a case where neither State nor Federal funds pass through State Parliament and where the control and direction of those funds does not rest with the State Minister of Transport.

I think we must be concerned that the Parliament of this State is not debating the massive expenditure on road networks: \$64 million for roads and \$27.5 million for the bicentennial road development in 1983-84. The implications of this for accountability are vast. The annual program of works is the document which details proposed expenditure on roads, including projects funded by Commonwealth grants. This document is not debated in Parliament. In the case of the Highways Fund, the Parliament has, in my opinion at least, voluntarily relinquished such control as it might have had.

It should also be noted that, by establishing specific purpose payments, the Commonwealth neatly bypasses the need to set up its own bureaucratic structure. While many service costs are wholly funded by the Commonwealth, there is still an extent to which the State is committed to expenditure on personnel to provide the service to be funded. Here I am referring not just to the professional or technical service providers but also to the clerical (for example, administrative and accounting) staff which provide an input (albeit as overheads) to the service. In view of this commitment by the State, I believe that there are further reasons for the State involving itself in accountability questions with respect to Commonwealth transfers.

What are the solutions? An option might be to re-examine the process of the specific purpose payment. At present the method of direct payment or non-inclusion of the payments in the State's budget means that the State Parliament has no opportunity to review the effects of expenditure. If these funds were to be included in the State budget, there would be some opportunity for Parliament to review proposed expenditure. An argument against this is that, if the moneys are tied to specific purposes, the debate is likely to be futile.

Yet, it might be possible to have a specific area grant, which may be more flexible in allowing the State to determine just where the priorities for expenditure are within, say, the primary education area. State Parliaments could then require Ministers and departmental heads to be more accountable for the expenditure of money and the allocation of resources within those specific areas. I would also suggest that accountability would be fostered if the funding process took more account of the need to plan and allocate resources across a longer time span than the fixed financial year. There has been much debate on the need for three or five-year rolling programmes for expenditure, and I do not intend to canvass that here.

The present approach promotes a shortsighted view to management and does not encourage longer term planning. It also encourages a peculiar spending attitude that can best be termed a fourth quarter syndrome, whereby everyone seeks to spend all money available within the financial year for fear of a budget cut in the following year if there is any surplus in the current year.

If the State Parliament does not, or cannot, include these special purpose payments in its deliberations by dealing

with them during the budget process, then the State Parliament is irrelevant to that portion of the State's effort. I would not like to be misquoted on that: I did not say that the Government is irrelevant. Indeed, the Ministers still, to a large extent, have the disposal of that money within their control and direction, and the Cabinet might be able to move other funds around if those funds had been freed by the special purpose grants. However, the State Parliament has been ignored and has accepted that it has become irrelevant to the degree that it has been ignored.

Further, while I have no objection to the State Parliaments being disbanded as part of a revamping of the Australian political structure, I do not believe that the State Parliaments should be laid to rest by stealth. Nor is it particularly relevant how well or how badly the State Parliament deals with the budget process (and members may well have a whole range of opinions on that subject), but by dealing with the budget at all, in any form, the State Parliament accepts responsibility.

It may be argued that the Parliament can, *post facto*, send the Public Accounts Committee in to check, on behalf of Parliament, whether the funds were spent effectively and efficiently, and it may be argued that the Parliament is in this way checking on the use of special purpose payments. However, to me this approach fails on two counts. First, a *post hoc* check on how someone else's priorities have been carried out is no substitute for having set those priorities oneself. Secondly, the Public Accounts Committee Act, as it stands at present, may not allow the checking by the committee of all the areas covered by specific purpose payments.

In concluding, I will not pretend that this paper is in any shape or form a definitive one. However, it raises questions and postulates possible solutions that need to be considered by members if the State Parliament is to continue to hold that it is important in the lives of the people of this State.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF PARLIAMENT

Adjourned debate on the motion of Hon. B.C. Eastick:
That the report be noted.

(Continued from 15 August. Page 337.)

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): I support the motion and, in so doing, I wish to make a few brief remarks on the report and my interpretation of it. The committee has been working on this matter since 12 May 1983, but informal investigations have taken place in this building on the Parliamentary working structure for many years before that. Indeed, this undertaking has probably been ongoing formally and informally for about five years. Therefore, the people involved have had a long time in which to come to a consensus and agreement on how Parliament should be managed administratively.

I compliment the committee on its work. Both sides of the Chamber, indeed both political Parties, have been able to come together in a way that we do not often see, to produce a result which members have before them. Unfortunately, members have not had an amount of time in proportion to the time given the committee to consider the results of the committee's work. I believe that those results deserve considerable attention and scrutiny so that all members may derive the maximum benefit from an understanding of the committee's work.

It is essential that reassessment of the administrative basis of Parliament take place. The Joint House Committee has

operated successfully for many years but, especially in employment terms, there are some shortcomings in the legal basis of the administration of Parliament, and this report goes a long way to setting those straight. The establishment of a Joint Services Committee is an excellent step forward to put the administration of Parliament on a sensible footing and enable the management techniques of the 1980s to be applied rather than those of the 1940s and 1950s. Therefore, I compliment the committee on its report.

However, I draw to the attention of the House one area which I believe deserves substantial reconsideration, although I do not intend that that be done on this occasion. I believe that it would have been much better for the Parliament as a whole if the House of Assembly and Legislative Council officers could have been brought together under the one administration because considerable benefit would have been derived if we could have brought all the employees of this Parliament under the one umbrella. The present position is bad enough, but we are replacing it with circumstances where, say, two-thirds of the employees of Parliament will be looked after properly: their employment conditions will be set out in an Act of Parliament that is clear and concise; they will have clear management lines of responsibility; they will have certain rights and responsibilities, as well as adequate leave provisions and adequately set out conditions of employment; they will know what is required of them in terms of discipline; and certain penalties will be provided for breaches of that discipline. The whole system has been well established and set out by the committee.

However, that leaves out the employees of both the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council, and that is an aspect with which I am concerned. I have not had the benefit of the same degree of understanding of this issue which I am sure committee members have had, and I bow to their experience in this matter. They have had considerable time to research and come to an understanding on this matter, and I am sure that the factors that they have taken account of were compelling. However, I believe that I should place on record at this time, although I do not intend to move amendments, my wish that in future years we could perhaps move toward the situation where the rights, responsibilities, duties and obligations of all staff are correctly defined for this Parliament in a single piece of legislation, because one cannot separate the House of Assembly and Legislative Council staff from all the other staff in this place and say that they are indeed set apart.

The legal basis for the employment of staff of the House of Assembly varies considerably. Much of it is questionable, relying as it does on historical precedents alone. I doubt whether some of the officers employed under the authority of the President or the Speaker have any protection at law. Nor do I believe that this Parliament would have recourse if these officers breached discipline in some way that will be provided by the Bill in respect of the joint services staff. So, I believe that there would be considerable advantages in bringing these people together under a single Act.

Further, there can be no more difficult and dangerous situation industrially than to have staff in a single building rubbing shoulders day by day and hour by hour, yet working under different industrial and employment conditions. That is perhaps the simplest recipe for industrial chaos that one could imagine. Parliament, although it sets high and exacting standards for those outside, including those in the Public Service, to some extent has abandoned those standards in fixing the conditions of its own employees, because it has created a condition where there are those in the House of Assembly, those in the Legislative Council, and those in the joint services. By creating that separation, Parliament has created the opportunity for dissension and subsequent dispute.

Those employees who are left out in the cold, legislatively speaking, lack protection, as well as the obligations which this Act will correctly place on and bind in respect of other officers employed in this Parliament. Therefore, in that context, although I do not intend to pursue the matter further at this stage, I believe that it must be seriously considered in the future. Should I be a member in the next Parliament, I will raise it at the appropriate time. The Government of the day will no doubt want to take the matter further then, because if, as I believe, the joint services administration proves to be an effective and efficient means of joint service operation of this House, I am sure that it could equally well be extended in the future to all employees of the Parliament. I hope that other members may care to comment on that at the appropriate time.

The Bill, which is annexed to the Select Committee's report and which I understand will be before the House soon, includes some detailed and appropriate provisions in respect of the staff. I do not intend to go into those matters at present, because I do not consider that that would be appropriate. However, I certainly will, at the appropriate time when the Bill is before the House, be making a number of points of detail which I will ask honourable members to consider.

Whilst I strongly support the basic philosophy of the committee and commend it for the way in which it has undertaken the brief given to it by the Parliament on 12 May 1983, it is with the reservation that I believe there is further potential for development in the future. I support the motion before the Chair.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I am thankful for the contributions which have been made by the Deputy Premier and the member for Elizabeth. I believe that the opportunity that has been taken by many members to look at the report which was circulated has alerted a number of members to difficulties or situations which they did not previously appreciate.

The member for Elizabeth indicated that he would like to have seen the matter taken further. In fact, I referred to that situation myself. However, what we have to accept is that, in the political arena, there are the achievable and the unachievable. More specifically that is the case in an area where there are traditions which attach to two Houses of Parliament. To have attempted or to even now attempt to change circumstances relating to those matters would see the demise, I am quite sure, of the Bill in another place. In fact, amendments other than those which are strictly technically necessary could have that effect upon the passage of the Bill.

The decisions were not reached lightly and they were tested one against the other. In some circumstances it was necessary to retract from a position which had been held even days or weeks before, after the full impact of one measure on another became apparent. I am delighted that we have achieved this result. I know that Mr Speaker and the other members of the committee are delighted that they have achieved the results which seemed, in the early stages, so far from reality or possibility.

I say to the member for Elizabeth that I think the important thing is that, by the committee of the three service sectors working functionally and effectively together, there will be a clear indication of the benefits that can flow from cooperation and cooperative effort. I believe that that will flow over.

The document that was placed before the House as recently as last Thursday, the report of the Librarian for the year 1984-85, is an excellent document, which I commend to other members. The Librarian referred on a number of occasions to the importance, in today's world, of the com-

puter, and of the need for computerisation to a degree where we can have recovery of information so that we may better service members in their enquiries about a whole range of subjects. One of the pleas which the Librarian and other officers of the parliamentary family have made over a period of time has been the extreme importance of ensuring that there is a compatibility of equipment which is brought into the Parliament. The idea of one sector having equipment which does not dovetail into the other departments or the other equipment which is available must surely be something of considerable concern to any member of Parliament who wants to see efficiency and value for money.

The Librarian made those points effectively in that document. He also referred to the importance of communication between the various branches. On page 9 of his report he states:

And it is proposed that shortly the Government Computing Centre and the library will make a joint proposal for funds into the feasibility of developing the project further.

The report goes on to state (and this is the critical part to which I want to refer):

The lack of a proper framework within which these essentially cooperative developments can be discussed is still felt and there has in the current year regrettably been no further progress on the proposed Parliamentary Services Bill which was referred to in last year's annual report. A forum for the regular discussion of matters of common interest to all the departments of the Parliament is still sorely needed. It is instructive to note that the Australian Parliaments which have developed most quickly in introducing automated systems have embraced the concepts of cooperation, discussion and the development of an overall strategy for their Parliament.

Those views were so well expressed by the Librarian and I think that they were at the very core of what the committee had in mind and what it has almost achieved. I say to the member for Elizabeth and other honourable members yet again that I believe that, by example, the benefits of the proposed legislation will be forthcoming.

Motion carried.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

PARLIAMENT (JOINT SERVICES) BILL

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the appointment, and to regulate the conditions of service, of officers who serve both Houses of Parliament; to facilitate the provision of joint services to the Houses of Parliament; to repeal the Joint House Committee Act 1941; and to make related amendments to the Public Service Act 1967. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This is very much a matter that has come from the Select Committee. Although obviously the Government endorses what the Select Committee has done, I do not see this so much as a Government measure as one which arises from the concern of the whole of the House. In Committee I will be quite happy on those grounds to yield to honourable members who may wish to make some contribution where particular questions may be asked. I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill is an exact copy of the Bill annexed to the report of the Joint Committee on the Administration of Parliament presented to the House.

As I am sure members would by now be aware, the Bill is principally concerned with the employment of the officers who serve both Houses and the provision of joint services. As mentioned in the report of the Joint Committee, the Bill—

- (a) creates a joint parliamentary service concerning those employees;
- (b) sets forth their conditions of employment; and
- (c) provides for various other matters that are for the most part presently embodied in the Joint House Committee Act, 1941.

Central to the structure of this Bill is the creation of a Joint Parliamentary Service Committee. The committee will be a corporate body consisting of members of both Houses; it will be constituted by both Government and Opposition members; the two Presiding Officers will be *ex officio* members. Appointed members of the committee will hold office until the first sitting day after a general election for the House of Assembly. Provision is made for the appointment of alternate members. The chairman of the committee will alternate between the office of the President and the Speaker, each acting for an alternate calendar year. The first chairman is to be the most senior Presiding Officer.

As recommended by the Joint Committee, the proposed committee will have clear authority to employ officers and regulate the performance of their duties. In turn, the officers will have prescribed rights to recreation leave, sick leave, long service leave and accouchement and other special leave. The situation pertaining to the retirement of officers is to be specifically dealt with. Clear grounds for the taking of disciplinary action, and associated rights to be heard, are to be provided for. The Bill also makes provision for the payment of 'higher duties allowances' in appropriate circumstances. Overall, the entitlements contained in the Bill are similar to those that apply to public servants.

The Government is pleased to support the recommendation as to the establishment of a contemporary structure for the joint parliamentary service. The division of the joint parliamentary service into three divisions, each headed by a chief officer, should enhance the status of officers and lead to efficiencies in administration. The creation of a management panel of the chief officers of the three divisions should assist in achieving a consistent and efficient approach to the joint parliamentary service as a whole and ensure equality amongst the staff. The Government accepts the recommendation that the creation, classification and abolition of offices of the joint parliamentary service reside with the Governor acting on the recommendation of the new committee and that the committee be responsible for the appointment of persons to vacant offices, the retirement of officers, the day to day management of officers, and the taking of disciplinary action.

It is acknowledged that critical care must be taken in the application of various Acts to persons employed in the Parliament. There is no doubt that the supremacy and absolute independence of Parliament must be preserved and that Presiding Officers must retain control of access to Parliament House. Equally, the Parliament must be seen to be willing to abide by the laws that it itself has made and promulgated. Furthermore, officers should not be deprived of all rights by virtue of their special positions. It is almost certainly true to say that the provisions of the Bill dealing with the application of the various Acts provide the best possible balance between the various principles that apply. It is accepted that it is critical that the Parliament must not be compelled to comply with orders of courts and tribunals

and its supremacy must never be abrogated but it is appropriate that the committee be allowed to accept an adjudication in appropriate circumstances. It is therefore appropriate, as recommended by the committee, that the Parliament, through the new committee, be empowered to decide when to accept and give effect to an order made under a particular Act and the Government is confident that the committee will always act sensibly and fairly.

Apart from these matters, the Bill also adopts all other recommendations of the Joint Committee. The new committee will take over the responsibilities of the Joint House Committee and the Joint House Committee Act is to be repealed. Consequential amendments will be made to the Public Service Act to ensure that officers in the new service are properly recognised.

The Government looks forward to the implementation of this measure at the Parliament and trusts that it will achieve the objectives in relation to which the Select Committee was established.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure. Clause 3 repeals the Joint House Committee Act and vests the property, rights and liabilities of the Joint House Committee in the committee being established by this Act. Clause 4 sets out the definitions required for the Act. Clause 5 provides for the creation of a committee to be known as the 'Joint Parliamentary Services Committee'. The committee is to be a body corporate and is to consist of six members, being the President of the Legislative Council, the Speaker of the House of Assembly, two members of the Legislative Council (one being a member of the Government and one being a member of the Opposition) and two members of the House of Assembly (one being a member of the Government and one being a member of the Opposition). Appointed members of the committee are to hold office until the first sitting day after a general election and will be eligible for re-election. Two members of the Legislative Council and two members of the House of Assembly are to constitute a quorum. The chairmanship of the committee will alternate each year between the President and the Speaker.

Clause 6 creates an office of secretary to the committee. Clause 7 provides for the division of the joint parliamentary service into three divisions, namely *Hansard*, Library and Joint Services. Each division is to have a chief officer, being respectively the Leader of Hansard, the Parliamentary Librarian and the secretary of the committee. Clause 8 prescribes the duties of chief officers. They are together to constitute a management panel for the purpose of achieving a consistent and efficient approach to the management of the joint parliamentary service as a whole. Clause 9 provides for the delegation of powers or functions under the Act. Clause 10 provides for the creation or abolition of offices in the joint parliamentary service by the Governor on the recommendation of the committee.

Clause 11 relates to the classification of offices by the Governor on the recommendation of the committee. It is proposed that a system of classification that corresponds to the one applying under the Public Service Act 1967 be adopted. Officers will be able to apply for reclassifications. Clause 12 provides for the appointment of persons to vacant offices. A person first appointed to an office in the joint parliamentary service will normally be appointed on probation. Clause 13 allows the committee to arrange for people to work in a division of the joint parliamentary service on a temporary basis, or at hourly, daily or weekly rates of remuneration.

Clause 14 provides for the retirement of officers of the joint parliamentary service between the ages of 55 years and 65 years. Retirement may also occur on the ground of invalidity. Clause 15 relates to compulsory retirement on

the ground of physical or mental incapacity to perform the duties of office. An officer directed to retire on such a ground may lodge an objection and shall be given a right to be heard in support of his objection. Clause 16 concerns the right of the committee to discipline an officer. Specific grounds for disciplinary action are set out in the clause and the committee will be empowered to forfeit entitlements to leave, impose fines, reduce salaries or classifications or dismiss officers who are liable to such disciplinary action. Officers liable to disciplinary action are to be notified of the circumstances pertaining to any proposed disciplinary action. Objections may be lodged against any proposed action and a right to be heard is included.

Clause 17 empowers the committee to suspend an officer who has been charged with an indictable offence. Clause 18 prescribes the rights of officers to recreation leave. Recreation leave will normally accrue at the rate of twenty working days for each year of service and there will be a proportionate entitlement for each month. Leave accruing during a particular financial year may be taken at any time during the year, although leave may be taken only at such times as the committee may approve. The working days falling between Christmas and New Year must, unless the committee otherwise directs, be taken as recreation leave.

Clause 19 prescribes the rights of officers to sick leave. Sick leave will accrue at the rate of twelve working days for each year of service. Sick leave will be credited in advance from the first day of July of each year. Clause 20 provides for rights to long service leave. Ten years' service will give rise to an entitlement to ninety days of leave, each subsequent year of service to fifteen years' will give rise to an entitlement to nine days of leave and thereafter each year will give rise to fifteen days of leave. A person who ceases to be an officer and who has long service leave standing to his credit will be entitled to receive a sum in lieu of leave. Long service leave will be paid out on a *pro rata* basis after seven years' service.

Clause 21 provides for the granting of special leave to an officer by the committee. Clause 22 relates to the ability of the committee to provide that the accrued rights of a person in previous employment may be preserved under this Act and to the preservation of continuity of service. Clause 23 provides for entitlements to recreation and long service leave accrued to an officer who dies to be payable as a debt to the dependants of the officer. Clause 24 provides for the status of officers under certain Acts. Special provision is made to preserve the independence of the Parliament.

Clause 25 provides for consultation between the committee, the President and the Speaker for the purposes of achieving comparable conditions for all of the staff of the Parliament and the efficient management of the resources of the Parliament as a whole. Clause 26 provides for a joint officers' committee that is to make recommendations to the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee in relation to the management and working conditions of the staff of the Parliament. Clause 27 allocates to the committee the control of the dining and recreation areas of the Parliament. Clause 28 relates to the provision of meals and refreshments.

Clause 29 allows the committee to fix allowances and deductions affecting the salaries of officers. Clause 30 allows the committee to direct an officer to perform temporarily duties other than or in addition to the duties of his office. Clause 31 relates to the expenditure of funds. Clause 32 preserves the rights of the Presiding Officers to remove persons unlawfully on the premises of the Parliament. Clause 33 directs the committee to provide an annual report to both Houses. Clause 34 is a rule-making provision.

The first schedule provides for transitional arrangements. The Governor is, on the joint recommendation of the President and the Speaker, to publish a list of officers who are

to be brought initially under the Act. Existing classifications and rights are to be preserved. In addition, parliamentary reporters are to become part of the joint parliamentary service, unless they opt (as an individual basis) to remain in the Attorney-General's Department. The second schedule makes consequential amendments to the Public Service Act, 1967.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): The Opposition supports the Bill. The Minister has clearly indicated the origins of the development. Basically, I believe that further discussion would be proper in relation to the clauses rather than to have a second reading speech which has virtually been given by contributors to the previous noting of the Bill, and members on this side have asked me to express that point of view.

It is important to note that the provisions allow for proclamation to be made on a differential basis. It will be necessary for certain action to be taken to put the new committee into place prior to the repealing of the Joint House Committee Act, which is currently responsible for certain of the employment and other features provided in the House. I believe that it will be a matter requiring consultation between the Government and the Opposition. Obviously, that will be necessary in the determination of what will be the membership of the committee.

It is a matter which, whilst it must be put into place at the earliest possible opportunity, must not proceed with indecent haste. It is not imperative, once the basic structure is up and available, that it should be done tomorrow or that it should have been done yesterday. It will be of great benefit to everyone to know of the new features—the words used in the Minister's speech referred to it as upgrading or bringing forward into the present contemporary state the provisions for employment in this place. They are more likely to be in the contemporary state than they have under the topsy turvy method of employment that has applied in this place over some time in a number of areas. On that basis I have pleasure in indicating support.

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): I agree very much with the member for Light. It is not a Bill to be debated at the second reading stage, and I will be seeking to take up a number of points in Committee later this evening. Honourable members will have a chance to go through the detailed provisions of the Bill at their leisure. I certainly support the second reading on that basis.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 394.)

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles): I support the motion and, in so doing, pay my respects to Her Majesty the Queen and the Governor of South Australia, to whom the address will be presented. I also join other members of the House in expressing my condolences to the families of the late Mr Hunkin and the late Mr Clark, both of whom served well before the time of most of us in this House. Mr Hunkin's contribution, not only as a member of Parliament but also as a reformer of the South Australian Public Service during the 1920s, will certainly go down in the annals of

the State and will stay in the mind of many a public servant for decades to come.

I wish to address myself principally in this Address in Reply debate to matters concerning tourism, and to recapitulate the experience of the past three years—the experience of the industry and the attitude of the Government. I deeply regret that the Ministry has changed and that the majority of my remarks, which would have been addressed to the present Minister of Transport (the member for Stuart and former Minister of Tourism) cannot be addressed to him directly as he no longer holds that post. I would infinitely prefer to be addressing my remarks to someone who could respond directly rather than to a new Minister who has inherited what I believe to be significant problems with the Government's approach to tourism and, in particular, to the administration of the Department of Tourism. One can hardly burden a new Minister with the responsibilities of her predecessor.

Nevertheless, I lay that responsibility at the door of the Government as a whole, and I believe that it has a lot to answer for. The Government has failed to address the key issues confronting tourism in South Australia today. It is hanging its hat on two major projects—ASER and the Grand Prix—but it has completely failed to address the basic structure of tourism, to maintain the momentum established under the previous Liberal Government, and to give direction and a sense of purpose to the industry as a whole.

They are serious allegations—very serious allegations indeed—and I do not make them lightly. During the first year of this Government I waited to give the new Minister a chance to establish himself and to see whether the Government would maintain that sense of direction. During that year my contributions were limited to constructive suggestions and close cooperation with the industry. During the second year the Liberal Tourism Policy Committee, under my chairmanship, made extensive visits around South Australia. In the past 12 months we have continued to visit parts of South Australia. I have been listening intently to all sectors of the industry and to all regions. Again, I have tried to continue to make constructive suggestions—and I believe that the former Minister would acknowledge that.

I certainly have always appreciated his personal courtesies, generosity of spirit and the sociable manner in which he fulfilled his responsibilities as Minister of Tourism. They are personal qualities. Leaving aside those personal qualities and bringing to the forefront the political aspects, the things that really count, the Government has failed miserably to fulfil the promises laid out in its policy speech before the last State election. It has failed miserably to update and give new impetus to the South Australian Tourism Development Plan.

When I became Minister of Tourism in September 1979, the Department of Tourism was moribund. Today, in 1985, the Department of Tourism is chaotic. It is known among the industry as the department of meetings. If anyone ever wants to contact a senior officer in that department, the answer is, 'I am sorry, he is not available, he is at a meeting'. One can travel the State, and I challenge anyone to refute the statement that the department is now notorious for holding continual meetings and for its officers rarely if ever being available for the purpose for which they were appointed, namely, to advise, research, develop, promote and market. The situation with meetings in that department is now so bad that the marketing section—a key responsible arm of the department—has its senior officers regularly working Saturdays and Sundays (and that is a well-known fact in the industry) to fulfil their basic paperwork, because they are never available during the working week to carry out the administrative responsibilities required of them.

That is a very serious indictment of the Minister's lack of leadership. It is also a serious indictment of the Premier, who has raided the Department of Tourism and has reduced the time that the Director of Marketing should be spending on marketing by ensuring that a large proportion of his time is taken up with arts administration. That is simply not good enough, and it is an indication of the very weak standing of the former Minister in Cabinet that he was never able to stand up to his Premier and say: 'Enough is enough; the Marketing Director of this department has a prime responsibility and that is to tourism.'

I do not, for one moment, dispute the importance of the arts and their relationship to tourism in South Australia, but I do dispute that it is right or proper for a Government to occupy the time of senior public servants not five days a week, not six days a week, but seven days and very often seven nights a week, simply because the workload is out of all proportion, and that is a completely unreasonable demand on any individual.

The failure of the Government in respect of marketing is actually acknowledged in a most extraordinary document which is distributed by the department itself. It is entitled, 'South Australian Department of Tourism—Marketing Policies—Objectives, Targets, Strategies.' It is a supplement to *Grapevine*, South Australia's tourism industry newsletter, of July 1985. The first and most important markets that South Australia has are first and foremost our own residents, readily accessible and relatively cheap to sell to in terms of the cost of media space and direct promotions. The other biggest market on our doorstep is the Eastern States of Australia—New South Wales and Victoria.

In New South Wales we have a market of 5.3 million people and in Victoria we have a market of 4.03 million people. They are the principal sources of visitors to South Australia, yet the marketing policy of the South Australian Government in respect of tourism says, with regard to those important markets:

Preliminary estimates for 1984 indicate a small increase (of about 3 per cent) in the number of nights spent in South Australia by visitors from interstate.

What an indictment! The department acknowledges that there has been only a 3 per cent increase in visitation to this State from interstate. Despite all the ballyhoo, despite all the razzamatazz, despite all the primping and prodding by the Premier and the puffing up of himself and his Government, only a measly 3 per cent increase has occurred in visitation to South Australia from our principal markets. That compares dramatically with the situation under the previous Liberal Government when the overall increase was in the order of 16 per cent, which outstripped every other State in Australia and indeed out-stripped the nation.

There is a reason for that poor performance, and the reason is even acknowledged in this extraordinary document which is, in itself, an indictment of the Government. It is one of the most interesting documents I have seen put out by a department, because it acknowledges failure. It sets failure down on the record for all to see. It is not I, as the Opposition spokesman criticising the Government; it is the Government's own department. This is what the department says in that document:

The department has had to commit a disproportionate amount of its resources to overseas marketing so as to compete more effectively with those States which have previously established a strong international position. This has necessarily occurred at the cost of an expanding presence in our main domestic travel markets.

What the Government has done in effect is to raid its own tourism budget and use the resources which should be devoted to our principal domestic markets in order to establish offices in Singapore, Los Angeles and Tokyo. How negligent can a Government be to ignore the main markets

on its own doorstep and to use taxpayers' money, which was committed to those markets, by simply slipping it across from one budget line to another and then trumpeting to the world that South Australia is selling itself in Tokyo, Singapore and Los Angeles.

That 3 per cent increase would barely account for the natural increase which would have occurred anyway as a result of increased economic activity. It is no credit whatsoever to the Government that there is only a 3 per cent increase in interstate tourism. The goal of the South Australian tourism industry development plan was an annual increase of 10 per cent. How miserably this Government has failed in that goal! The document goes on to acknowledge:

As a consequence—

that is, a consequence of the failure to do better in interstate markets—

we must be quite specific in setting our interstate marketing objectives and priorities for 1985-86 to ensure that our overall effort achieves the most productive results.

Well, at least someone in the department has recognised that things are pretty crook—to use a colloquial phrase—in Tallarook! They are crook in the Travel Centre in Adelaide; they are crook in the Travel Centre in Melbourne; and they are crook in the Travel Centre in Sydney. To give an example of how bad they are, Victoria has 850 travel agents, each of whom is committed to selling travel. South Australia has a staff of six or seven employed not as sales representatives to the 850 travel agents in Victoria—no: those six or seven are employed simply as booking clerks to take individual bookings from people who walk in off the street.

If ever there was a strategy designed to waste resources, that is it. In that Travel Centre, according to my most recent report, there are only 20 brochures on display, despite the fact that there are brochures available from over 2 000 operators in this State. No-one in that Melbourne office has been given the responsibility to market the products that are available. The staffing in both the interstate offices consists mainly—and I do not criticise the individuals, I criticise the Government and the Minister who has responsibility for this—of junior staff who have spent a bare few months in the South Australian Government Travel Centre in Adelaide and who have then been transferred interstate. There is no depth or breadth of experience or understanding of the South Australian market. Consequently, I get letters which make it abundantly clear that we are simply not exploiting our principal market. One letter from a key tourism operator states:

I have recently returned from an extensive interstate promotional tour on behalf of (name of employer)—

one of the better known tourism operators in South Australia—

I travelled widely throughout Victoria and the border areas of South Australia, visiting some 70 travel agencies and numerous RACV and RAA branches. I visited all the large regional centres and provincial cities and towns in Victoria, including Portland, Warrnambool, Geelong, Horsham, Bendigo, Ballarat, Mildura, Swan Hill, Sale, Bairnsdale, Albury, Wodonga, and Wangaratta. The letter continues:

Victorian travel agencies are very keen in their pursuit of detailed information on the Flinders Ranges, yet *en masse* they claimed that they were unable to obtain anything other than scant detail which provides little for the genuinely interested and curious would-be visitor to South Australia. In fact, despite frequent and repeated requests to the South Australian Government Travel Centre, many Victorian agencies claim they are simply unable to provide clients with the sort of detailed information on South Australia that they require, that is, with the exception of the Barossa Valley.

Again, I did not make that criticism: that criticism was made by a member of the promotional staff of one of South

Australia's better known tourist operators. What an indictment of the Government! The letter continues:

Some agencies, notably those in the larger regional centres, claim to receive almost daily requests for information on the Flinders Ranges. Many complained of virtual frustration in this area, and commented on the negative impact that such had upon their business earning potential. Dissatisfied customers tend to take their business elsewhere, and particularly to other States.

I can certainly elaborate on that. As a result of the tourism phone-in that I held in late January this year, I received complaint after complaint after complaint about the South Australian Government Travel Centre in Adelaide. I also had complaints about Sydney and Melbourne centres. During that phone-in the top of the list of unpopular bodies was the State Transport Authority; second was Australian National; and running a very close third in terms of a high level of criticism was the South Australian Government Travel Centre.

Remarks like, 'They could not care less', 'They gave me the wrong information,' or 'They told me to come back later' were made. The people did go back later to a different place—to the Victorian or New South Wales travel centres because they were certain that they would get service, which is exactly what they got. The complaints are catalogued and are freely available. I have no doubt that members of the Government have seen the verbatim comments of South Australian consumers about the South Australian Government Travel Centre. It is simply not good enough that this principal shop window for our citizens and visitors from interstate should simply fail to provide the basic service and information that people require.

The most extraordinary situation existed at the South Australian Government Travel Centre in Sydney for many months of the past year, a situation that no responsible Minister should have endured for a moment. The Manager of the Travel Centre in Melbourne resigned, no doubt out of sheer frustration (I have not spoken to him, but I imagine that that would be the reason). Instead of appointing a replacement (the department was strapped for cash, having stretched itself from here to Singapore, Los Angeles and Tokyo) the department had the temerity and irresponsibility to ask the Manager of the Travel Centre in Sydney to manage both the Sydney and Melbourne travel centres!

In other words, this Labor Government, which says that it is committed to tourism, was willing to waste the time, energy and resources of an individual, and taxpayers' resources, by having that one manager commute between two States two or three times a week to manage two travel centres. That really is an example of the total incapacity of the previous Minister of Tourism to manage responsibly the affairs of his department.

The ultimate result was that the manager of the travel centre in Sydney resigned, also. There have been a series of resignations and I would not be too surprised to see more unless, of course (and this is my hope), the senior officers of the department are waiting—and they will not have to wait very much longer—for a change of government so they can be sure of a clear sense of direction. One cannot address these complaints to the present Minister, who has only been in office for two or three weeks.

My observations so far are two. First, it is absolutely extraordinary that a new Minister should fail to respond to a direct request from a highly respected industry association, that is, the South Australian Restaurant Association, to receive a deputation and petition on the steps of Parliament House protesting the Federal Government's proposed new imposts on the hospitality industry through its withdrawal of taxation concessions for business entertainment.

I could not believe it! I marched with those restaurant employees from Victoria Square up King William Street to

the steps of Parliament House expecting to see the Minister and, behold, the steps were empty! Out of courtesy we waited for about 10 minutes for the Minister to appear. No Minister! Therefore, I took the microphone and assured the assembled company that I would forward their petitions. Unfortunately, the petitions were not worded in a form that would allow them to be presented to either House of Parliament in this State, or to the Commonwealth Parliament but they have certainly been forwarded to the Treasurer, because it was to him that these protestations were to be delivered.

That was the first impression of the Minister that an important sector of the industry gained. When the Minister did arrive it was so late that the crowd had virtually dispersed, the petitions had been presented, and so her presence was not of much value—it certainly did not inspire much confidence. The next thing the Minister did—or the Premier did on her behalf—was claim her achievement in securing the Australian Federation of Travel Agents (AFTA) convention for Adelaide in 1987. The Premier was moved to say that it was a tremendous triumph for the Hon. Barbara Wiese, who had flown to Hawaii and managed by dint of great skill and advocacy to secure that convention for this State in 1987.

What absolute bunkum! In saying that, the Premier has discredited himself and his Minister in the eyes of the industry. No one in their right mind would believe that a Minister—a Minister of two weeks (if that)—could fly overseas and by dint of her personal skills and advocacy secure a convention of that nature. For the benefit of the Premier, I shall state the facts. In September 1982 a meeting was held under my Ministry at the Department of Tourism between officers of that department, AFTA officials and officials of the Adelaide Convention and Visitors Bureau which decided to seek the assistance of the Government in securing the AFTA convention for Adelaide in 1986.

The Government's assistance was readily promised by officers on my behalf and confirmed by me following advice. Efforts were then made by those there bodies—AFTA (South Australia), the Adelaide Convention and Business Bureau and the Department of Tourism—and much work was done. In October last year it was confirmed by AFTA that it would hold its convention in Adelaide in 1987. That makes something of a mockery of the Premier's protestations that that convention was achieved wholly and solely by the newly appointed Minister of Tourism. I advise the Premier, before making statements about tourism, to acquaint himself with the facts, the manner in which the industry works, to realise that it takes two, three or four years lead time for national and international conventions of that nature to be secured, and to stop making patently stupid statements that bring both him and his Minister into discredit in the eyes of the industry.

I now turn to the Tourism Development Plan and the failure of the Government to do what the plan was designed to do, namely, maintain an impetus and a strong sense of purpose and direction for the industry in South Australia on a five-year rolling basis (in other words, a continuous update). I would say that my most serious criticism of the previous Minister would be levelled at him in that direction, namely, his failure to properly maintain the impetus and direction of the Tourism Development Plan.

It is true that the Plan, which was developed in August 1982 under the chairmanship of Mr John Sharman (to whom I pay a tribute), was updated in January 1984. It was also updated at the annual tourism conference in 1983. But since then the Government has done nothing. The South Australian Tourism Industry Council has done its best in recent times to fulfil its function of monitoring the plan, but the reality is that so much of the plan depends on the

Government: monitoring a plan and seeing how its various objectives and strategies are being met is one thing, but what about the actual updating of a plan? It is extraordinary how fast things can happen and how quickly a plan that is 18 months old can literally look archaic in the light of present challenges, opportunities and responsibilities for the industry concerned.

There is so much that should be in the Tourism Development Plan in relation to strategy and objectives which at present is missing from the Plan. To simply monitor the present implementation of the plan is not enough. The Government just has not done its homework in calling together the necessary bodies and providing the moral leadership to ensure that the Plan is working and updated.

The Tourism Industry Council has certainly done its best, but in looking at the most recent plan, which is the one that was released dated January 1984, one notes that the progress statement, which was signed by the Chairman of the Tourism Development Board and the Chairman of the South Australian Tourism Industry Council, in the main refers to initiatives which were set in train (and in many cases firmly established) by the former Liberal Government. Those initiatives include: the development of a corporate identity for South Australia, and certainly the 'Enjoy' image was developed under the Liberal Government; the formation of the Tourism Industry Council, which was set in train by the Liberal Government; the establishment of South Australian representation in Western Australia and New Zealand, which was provided for in the 1982-83 budget of the former Liberal Government and for which the present Government can take no credit whatsoever; the position statements for each region as components of regional marketing and promotion plans, which were set in train by the previous Government; and so it goes on for three pages.

The previous Government was responsible for virtually all those objectives and strategies. Very little is new—very little that is relevant to these times and opportunities is now in the Plan—and yet the Tourism Industry Council just has to continue to monitor the Plan. The question of updating the Plan and getting industry together with Government representatives and of identifying the relationships and the interrelationships between the tourism industries and the other industries in South Australia simply has not been addressed. That is a matter for very serious criticism indeed.

Another issue for which the Government must be criticised concerns the matter of costs, which have become so burdensome on the industry that relief is essential. That will certainly occur on the election of a Liberal Government. If the tourism industry were asked to identify the adverse taxation and cost factors in rank order, I believe that its list would be as follows.

At the top of the list is electricity, an impost so burdensome as to break the backs of some businesses—a 41 per cent increase. When one thinks of how this affects the domestic household, the figures are serious enough. However, when one thinks of how this affects hotels, which can pay tens of thousands of dollars per quarter and then adds 41 per cent, one can appreciate the seriousness of the situation.

Another massive cost is workers compensation. The Government comes up with a so-called plan that the Premier 'hopes' that 'soon' and 'if—they are the words used by him during Question Time this afternoon—employers and unions agree with the Government (that is, if the Premier can get his Caucus together—and it is quite obvious they are divided) there should be, might be and could be a new workers compensation system in South Australia.

Last year the Liberal Party laid down its policy, and the results of that policy would be a reduction by up to 40 per

cent in premiums for workers compensation. To do as this Government has done—take out a half page advertisement in this morning's *Advertiser* using taxpayers' funds and claim that unions and employers are 'as one' with the Government's plan and that it intends to introduce legislation before the close of this session, that is, before the election—is to strain credulity beyond the point where any of us can sustain it.

No wonder the backbenchers and frontbenchers on the Government side looked so discomfited at Question Time today. The reality is that employers and unions have not reached an agreement. Despite what two small groups may have done behind closed doors, there is no agreement. Nor is there any agreement in the Caucus of the Labor Party. The two sides that are tearing at each other's throats include those who believe that employees should have the right to sue under common law for pain and suffering—a right that the Liberal Party upholds—and those who say that there should be no such right.

One can well imagine which members on the Government side are sticking up for the basic rights that have always existed under our system of justice. Hopefully, they include the practising lawyers on the Labor side, and they would—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: In terror or in 'Terry'. Hopefully, they would also include those members on the other side who have some conscience when it comes to the rights of their constituents and the portion of the community they claim to represent—the workers. I believe that that is a claim much more reliably attributed to the Liberal Party than to the Labor Party in respect of workers compensation.

Another key item on the list is the 33½ per cent increase in liquor licence fees. True, that increase was knocked back, after pressure from the Opposition, the Australian Hotels Association and the liquor industry, from 33½ per cent to 22 per cent. It is true that hoteliers and restaurateurs can recover this fee by increasing prices, but the reality is that they cannot, and they are not doing so. The simple fact is that in order to cover costs they have to increase volume; in order to increase volume they have to discount; and if they discount there is no way that they can recover these increasing costs that the Government is placing on them.

The list goes on—FID and land tax. Land tax for metropolitan hotels and those in principal country areas is taking a very severe bite out of profits and, consequently, is affecting employment. For the information of honourable members, land tax for a large hotel in the metropolitan area could cost up to and above \$20 000 per annum; for a smaller hotel in the suburban areas it might be in the region of \$14 000 per annum; in a regional city like Mount Gambier it would be in the region of about \$6 000 per annum. That is big money indeed, when it is piled on top of the other costs that I have mentioned and there is no possibility of recovering it by increasing prices.

All these things add up to an indictment of the Government—an indictment that the industry recognises and an indictment that all the Grand Prix and ASER projects in the world will not cover. These are the basic imposts affecting industry.

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

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Before the dinner adjournment, I was outlining the manner in which the State Government has failed to meet the real needs of tourism during its term in office. I now turn my attention to the Federal Government, and appropriately enough, tonight being budget night, I will discuss budget items which have so far been dealt with by the Federal Government and which have adversely affected the tourism industry. The first of

this year's blows was dealt with in the 14 May mini-budget, when the tourism industry was excluded from the Export Development Grants Scheme. The Export Development Grants Scheme had been of tremendous benefit to the industry in the whole of Australia and particularly in South Australia, where some kind of incentive has been needed to encourage smaller operators—and we are a State mainly made up of relatively small tourism operators—to exercise their own initiatives and to promote our tourism product overseas.

Suddenly, in the mini-budget, despite the protestations of the Federal Minister, the Hon. John Brown, that there would be no tampering whatsoever with the Export Development Grants Scheme until the industry had been consulted and advised, those grants were withdrawn and the tourism industry was excluded from participation in the scheme. The result of that, naturally enough, was turmoil, because most operators have long-term plans that depend on the scheme. It is not an *ad hoc* thing that one suddenly takes up this week and drops the next; it is something that an operator plans or certainly should plan carefully for over 12 months or longer, and budgets are drawn up on the basis that some of the funds spent on overseas promotion will be recouped through the Export Development Grants Scheme.

Many of the operators were already, and still are, committed to promotions on the basis of their entitlement under the scheme, and they are suddenly left in the lurch. The industry was and is left footing the entire bill for long-term promotional contracts, despite the Minister's promise. It is an indication that not only in South Australia does the Minister of Tourism lack clout in the Cabinet, but also in the Federal Cabinet the Minister of Tourism lacks clout. If he had had any clout, there certainly would have been an insistence on consultation with the tourism industry and on the industry getting its reasonable share.

A vague announcement has been made about a new scheme that is in the melting pot, known as TOPS (Tourism Overseas Promotion Scheme). As yet, no details have been advised to the industry, but the industry has estimated that a replacement scheme to compensate for the lack of the Export Development Grants Scheme would have to be worth between \$9 million and \$12 million. If one breaks that down on the customary percentage basis for South Australia's share, it means that South Australian tourism operators have lost at least \$1 million as a result of an arbitrary and irresponsible act on the part of the Federal Government in withdrawing tourism from that scheme.

Some of the operators in South Australia who have actively participated in this scheme are Ansett Briscoes, the Hilton Hotel, the Adelaide Convention and Visitors Bureau itself, Murray River Developments, the Oberoi, the Gateway, the Grosvenor and Wirrina—all well-known operators with the capacity to earn export income for South Australia by bringing tourism from overseas. All of those people, and indeed every member of the industry, have now lost that right. Whether or not any kind of benefits will be returned to them in tonight's Budget is a matter for conjecture, but certainly, if they are not, there should be a very loud roar instead of the merest squeak of the kind that we normally hear, if we hear anything at all, from the Premier when it comes to defending this State against the actions of the Federal Government.

Again, not only am I, but the industry itself is critical of the Federal Government. I have been sent a copy of a letter from the Chairman of the South Australia Tourism Industry Council, Mrs Wendy Chapman, addressed to the Federal Minister for Tourism, the Hon. J.J. Brown, MHR. The letter commences by noting the disappointment and anxiety that

the South Australian Tourism Industry Council felt in noting—

your absence and the Ministry's silence during the recent tax summit.

It was not only Mr Brown who was silent; it was also the then Minister of Tourism, now Minister of Transport, the Hon. Gavin Keneally. In fact, it was left to the Director of Tourism, a public servant, to protest about that tax. The Opposition certainly protested, but the only one who could in any way be said to be representative of the South Australian Government who uttered a word about that tax was the Director of Tourism.

What a pitiful performance by a Minister to let his departmental head do the political fighting on behalf of the industry when the real responsibility is that of the Minister himself, or, in the present case, the Minister herself. Again, there has been not a word of protest, not a word of advocacy for the South Australian industry, nothing effective by way of carrying the fight right up to the Prime Minister and the Treasurer: just the limp sort of silence that we have come to expect from this Government. The letter from Mrs Chapman, dated 2 August, goes on to say:

Members of the council are most concerned that you make public your opinion of the effect on the tourism industry of taxing financial incentives. The suggested service tax would also significantly hit many levels of a developing tourism industry . . .

Tourism services in Australia are one of the most criticised aspects of the industry. To additionally tax these services would further reduce the viability and reputation of that area of the industry. Your Ministry must be aware that the travel, accommodation, hospitality and entertainment industries are direct beneficiaries of the present financial incentive scheme. The entire tourism industry benefits from a healthy, vigorous private industry sector which demands visitor service products.

The letter says:

A further taxed financial incentive scheme would result in employers withdrawing incentives as part of employment packages; unions demanding retention of incentives regardless of the employer's ability to pay; reduced productivity in job creation opportunities.

The letter concludes by asking for the Minister's standing on these issues. I doubt whether the Chairman of the South Australian Tourism Industry Council will get a satisfactory reply. She certainly has not had a satisfactory reply from the South Australian Minister.

The South Australian Tourism Industry Council is not the only body that has protested. The Australian Hotels Association, the largest and certainly one of the most respected tourism and hospitality organisations in South Australia, in its July 1985 issue, carries a major headline—in fact it is the lead story—'The Summit Part 1, Tax would hit holidays and prices'. The report goes on to say how violently opposed the AHA was to proposals before the start of the national taxation summit in Canberra. Of course, the hospitality and travel industries were given little or no representation. Despite the fact that this industry is Australia's largest growing industry and potentially its biggest employer, there was one representative only from the ATIA—the Australian Travel Industry Association. There was no Minister—Mr Brown did not rate a mention—and the Premier of South Australia, as far as I am aware, did not even raise tourism as an issue with the Federal Government. The *AHA Gazette* goes on to state:

About 60 per cent of patrons in many hotels use credit cards. Most of these billings are allowable deductions which will disappear under the Government proposals.

This will have a catastrophic effect on the hundreds of hotels throughout the country which rely heavily on business clients.

In time, the Government's tax must force hoteliers to reduce job opportunities for the 100 000 people they directly employ. Australia's 6 000 hotels—

in South Australia it is about 10 per cent of that—would be forced to collect an astronomical amount in taxes. Given their present battle to contain prices, many would be forced to

curtail prices, many would be forced to curtail or to increase the cost of their services, which would discourage lower income earners from using hotel bistros and restaurants.

This comes from the very Government that, as part of its pre-election tourism policy, said that it was interested in low income earners and low cost holidays for low income earners—the very people who will be hit for a six by the State and Federal taxes and the very people whom the ALP purports to represent.

By way of an aside I refer to the fact that the so-called low cost cabins at the West Beach Trust development, which again were purportedly designed for South Australians, are being promoted in New Zealand. If anyone can tell me how spending South Australian taxpayers' money to promote low cost holidays to New Zealanders will benefit low income families in South Australia, I would be fascinated to hear it. There can be no justification whatsoever for the Government promoting Government sponsored and Government funded holidays for overseas people when they were purportedly developed in the interests of South Australians. The trust is competing on a completely unfair basis with the private sector, which is attempting to make a living without using taxpayers' money as a prop for their advertising and promotion, either here or overseas. The *AHA Gazette* further states:

The AHA was vehemently opposed to the introduction of a consumption tax, capital gains tax and the non-allowance of entertainment as a legitimate company deduction in the production of assessable income.

The article concludes by stating:

The Australian hospitality industry is vigorously competitive, operates with minimal assistance from the public purse and is a major employer. It is the mainstay of tourism, which has the potential of bring Australia's highest growth industry. To place such an industry in jeopardy would be irresponsible.

Again, who knows what will be revealed in about an hour's time when the Treasurer gives us the components of the federal budget? We know that the essential taxation components of it are not going to be there. That is because the Prime Minister did a complete about face. The Treasurer lost face completely, or whatever he had before this taxation summit, which was really initiated at the whim of a radio announcer in Perth and the Prime Minister's response to that whimsical question. This taxation summit was a farce.

The results of tonight's budget will not be the properly considered and balanced presentation which is normally the case with the federal budget, simply because the Federal Government is refusing to bite the bullet on taxation. One of the reasons for not doing that is that it wishes to protect its beleaguered colleagues in South Australia in the hope that this Premier goes to an election before the really bitter pills that will be forced down our throats are swallowed in South Australia.

Another aspect of federal taxation that has had a devastating effect on the tourism industry is the 2.3c per litre of diesel excise for off-road use. In South Australia our principal attractions for overseas visitors and our very important attractions for South Australians and interstate visitors are in the remote areas in the Flinders Ranges; in Kangaroo Island; along the Coorong; in various places where the off-road use of diesel fuel is essential. I have a letter from a tourist operator on Eyre Peninsula and his words are certainly worth noting by the House, as he states:

On the tourism industry: if the 12½ per cent tax is added to fuels, air navigation charges, insurances, rents, food, beverages, etc. etc., it is probable you will increase costs in this supposed growth industry by the order of 20 per cent when a person considers purchase of a ticket or holiday package. In short, your proposed package—

his remarks are addressed to the Federal Treasurer—

is a thinly disguised scheme of greatly increased taxation on each member of our community to finance an unpayable, increasing debt. It is significant not one politician—

that is, not one ALP politician—

or public servant is arguing for reduced taxation.

The only people arguing for reduced taxation is the Liberal Party in South Australia, federally and in other States. The letter further states:

As Treasurer you possess the necessary power to create 'money or credit' as a credit. However, it is as certain as tomorrow you will continue creating an ever greater interest bearing debt. The inevitable consequence will be continuing high taxation, high inflation, rapidly increasing national debt and high unemployment. The higher the rate of interest charged, the more savage the tax, debt increase and inflation.

If you want a fairer, more equitable system of tax, then try halving current levies; or, if you prefer, apply 1950s-60s levels of taxation to 1980s incomes. You cannot expect to take 42 per cent of a nation's wealth annually in tax and have a happy, honest, contented nation.

That is a basic form of economic comment, but one with which I think most Australians—and certainly most South Australians—would agree. One simply cannot continue taxing in order to pay interest on increased borrowings and expect to have a sound economy.

To conclude, I simply refer to the paucity of the Government's policy in regard to tourism. We cannot be more than months, possibly more than weeks, away from a State election and so far nothing significant has been announced by the Government in the way of tourism policy. It is all very well to hang one's hat on ASER—initiated by the Liberal Government—and the Grand Prix—initiated by private citizens and encouraged by the previous Liberal Government, resulting in what we all hope will be a very successful event. The Government cannot rely on that. If industry in this State is to be sound, it needs sound policies.

Already the Liberal Party has released its tourism and recreational boating policy. Interestingly enough, two or three weeks later the Minister of Marine, in opening the Boat Show, made a speech, no doubt written by a member of his staff. He used as the basic research for his speech the tourism and recreational boating policy of the Liberal Party. The similarities between the two documents were unmistakable, to even the most casual observer.

Later, the Liberal Party released its wine industry development policy and, as part of that, there was an integral section relating to the tourism industry. A key part of that policy—a well integrated and co-ordinated policy—was the undertaking to introduce a rebate on the licences for cellar door sales. Behold, in the Governor's speech and in Parliament last week the Premier suddenly announced that it might be a good idea to introduce a rebate on cellar door sales. Later still—I think in early July—the Leader of the Opposition and I released the Liberal Party's tourism and mining policy—again a policy designed to ensure that on the important industry, which has been interlinked with South Australia's economic, social and cultural development from the nineteenth century to this very day, is co-ordinated with our tourism industry so we can really present our past, present and future to visitors and our own residents. That policy was released on Friday. Imagine the surprise when members of the Liberal Party read their newspapers a couple of days later and saw a timely little item inserted as if by chance to indicate that the Director of Mines, who would be visiting England shortly, would inspect the manner in which the United Kingdom mining industry presented itself to tourists and visitors to Britain.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: No wonder people are cynical of the Government.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Indeed. Every positive, original and imaginative initiative announced by the Liberal Party over the past 12 months has had the eyes

picked out of it by this Government, which is bankrupt of ideas, bereft of talent and bereft of membership, because half the Ministry never seem to be here and those who are are only half here when it comes to intellectual comprehension of what is going on. And this is the Government that claims it is trying to win for South Australia!

The Hon. D.C. Brown: Why do you think the Premier waited three years before suddenly adopting all these good ideas?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I would say that the Premier is facing an election and he knows that he is like the emperor with no clothes: he has nothing to offer. He has promised everything, he has delivered very little, and in due course (and in the near future) the people of South Australia will make their judgment on the emperor with no clothes. He and his Government will be seen for what they are and rejected by South Australians. John Olsen will be the Premier of this State.

Mr PLUNKETT (Peake): I support the motion. I wish the four members of this House who will be retiring at the next election the best of health in retirement. I refer first to a very good friend of mine, Jack Wright, as well as to George Whitten, Max Brown, and Allan Rodda from the opposite side. I have known Allan Rodda for many years, even before I came into Parliament. I serve on the Public Works Standing Committee with Allan and I know that he is very well respected by members on both sides.

I do not want members to think that I am entering the pop industry, and I do not want pop groups to panic, but we are going 'down the same old road again': 'privatisation' should be the swan song of the State Liberal Government for the next election. When it was in office the Liberal Government in the interests of privatisation disposed of machinery in all Government departments.

The Liberal Government virtually gave away equipment to private contractors. For example, three Lennox loaders were disposed of for \$150 000, although the new price was \$900 000. Who bought them? Friends of the Liberal Party bought them—Western Australian mining companies. I point out that Western Australian mining companies do not buy rubbish. They buy only stuff that they know is in good condition.

The Highways Department camp at Coonamble was sold. Initially it cost more than \$1 million, but it was sold for one-third of that sum. I do not know whether friends of the Liberal Party bought the equipment, but that was possibly so. Perhaps the funds were donated towards the election campaign. The unions picketed the Highways Department project at Northfield. The bitumen plant had just been reconditioned and was in perfect order. I had knowledge of that matter before I came into Parliament. Who was it sold to? To my amazement it was sold to Bitumax, a private contractor.

That is not privatisation—not much! What happened? The first thing that happened was there was trouble immediately because the Highways Department expects a special mixture for its roads. They found that the private company was unable to produce this mixture, so it was necessary to transfer the plant operator down to Bitumax from the Highways Department so that this could be a success. The Minister involved was the Hon. Michael Wilson, and he is one of the lucky shadow Ministers who is in the pamphlet. He has been favoured. The next Minister was the Hon. Murray Hill, Minister of Local Government.

Mr Lewis: He's a nice chap.

Mr PLUNKETT: Yes, he wrote a fairly nice letter. It amazes me that people will always point at trade unionists as people who stand over companies. How would members opposite like to get a letter like this if they were town clerks

or mayors of a council? Written in the Hon. Murray Hill's handwriting, it says:

Office of the Minister of Local Government: circular to all councils, town and district clerks. It is a firm policy of the Government that in its own operations it should employ the private sector as far as possible.

Mr Lewis: He can read, too.

Mr PLUNKETT: The letter continues:

As a development from this policy, not only do I urge councils to avoid becoming involved in private works that are outside of their specific powers, but also themselves consider using private contractors for council work.

In order to be consistent in the application of its own policy, the Government has decided that its own departments and agencies should no longer employ local councils to carry out work on their behalf. (Signed) Murray Hill, Minister of Local Government.

I heard some stupid comment from the other side, and I would like to say that not only can I read, but I also know a little bit about local government, and apparently he does not because he does not appreciate the fact that—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Peake must refer to other honourable members by their district.

Mr PLUNKETT: I apologise, but I did not mention any particular member. I said I heard a remark coming from the other side. I am not too sure who it was: I have found it better to ignore certain people on the opposite benches.

The SPEAKER: All interjections will be ignored. The honourable member for Peake.

Mr PLUNKETT: If the people on the other side made some inquiries of local government, they would find out how this affected the councils, how it virtually destroyed them. People, including private contractors, had been working on councils all their life (private contractors have been employed by local government and Government for many years), but what happened? Were they the people included in the privatisation of the Liberal Party? No, they were not. Apparently they did not donate enough, because they were left by the wayside. My office was completely filled in the first few days when they found out they were not even employed by Government departments and local government and because of my experience as an organiser with the union, they came to find out what was going on. I quickly explained to them that they should not take notice of some of the Liberal's promises because they have a record of breaking all of them.

I draw members' attention to the photograph of the shadow Cabinet: it shows nine people, yet I thought there were supposed to be 13. That means that in the next Government the Leader of the Opposition will have a shadow Ministry of only nine people, unless he intends to appoint a few more. I do not see tonight too many faces here who are included in that photograph. It was circulated by, I suggest, friends of the Liberal Party in the *Sunday Mail*: they did not even distribute it themselves. It might have been a donation by the *Sunday Mail*.

In this portrait the Leader looks like the Lone Ranger, because he is about the only person in it, having dropped half his shadow Cabinet. There are a few lucky faces, but some may not be retained. I have noticed a bit of slackening of support.

The Hon. D.C. Brown interjecting:

Mr PLUNKETT: I will not be pulled in by the former Minister of Labour and Industry.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will not be stood over by anybody.

Mr PLUNKETT: Thank you, Sir. The former Minister of Employment, or one could say unemployment, has been replaced, too. He looks closely down the back of the Leader and is careful about which shadow portfolio he is placed in, because the knives are pretty thick on the Opposition side. They don't mind jamming a knife into you!

I now want to talk about the farmers march, in which I did not take part. However, I saw the large number of people outside Parliament House on that day. Ian McLachlan, who organised the march, I have known for a number of years, and I have had a little experience with him on his property. I was amazed when I read in the newspaper a reference to his being a battling farmer. I read about him in *Who's Who*.

Mr Lewis: Are you going to give our concessional registration?

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the honourable member for Mallee will come to order.

Mr PLUNKETT: Outside his pastoral properties, the family has investments in urban land and holds shares in certain companies. Family involvement with the land was begun in 1856 by H.P. McLachlan, whose three sons—Byron, Alex and Ian—father of the National Farmers Federation chief—expanded the empire considerably. This is the little battling farmer: he is a director of Elders IXL and Deputy Chairman of the South Australian Brewing Company. He would be lucky to get a dollar out of those two companies!

Mr Lewis: Knock, knock.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PLUNKETT: The year saw control gained of the Executor Trustee Agency Company of which he was also a director and which was passed to the State Bank of South Australia at an estimated minimum net worth of \$50 million. There are other farmers such as the McBrides and Kidmans who own big grazing properties. They own a little bit of land, too.

Mr Lewis: Knock, knock.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has had about as much as it can tolerate from the honourable member for Mallee. Proper warning was given during the course of the day. I hope that the honourable member will cease interjecting forthwith.

Mr PLUNKETT: I thank you for your protection, Sir, and I need it. A little further down the line is a reference to the battling farmer who organised the farmers march. He would be fairly used to that after his involvement with some of those boards. Nangwarry Pastoral Company and other companies controlled by the family comprise 5 per cent of the area of South Australia. My God! No wonder he is protesting. He would be going really bad! Further, I would like to suggest that Mr Ian McLachlan is conveniently using small farmers for his own benefit and power. That is what he is after. Indeed, he has done well in organising small farmers. Would small farmers living around his property at Nangwarry be able to say, 'Ian, old mate, how are you? I've come over to have a beer with you.' He would order them off his property. He ordered me off his property when I was a union organiser. Certainly, Ian McLachlan has no mates among the small farmers.

If one goes back through the history of South Australia one understands why those big landowners still exist in South Australia. The other States, after the Second World War ended, believed that the boys who had saved Australia, who had done such a good job fighting for this country, deserved a little bit of land. Those young men went away and risked being killed. Indeed, they offered their lives for their country, and some States believed that they should be allowed to have land.

Victoria provided soldier settlements by cutting up a lot of properties. There are now few big properties in Victoria. Those that remain are merely exceptions. The same situation applies in New South Wales, where the Western Land Board cut up many properties. I know of two and can name them. What happened in South Australia under the Playford Government? Was that a Liberal Government? It was not

very liberal minded, I can tell the House—it did not do much for soldier settlement. True, it established a few small settlements like those on Kangaroo Island where farmers are now saying that they cannot make a living because the properties given to them are too small. That is why the McLachlans, McBrides and people like that still exist and, while there is a Liberal Government around here, they will always exist. The House should never believe that the little farmers organised the marches.

I would like to go further than that. As the honourable member would know, I have been on many properties, I have a damn good memory and I can remember faces very well. I watched the march down King William Street—and I was amazed! Little farmers, indeed. There were some farmers in that march! One farmer wore a straw hat, a dirty old torn cardigan and old dungarees and a pair of sandals. I guarantee that he picked them up from the shearing shed—a poor old shearer would have owned them.

Mr Gunn interjecting:

Mr PLUNKETT: The member for Eyre just flew in. He does not want me to be heard, because he is a big landowner—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is fast losing patience both with the member for Peake and certain other honourable members. I ask the honourable member to address himself to the Chair in less inflammatory terms than he has used up to date, and I ask other honourable members to restrain themselves.

Mr GUNN: I rise on a point of order. The member for Peake has used his position in this House to abuse and malign members of the community and, in particular, members of the rural community, without any foundation whatsoever. He has personally abused Mr McLachlan, who has the overwhelming support of the farming community. Therefore, I ask you to prevent the abuse of his position.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will have to resume his seat. I rule that there is no point of order. There may be, depending on one's point of view, some fairness in what the honourable member is saying. However, it means that honourable members would have to tell me to change Standing Orders so that everyone in this place was open to libel suits. That is my ruling: there is no point of order. I return to what I said: will the member for Peake address himself to the Chair in less inflammatory terms, and will other honourable members refrain from interjecting.

Mr PLUNKETT: Thank you, Mr Speaker, I appreciate that you are trying to give me some protection.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PLUNKETT: Members opposite do not want to hear what I have to say, because they know that what I am saying is correct. I refer again to the person whom I saw dressed in those ragged clothes and sandals. I thought, 'I know that man, he is the person who has a very big property just out of Naracoorte.' Many people recognised him, although the name given in the paper was not his name. I do not know whether that was arranged on purpose or whether it was a misprint. I wonder where he got those old clothes from, because he is never seen in Naracoorte dressed like that. I also wonder where he had his Mercedes parked, and that would apply to a few other people who drive Mercedes cars and whom I recognised.

A few weeks later there was the march by farmers in Canberra. I was told that one could not get near the airport due to all the planes there—talk about the poor old farmer! Many of the people in Canberra on that occasion flew there in their planes, and they are not farmers at all. As I said earlier, a certain number of farmers were present, and they

are deserving people, but they have been used by certain other people. In relation to those people, when the Minister of Agriculture (Mr Blevins) spoke to the farmers who assembled in Elder Park they encouraged the farmers not to listen to him speak. Had that happened with unionists outside Parliament House one would never have heard the end of it. The headlines would have read 'Communists march on Parliament House'.

I agree that there are some poor farmers, and I feel sorry for them. For many years the Liberal Government did nothing for them, and it was only under a Labor Government that the Wheat Board and the Wool Corporation were set up. Farmers now have the benefits of those arrangements. If people such as the McLachlans and a few other people I could mention got out and did their job organising these people to the extent of ensuring that they do not over-produce, the situation would have been improved. Articles in the *Financial Review* and the stock papers and comments made by Maximillian Walsh on his show a few weeks ago indicate that over-production of wheat is occurring. Some of the organisers agree that this is the case, although none of the stock and station people go out to the farms and say, 'Look, don't pull that timber out, as it is a waste of time because you would be over-producing. You would be better off looking after certain other things.'

One hears a lot of howls about vegetation retention and about farmers not being able to work up properties. However, they are working their properties up. All the silos in America are bulging at present to the point where farmers cannot get rid of their produce. Members opposite know that. Had members opposite read the papers or had they seen what happened at Collinsville the other day, they would realise that the next thing farmers would find would be that they would not be able to sell some of their rams, and this would be because of artificial insemination.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member who referred to 'a bucket of water' to come to order. I am issuing a final warning. Will that be noted by the member for Peake? I ask the honourable member to address the Chair and to speak in less inflammatory terms, and I ask other honourable members to refrain from interjecting.

Mr PLUNKETT: I do not intend to enter into any arguments with members opposite. On 11 July 1985—and if members opposite would like to read it, I will give them a copy—Max Walsh, in an interview with Mr Mick Charles, stated:

But that there is a crisis developing in our farming industries is, however, perfectly true. But, if you want to know why, you'll be far better informed reading the inside pages of the *Financial Review* than listening to the demagoguery of some of our farm leaders. Take today. On page 45 the *Review* carried the following report: 'China cutting into United States corn export to Japan'. The report states the Chinese have grabbed more than 10 per cent of the Japanese corn market and are headed for 20 per cent. Now that's a market worth \$2.3 billion—so much for the starving poor of China.

This is Max Walsh's statement, not mine:

It's now a major exporter of corn.

This comes on top of what I have already said. Every page of the document mentions how full the silos in America are, yet we are still producing wheat all the time. What will happen if it cannot be sold? Is it the fault of the Labor Government that the people who were supposed to advise the small farmer over the past 20 years did not do their job? If they are not doing their job, why do they not get out and do it instead of blaming the Government, whether a Labor or Liberal Government?

They blame the Liberal Government, too, but they wait until it goes out of power, before saying that it did not do much. However, while a Liberal Government is in power

they never criticise it. Yet they most certainly criticise a Labor Government. Why did they not allow the Prime Minister to speak to them? What did he have to say that Mr McLachlan and a few others did not want to hear? They had only two marches, and virtually gagged the Minister in South Australia. I promised the Whip faithfully that when I rose to my feet I would not speak for more than 25 minutes. I have been going 25 minutes.

Members interjecting:

Mr PLUNKETT: Well, let us have a look at the Liberal Party brochure which was distributed in the *Sunday Mail* and which has some Opposition members in a photograph of the shadow Cabinet. The honourable member did not make it, although he may have had a chance. The member for Hanson might even make it.

The Hon. D.C. Brown interjecting:

Mr PLUNKETT: Although I have never held a ministerial position, I have never been sacked from one, either. There are no problems there, but the member for Davenport was demoted. He will not be put in a position of trust where he can put a knife into the back of his Leader again. However, the honourable member did make the picture, but he is standing in front of the Leader, not behind him. The member for Hanson has a bit of a chance: he has been here for a while, although he has had a bit of bad luck. I suppose he has some expertise as a shadow Minister. I am not putting any member opposite in as a Minister, they will not get in. There is no problem about members opposite winning an election, the people of South Australia are not that stupid!

Then the shadow Minister of Highways (the member for Torrens) was changed, too. He sold the equipment off when they found it could not operate successfully. So, they switched him around. The shadow Minister of Tourism has her picture in, too. Little curly locks never made the photograph, but there is a possibility he will later. There are a few positions to be filled yet. I notice that not only members in this House missed out, but that members in the Upper House missed out, too. Only one made the photograph. The Liberal Party must be changing the system of not having shadow Ministers in the other House. They do not sit very often, so it was probably thought that it would be better to have them in this Chamber.

Mr Baker interjecting:

Mr PLUNKETT: Until the member for Bragg's performance the other night I thought so, but some of these other fellows have not much to fear from him. He could be back in the chemist shop.

An honourable member: What about the member for Alexandra?

Mr PLUNKETT: There is a prospect. He could not sleep for two days when the paper came out. I can have a bit of a joke with him occasionally, but he just did not see the joke at all. He did not know anything about the photo; he probably did not know that the brochure was being made. Whether they will retain their positions I do not know. As I say, he has made sure that he has only the nine as shadow Ministers there, so he certainly has a little room to work. One of them there puts his head down: the member for Morphett reckons that he is in the running. He might be, too: he is a pretty quiet person. One never hears much from him, but they reckon that some of those quiet ones are worth watching. So, he might be in it later.

Having looked through the Opposition's brochure, I do not find it as interesting as the one put out by the ALP. I have noticed that if certain members on the other side never had a brochure from the Labor Party they would not be able to make an Address in Reply speech. I cannot see another five minutes in it for me.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PLUNKETT: I will not torment the shadow Ministry over there much longer, but I suggest—

The SPEAKER: Order! We have been through this before.

Mr Oswald: I'll get that bucket of water.

The SPEAKER: Order! This is the last time that the Chair will show any leniency to anybody. The member for Peake will refrain forthwith from displaying the document that he had in his hand. All other honourable members will refrain from referring to buckets of water or anything like them, or I shall take the next step and warn and then name those responsible. The Chair is now perfectly serious. The member for Peake.

Mr PLUNKETT: I do not intend to stay on my feet any longer. I have decided—

Mr Ashenden: Tell us what the cockies in the South-East think of you.

Mr PLUNKETT: I am just waiting for your order, Sir. Am I in order in standing here and continuing?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members are behaving in a very contemptuous way, which I am sure members of the community would regret. The member for Peake will continue his address in the normal fashion, and I hope that honourable members will obey the Standing Orders, which they have imposed on me. The member for Peake.

Mr PLUNKETT: Thank you again. I will finish my speech by saying that the Liberal privatisation policy would be a tragedy if it came into South Australia again: it was a tragedy the last time, and it would be again if it came in. However, I do not think that I need have any fear of its coming in, as it would most certainly prevent a Liberal Government from continuing in office after a subsequent election.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I have sat here for the past 30 minutes trying to think of some response to make to the member for Peake, but I am having the greatest of difficulty. It was the most outrageous outburst against the rural community that I have ever heard from a member of this House, and it showed beyond any shadow of doubt the man's ignorance in the matter.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will refer to all honourable members by their districts.

Mr OSWALD: The outburst of the member for Peake typifies his absolute ignorance of the economies that are at present straining the rural community. The member for Alexandra has referred to the honourable member's hatred of the rural community. I have no knowledge of that, but there is some hidden problem in the background which is obviously colouring the honourable member's views of the rural community. Without the rural community, this State would have been bankrupt years and years ago. To sit here and be subjected to that outburst was totally intolerable, and the honourable member should stand condemned for it. I suggest that members opposite who have some knowledge of rural finances take the honourable member aside and explain to him some of the financial problems that have faced the rural community over recent years.

Mr Ashenden: They've given up on him, too.

Mr OSWALD: That is a distinct possibility. I do not think we should give up totally on anyone. Someone should take the honourable member aside and give him some sound advice on rural economics so that we do not have to be subjected to that type of outrageous outburst again. Ever since this Government came to office the people of South Australia have been calling for an end to the spiral in State land taxes, ordinary taxes and charges. The people in the district that I seek to represent want an end to this spiral in prices, taxes and charges that has been going on continuously now for the last 2½ years. We must see an

end to rises in transport fares, electricity tariffs and water rates that exceed the rate of inflation. The people of South Australia are screaming out for this to happen.

It is only because of the pressures of this Opposition, the Liberal Party in this State, and the unfavourable polls facing the Labor Party at the moment that we have seen any checks in that spiral at all. It has not been because of Government initiatives. It has taken an approaching election to galvanise the Premier into action with that \$41 million handout that we saw a few weeks ago as a last minute effort to entice a few voters.

We now all know what happened at the recent Premiers Conference and the deal that was struck regarding the future of grants to South Australia. Let us not be mistaken. After the last Loans Council, South Australia will be at a distinct disadvantage. There was a specific trade-off between the Premier as Treasurer and the Prime Minister whereby we received a special one-off grant of \$35 million, which was given to the South Australian Government for electioneering purposes some months later. In return, however, we have lost our bargaining power at the next Loan Council meeting.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: As the member for Bragg says, we should add to that the \$5 million which is a grant for the Grand Prix, and we are suddenly up to \$40 million that has been handed out by Canberra. Yet our magnanimous Premier opposite has the gall to say, 'I am now giving away \$41 million in tax cuts', and he wants us to believe that he is giving back some of the taxation revenues that he has collected from this State. What utter and complete nonsense! We are getting back \$1 million. Of that \$41 million, if you want to analyse it another way, all we have been given back is some of the money which normally is in next year's budget, anyway, because of normal escalation in State income.

The whole matter is outrageous. It is a total sleight of hand, something typical of the Labor Party that we have come to notice in the past six years. I studied the first Labor Party's performance prior to 1979 and thought that I would sit back in its next three years and see whether it did the same. All we have is the same performance again, taking the tax revenue back and giving it out in so-called tax cuts when in fact it is not coming out of general revenue.

Pardon me if I appear cynical, but I am sure that the public joins me in my attitude regarding this matter. It is patently obvious that the Bannon Government is not giving back anything more than \$1 million. It is a fact of life. All the talking in the advertising pamphlets it is distributing will not detract from that fact.

I have read with great interest the speech by His Excellency the Governor in which he put forward the Government's assessment of the State's financial and social position. The Government was at pains to point out that the recovery of our regional economy has continued. Once again that is an indication of the deception at which this Government is very adept. It did not say that previously, under the former Liberal Government, we were in the depths of a national and international economic crisis, that national and overseas trading was down; countries across the world were in a state of recession and that, as we have emerged from that recession, of course, Australia has benefited, as have the States.

The improvement has allowed the State Government to have an increased revenue which it had not forecast. It has given the Government extra money, but it is a revenue increase in taxes and charges which has been brought about because of increased business turnover. It has nothing to do with the work of the Labor Government. It was just an

ordinary increase in turnover as the economy improved, but the Government likes to claim all the credit for that.

We have gone from being the lowest taxed State under the Tonkin Administration to being the fourth highest. For the family, the pensioner and the unemployed living costs are starting to go through the roof. I do a lot of door-knocking, as do members on both sides of the House, but everywhere I go the message I receive is, 'Give us relief; we must have relief from this spiral in taxation.'

Under this Government, ETSA charges have risen by more than 41 per cent. The Government then gives back 2 per cent. Is that or is that not an election ploy? I also remind the House that that is a one-off situation for this year only. It works out to \$2 off the average quarterly electricity account. The Government may think it is doing great work by giving back taxation.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Two dollars a quarter.

Mr OSWALD: As the member for Alexandra points out, \$2 a quarter. The minimum water rate has risen by 60 per cent; the price of water by more than 43 per cent; sewerage rates by more than 54 per cent; milk by 17 per cent; bus fares by 58 per cent, and the minimum electricity quarterly rate has risen by 158 per cent.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: The member for Alexandra is quite correct: they have also escalated. Three weeks ago, as part of the softening up process for the Bannon election campaign, the people of South Australia were offered tax cuts. As I said a moment ago, we had the 2 per cent reduction in electricity bills and, when compared with the 41 per cent I mentioned earlier, I think that is a good example of how the Government is honing away at the edges. The cuts in power bills are ludicrous.

The Government flatters itself with a slight surplus in its current account this year and claims that that was brought about by its management of the State's economy. That is absolute nonsense. That situation has been brought about by the increase in business turnover and the rapidly escalating land and property prices that are being experienced in this State. Those factors have given the State Government a surplus this year of \$35 million in its estimates. Without that \$35 million surplus, which is a bonus that will balance their books this year, the last financial year would have been a disaster. The Government received that surplus through increased business turnover and land prices; it did not obtain it through good management. It lost through bad management. The Government has been saved by that \$35 million surplus, because of the increase in turnovers.

The Bannon Government has demonstrated over the last 2½ years that, despite the economic hardships being experienced by the private sector, which has had to tighten its belt (anyone in business would know that), it has had to reduce staff and had to consider automation, which means that jobs start to be moved sideways, and it has had to improve its own business management. In other words, it has had to become generally more efficient. If business in the private sector had not done that, it would not have survived.

On the other hand, our socialist Government, which has not had all the restraints placed upon it that are placed upon private business, has swung along on its merry way. It has expanded its work force by 3 300 personnel at the last count. It is supporting a reduction in working hours, which is adding millions of dollars to the public payroll. I am not suggesting that the nurses should have a reduction. That is a different debate and I do not want to get into it tonight. The economic exercise in extending the 38-hour week to a profession adds millions and millions of dollars to the overall cost which must be paid for from the public purse.

The Government also allowed a \$30 million overrun in its construction budget, brought about by the inability of Ministers, who have departmental construction works on the go, to be able to get some sort of budgetary control over their expenditure. It was \$30 million in just one year. In any sense of the imagination, that is absolutely intolerable.

The Government tolerates boards of directors—I suppose equivalent to the Cabinet—that are largely incompetent to perform the tasks entrusted to them. To rub salt into the wound, the Government continues to promote State owned business enterprises, which are in direct competition with private sector businesses, which must employ staff, pay wages, and make a profit to survive.

As the member for Alexandra pointed out earlier, there are other expenses that businesses have to incur and incorporate within their cost structure: legal fees, accountancy fees, water rates, council rates, licence fees, superannuation payments, land tax, payroll tax and insurances; to name but a few. Those are some of the expenses that businesses must contend with and write into their cost structure and still make a profit at the end in order to survive. Government enterprises do not have to do that. They are spared such expenses, so, naturally, their costs are lower. Then they step out and compete against the private sector; in many cases squeezing companies in the private sector out of business.

I have referred only to the small budget surplus. Let us not forget the recurrent deficit that has built up with this Government over the last 2½ years—a deficit in excess of \$60 million. The Premier, again, has made great play of balancing his books this year, but he has not, in his deceptive way, talked about the recurrent deficit of about \$60 million. If he has \$41 million to throw away, why not shift some across and pay off the bankcard. It is all very well to build up the bankcard, stick it in the top drawer and forget about it. However, we have a surplus and we could use it to pay off the State's bankcard.

This year petroleum royalties will bring in \$24.3 million and next year that figure will rise to \$43.3 million—an increase of some \$19 million. If we are going to experience long-term relief from taxes and charges, the Government has an obligation—there is no other word for it—to use the \$24.3 million in royalties from petrol, the \$19 million over and above that figure that it is expecting next year and the \$35 million gift it received from Bob Hawke to wipe the slate clean.

And what does the Government do? It grabs \$41 million and goes out on an election spree, leaving us with a \$60 million plus deficit untouched. That is an absolute disgrace. The people of South Australia are quite justified in saying, 'Enough is enough. Move aside. Put someone else on the Treasury benches—someone who can balance the books and pay the debts. That is all we are asking.'

I cannot let go unchallenged the Government's claim that it is responsible for the creation of 20 000 jobs in South Australia. Certainly, the Government has put 3 300 people on the payroll, financing that employment by FID. We find that the Government's income from FID equates with the cost of 3 300 extra staff. A further 20 000 jobs have been created in South Australia not in the public sector but in the private sector. The entrepreneurs in the private sector have created work, despite the pressures they face and despite the fact that State taxes and charges have increased by three times the rate of inflation. Private entrepreneurs have managed to survive because the national economy has moved forward and we have come out of recession.

If David Tonkin was still Premier, having won the 1982 election, people would have thought that he was the greatest person South Australia ever had because he would have presided over the period when South Australia was coming out of recession, just as Malcolm Fraser would have been

considered the greatest Prime Minister Australia ever had, because he would have presided over the period when Australia was coming out of recession. This situation has nothing to do with Bob Hawke or the Premier of South Australia: it is a matter of national and international economics. That is why South Australia has enjoyed an increase in the number of jobs. Let us reflect on that and let us not forget that more people are out of work in South Australia now than in 1982 when the Tonkin Government lost office.

There has been a net loss of jobs in South Australia. More people are looking for work now than when the Tonkin Government lost office. I do not think that the Government really has anything to crow about. Over the past 12 months of this Government's monetary control we have seen a continuous progression of blunders, procrastination, inefficiency and bad administration on the part of Ministers and the Cabinet. As I said previously, it has been estimated that waste amounted to between \$21 million and \$30 million—that is outrageous. The swimming centre at North Adelaide is a classic example. The cost over the period of construction doubled. As well, there were enormous construction problems—the swimming pool was leaking. Yet the Minister would not acknowledge the problem in this House. He hid the problem and it was only through the work of the member for Bragg and other members on this side that we were able to ferret out the truth. We learnt that the cost overrun for the swimming centre had doubled, yet this Government did its best to hide this fact.

The Bannon Government, through the Premier, promised to get tough on waste, but the proven incompetency of this Ministry and the Government's record indicate that this Government has a better chance of emptying out the Torrens with a bucket than coming to grips with the massive waste that occurs due to the mediocre performance of many Ministers.

Mr Lewis: Either way the water's muddy.

Mr OSWALD: That is right. Theft and waste have been with us for some time, as the record proves. We only have to examine the Auditor-General's Report to verify that. It has been particularly bad under this Administration. I will take a couple of minutes to run through figures that were cited in the recent Auditor-General's Report indicating that waste and theft are running riot in Government departments. I would suggest that they are areas for which the individual Ministers should stand accountable.

Mr Lewis: They should be condemned.

Mr OSWALD: Certainly, as the member for Mallee says, they should stand condemned.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Mallee is out of order.

Mr OSWALD: The theft of Government property is currently running at the rate of \$6 000 per week. Theft from schools is costing the State taxpayer \$250 000 per year. These figures are straight out of the Auditor-General's Report—they are not my figures. Rent on unoccupied premises is running at \$500 000 per year; overruns on Government constructions were estimated to be at least \$20 million per year; Highways Department roadside theft is running at \$100 000 per year; and overpayment on teachers' salaries was listed at \$205 000 for the year. I think they are absolutely outrageous.

In the press on 23 June last, the Premier claimed, 'There will be no soft options in dealing with State Government department inefficiencies.' Good heavens! Can he not see that the problem is in the lack of ability of some of his Ministry to come to grips with this particular problem? He should run his Ministry as a business. People in positions of authority in the private sector would not survive for a month as top executives (as these Ministers are) in companies if they had losses in their balance sheets as I have

just read out from the Auditor-General's Report. They would not survive for a month and, in those circumstances in the private sector, they would be shifted out sideways without any questions asked. If Ministers are going to have those sorts of losses, they should not be protected and I believe they should step aside.

Unlike the Labor Party, the Liberal Party believes in less tax and small government—more efficient government. We believe in a Government which concentrates on the provision of essential community services, which of course include education, health, community welfare and the like. We are committed in government to cutting taxes and reducing wastage. The Leader of the Opposition has been at pains to point that out and quite clearly the South Australian public now accepts that as being our ultimate aim—to cut taxes and reduce wastage. The Bannon Government has already increased Government spending, as I have pointed out, by some 37 per cent, which is well over twice the rate of inflation. This is what my constituents find quite outrageous. Since coming to power the Bannon Government has also swollen the Public Service by some 3 300 employees, at the last count, and has engaged itself in enterprises which the Government has no right whatsoever to be involved in.

Members of the Government are going to great pains—and the member for Hartley devoted some time to it in his speech—to misrepresent the policy of privatisation, yet this policy will bring about meaningful, long-term tax cuts to this State. It will reduce the costs of government. It will allow more efficient, competitive entrepreneurs the opportunity to own and manage what are now inefficient and costly Government enterprises in which the Government should not be involved. That is what privatisation is about. The bottom line is more efficiency—more efficiency through less waste. That gives us less taxes, a more stable economy and in the long term it will give us more jobs. It is a policy which shortly I would like to discuss and it is a policy which this Party is committed to. It will mean long-term tax cuts and more money in the hip pocket of South Australians. On the strength of that, I cannot see how any South Australian can possibly object to it.

I use this opportunity to echo the words of my Leader, because it is very important that this point should be recorded at any time that we talk about privatisation. He said that before any attempt is made to privatise a Government instrumentality, that instrumentality must pass the following test: will the consumers and taxpayers of South Australia benefit? Unless it passes that test, that enterprise will not be privatised.

I also echo his unequivocal commitment that not one person in the State Public Service or any public authority will lose his job through privatisation. If honourable members understand privatisation, they should understand that those aims are achievable. Socialism, Labor style, has given us over-regulation and a big expensive Government, which has found it necessary to maintain high taxes and charges to do nothing else but to fund its socialist programs. That is what a socialist government is all about. Indeed, the left wing would not allow it to happen in any other way.

On the other hand, privatisation Liberal style will put money back into the hip pocket of the ordinary South Australian; it will deregulate government and cut out red tape; it will reduce the size of government, to which honourable members opposite will obviously react because their purpose is to increase the size of government. When one reduces government size, one reduces its cost and creates more efficient government.

Mr Hamilton: Tell us about the Potato Board.

Mr OSWALD: I have waited for 10 minutes for interjections from honourable members opposite against the privatisation policy. They are scared stiff of this policy

because, as I will explain shortly, of the impact on the Labour Party in the United Kingdom and because its future fortunes have been shot to the wind. Honourable members who have studied the subject know that.

The private sector provides two thirds of the jobs in this State. Privatisation will ensure that those companies can continue to produce and to employ people. They now have to face unfair competition in the marketplace from Government instrumentalities which, for their part, have no hesitation in going into direct opposition to the private sector.

I will now spend a few minutes talking about privatisation in a more formal sense: it is the practice of moving assets and activities out of government sectors and into the private sector of the economy. It is the practice of having private profit seeking firms do what was previously done by public officials. Until recently very little thought or attention was given to the subject of privatisation.

Indeed, as late as 1979 privatisation did not even appear in Margaret Thatcher's policy speech. So, it has evolved within the 1980s. Traditionally, conservative governments and countries around the world have tried to hold back the growth of the public sector and allow for private sector expansion. At every election this is what conservative governments have tried to achieve at State and Federal levels.

The traditional conservative approach is to try to accomplish this objective by holding down spending on public sector programs. The problem with this approach is that it sets the conservative government against its opposition over the level of spending on particular programs, and election campaigns seem to settle down into an argument about who will spend what on those programs. Whilst the conservatives may be able to reduce spending by some amount through efficiency, they have always done so at great political cost. Even when they enjoy some success, it is usually very modest and spending cuts are not very great.

Moreover, these successes are frequently very temporary and are easily undone by the Opposition if it regains power. In the past, if Governments could show through economies made that they could institute spending cuts, the other Party could come into government and wipe out all the good that was done. Indeed, we saw that when the Bannon Government took over from the Tonkin Government.

The approach of privatisation, too, is a different approach. The technique of privatisation allows the Government to avoid altogether debate over how much is going to be spent on a particular program and instead focus on the wholesale transfer of the program to the private sector. Once the transfer is made, individual choice and market forces begin to play a greater role in determining how resources are going to be allocated and Government bureaucrats and political and social interest play a far lesser role; in fact, they cease to play a role at all.

What makes privatisation politically practicable whereas spending cuts are not? First, goods and services produced by the private sector are generally produced at a much lower cost, often at half the cost. It is well known from the English experience that a public instrumentality that has been privatised cut its costs immediately by one half.

In the second place, with competition or competitive bidding among potential private suppliers the quality of the product is generally higher in the private sector than in the public sector. In principle, privatisation leads to higher quality of goods and services produced at a much lower price. If it is a much lower price there is no longer pressure applied to increase taxes and charges.

I would like to talk about privatisation as far as the British are concerned and indicate that it is a British success story. I will quote from various papers to which I have had access so that honourable members can also have the benefit of

getting hold of these papers. Numerous studies have documented that privatisation generally leads to higher quality products at lower costs.

If members are interested, they should read the book *Better Government at Half the Price*, put out by James Bennett and Manuel Johnson, and another book by E.S. Savas *Privatising the Public Sector*. Another book by Robert Poole is *Cutting Back City Hall*. These books give details of the United States experience. However, until recently no-one had ever examined systematically how the techniques of privatisation worked, nor had they given a theoretical explanation of why they worked. The breakthrough came with the theoretical production by Dr Madsen Pirie, President, Adam Smith Institute of London, who produced the book *Dismantling the State: the Theory and Practice of Privatization*. I also refer members to another book by John Goodman, *Privatisation: Conference Proceedings*, a United States book from the National Centre of Policy Analysis 1985.

The English experience is interesting, and I intend to quote a couple of papers to the House. The first deals with the selling of Telecom. The British Government decided to sell Telecom, whose directors were happy and enthusiastic about what was happening. They floated Telecom, although the unions in England screamed about the selling of the State's asset, but two million new shareholders appeared. The unions did not anticipate that—they thought that the big conglomerates would move in and take out block shares, and that Telecom would be controlled by multinationals, but that is not what happened. Suddenly they found that they had two million new small shareholders in Great Britain.

Mr Lewis: And 90 per cent of them worked for Telecom.

Mr OSWALD: As the honourable member says, over 90 per cent of those new shareholders worked for Telecom. Suddenly the Labour Party had a problem: Telecom had been hived off and was being run as a profitable enterprise in the private sector. All Labor Parties are vote conscious, and it suddenly realised that there were 2 million voters in the electorate who are private little capitalists, if you like, with shares in Telecom—

Mr Lewis: And could employ others.

Mr OSWALD: Yes. So, it suddenly became very popular amongst the union movement to support this move. Therefore, the leaders of the union movement said that in this case it was a good idea. In England there was the problem of welfare housing. There, it is assumed that 90 per cent of those people who occupy council flats vote Labour. Traditionally, the Labour Party in England has never taken much notice of that block vote. Prior to an election the Labour Party offers those people cheaper rents, while the Conservatives probably indicate that they will have to increase the rents to a level applying in the market; it says that the Government never makes any money out of the arrangement and in fact only loses money. It may point out that the Government is trying to cut its losses. So, at election time people had to contend with the Labour Party telling them that it would reduce their rents while the Conservatives were telling them that a Conservative Government might have to increase their rents.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: And they still voted for Maggie.

Mr OSWALD: No, they did not the first time, when 90 per cent of the electorate voted Labour. In relation to privatisation, Margaret Thatcher concluded that, as the Government was losing money on the flats, anyway, why should they not be sold to the people who lived in them. The Government came up with a scheme of selling the council flats to the tenants at 50 per cent of their market value. At election time the reaction of the 90 per cent of people who had voted Labour was, 'What have we got? We have cheap

rents under Labour or a cheap house under Maggie Thatcher; therefore we will take the cheap house'. The union movement in England, which had written off the block vote in council elections, suddenly started—

The Hon. Ted Chapman: To think privatisation.

Mr OSWALD: Yes, and this is having a snowballing effect. Honourable members should bear in mind that privatisation is not just something that is peculiar to Great Britain. In relation to privatisation in Britain, the Government has sold more than \$5.5 billion of stock in nationalised companies, and it intends to continue selling at the rate of about \$2 billion a year. To date more than 400 000 jobs (almost one-third of the total nationalised work force) has now been transferred to the private sector. Do not let any honourable member think for one minute that this is just a small move that is taking place. It is not a small move but something of national and international significance, whereby companies are realising that the track down which we have been dragged by Labor socialist Governments (like the Government opposite) over recent years has not been the right track to go down. It has been disastrous. This has resulted in nothing but an increase in costs. It has reached the stage where the ordinary men and women of Adelaide, Sydney, London and cities of other countries in Europe have screamed, 'Enough is enough; you cannot bleed us any more as there is nothing else to be had.'

As I have said, privatisation is not confined just to Britain. It is occurring all over the developed world and in the undeveloped world as well. It is even occurring in the communist countries. A few of the more socialist left members opposite should bear that in mind before they criticise the Liberal Government's privatisation scheme and should think very deeply about where they are going.

I want to refer to some of the other privatisation exercises that have taken place. I refer, for example, to some of the more recent experiences in developing countries of Asia. In Asia, the State owned telephone and telegraph companies are being sold to the private sector in Bangladesh, Thailand, South Korea, Malaysia and Sri Lanka. The State-owned airlines are being sold to the private sector in Thailand, Singapore, Bangladesh, Malaysia and South Korea.

The State-owned banks are being sold to the private sector in South Korea, Bangladesh, the Philippines, Singapore and Taiwan. Railway and bus services are being privatised in Thailand and Sri Lanka. Highways are being privatised in India and Malaysia. Shipping and shipbuilding are being privatised in Singapore, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka, and oil and petrochemical companies are being sold to the private sector in India, South Korea and the Philippines. State-owned hotels are being sold in Singapore and the Philippines, and other industries are being privatised in Sri Lanka, Pakistan, Singapore, the Philippines, India, and Bangladesh.

Mr Lewis: Even farms are being sold off in China.

Mr OSWALD: I have no knowledge of that, although I believe the honourable member. I would not be surprised because the communist world, from my reading, is looking very closely at the question of privatisation. Other companies are dabbling in privatisation and, while they have done that, the British have homed in on it as a science. It is now becoming the new political science of the world. It is the political science to which honourable members in this Chamber must address themselves.

The books that I put on record a little while ago are some of the top reading material on the subject of privatisation. 'Privatisation' is a word that none of us likes. If anyone could come up with a better word I am sure that we would do so. Members should bear in mind that the bottom line of privatisation is that more money is put back in the public's hip pocket and the costs and size of Government are cut. In the long term, this means that one ends up with

a small, efficient Government looking after the essential services in the country, the remaining enterprises being hived off to the private sector. It is the only way to go.

Mr Lewis: And use the proceeds to pay off the bankcard.

Mr OSWALD: And use the proceeds to pay off the bankcard—the State debt, which I intend coming to in a few minutes. During the debate numerous examples have been given of the 188-odd individual charges that the Labor Party has increased, as well as introducing the new tax, FID. This is an outrageous record for the Government. The Premier promised not to introduce any new taxes during his term of office, but he has raised taxes by 50.2 per cent. I remind members of an election pamphlet which appeared in my letter box, as it did in all letter boxes in the electorate of Morphett in 1982, when the Bannon Government came to power. It said:

We will stop the use of State charges like transport fares, electricity, water and hospital charges as a form of backdoor taxation.

Mr Lewis: Did he say that?

Mr OSWALD: It is here in black and white. It goes on:

The Labor Party will not introduce succession or death duties—but the Premier is quite happy with Canberra doing it. The paper continues:

... and we will not introduce any new taxes.

Time will not permit me to go through the whole of this document tonight. However, it is a litany of promises that have not been kept. Under the heading 'Health', the pamphlet says:

The Bannon Government will stop any further funding cuts to our public hospitals.

This last year the Government cut funds to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital by 2 per cent in real terms. The paper talks about prices and says:

The Labor Government will re-establish a proper system of price control.

I am not too sure about that. If one asked petrol resellers one would see what they said about that.

Mr Ingerson: I wonder if they could stand on their record.

Mr OSWALD: Of course, they cannot. It is an absolute disaster. The paper mentions giving strong backing to resource development. The Labor Party backed Roxby Downs because it wanted to win the election. However, it shut down Honeymoon and Beverley, and one of those companies has now left the State. I do not want to spend any more time on this disastrous pamphlet.

Much has been said about the Bannon Government's record of waste, inefficiency, tax charges and increases, and the \$35 million that it was given by Bob Hawke to buy short-term votes. However, nothing has been said in this debate about the State debt. I will spend the last few minutes available to me talking about the State debt and the growing interest bill.

Members seem to have been engrossed in this \$41 million that the Premier will give us in order to win votes. No-one has mentioned the accumulated deficit on the current account or the State debt. It is a fair estimate that 95 per cent of Government members probably do not know the amount of the State debt, and I doubt whether some members opposite would even know of its existence. The State debt is becoming frightening. It has been put to me that if we did not borrow any more money, functioned within our resources and concentrated on paying off the existing State debt, we would spend the next 53 years before we could square the books.

This is alarming. It is also alarming when one talks to economists about the Canberra scene. I know that they are not joking, but it is almost in jest that they say that the Australian National debt under Hawke is approaching that

of Argentina, and that it is time to pull our belts in. Nationally, no-one seems to be taking any notice of this matter, but I hope that some of our colleagues in Canberra will start highlighting that point. The national debt is getting out of control.

The Hon Ted Chapman: But Mr Keating told us tonight that he had reduced it by \$1.8 billion down to \$4.6 billion, which is the lowest for 16 years.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Alexandra has already spoken.

Mr OSWALD: I do not have the national figures here to confirm that.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: We do not know whether we can believe him.

Mr OSWALD: I do not know whether I can believe him. The State debt in South Australia, on those figures, is the same as the national debt. It is worth mentioning what the State debt in South Australia is.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: It is the second biggest line in the budget.

Mr OSWALD: I will quote a few of the figures from the public record showing the escalation of the total State debt under the Bannon Government, including public borrowings by the Government and other instrumentalities. The latest data that I have been able to get hold of is for the 1983-84 financial year. The figures for 1984-85 should be released in the next month or so: financial authorities are still preparing them. There is no current collection of data on the overall level of debt in South Australia: there is some difficulty in putting it together. Treasury officers are working on an information paper at the moment that is not yet completed.

When statistics on the level of indebtedness are quoted they generally refer to the term 'public debt', which consists of borrowings for the State through the Loan Council. However, this is only one item of the overall State debt. Figures show that the Bannon Government slightly reduced the State debt in this past year by \$25 million. However, when honorary members see what the State debt has gone up to when one includes figures for all the statutory authorities they will share my concern.

To acknowledge that offset against State borrowings one has to take into account some of the State's assets. I will do that and still show that the State debt is escalating out of hand. The main sources of my figures are the 1983 annual reports of the Auditor-General and the South Australian Financing Authority. The State debt accumulates in five ways: first, borrowings by the State Government through the Commonwealth Finance Agreement, that is, through the Loan Council. This is the commonly used figure for the State debt. The South Australian Financing Authority's Annual Report details these borrowings on pages 17-18 and the Auditor-General's report refers to them on page 23. In 1983 the total public debt stood at \$2.01 billion.

Secondly, the debt can be incurred through loans provided by the Commonwealth for specific purposes, often at concessional interest rates. These loans are itemised in Statement 1 of the Auditor-General's report on pages relating to the relevant departmental authorities. In 1983-84 the liability for those loans totalled \$910.7 million. The third way in which the State debt can be incurred is through loans raised under the gentleman's agreement by statutory authorities, now largely the South Australian Financing Authority and the Electricity Trust. Whilst the financing authority's indebtedness amounted to \$598.1 million at 30 June 1984, the ETSA borrowing program is larger. New loans in the 1983-84 financial year totalled \$107 million, bringing ETSA's total debt to \$747.8 million for 1983-84. As a result, the total for this category for 1983-84 would be a minimum of \$1.345 billion.

Fourthly, the State debt can be incurred through borrowings by the State Government directly from its statutory bodies. Page 23 of the Auditor-General's report details these borrowings for 1983-84 under the heading 'Liability on trust and other funds'. The total was \$566.6 million for 1983-84.

Fifthly, the State's public sector debt can be incurred through leases, trade credits and other deferred payment schemes. There is no estimate available for this item, so I cannot include it in my total of the State's debt. By adding the first four figures together one arrives at a figure for the indebtedness of this State for 1983-84 of \$4.843 billion. I do not have figures for 1984-85.

I will now compare the escalated figures. In 1980, when the Tonkin Administration was still in power, the State debt, including the debts of statutory authorities, stood at \$2.662 billion; in 1981 the figures rose to \$2.758 billion; and in 1982 the figure rose again to \$2.766 billion. Then, with the change of Government in 1983, the figure rose to \$2.890 billion, and in 1984 it rose again to \$3.487 billion. One can see that from 1982 to 1984, under the former Administration, the figure held steady at around \$2.6 billion and then shot up from \$2.7 to \$3.4 billion. What makes up these debts under 'other statutory authorities'?

An honourable member: That's not local government though, is it?

Mr OSWALD: No, it is not local government. It is probably all right in each individual case to say that we need the debt. I do not deny that on each occasion we did need to raise money for specific purposes. For example, there are the following outstanding State debts: Adelaide water treatment, \$21.9 million; Dartmouth reservoir, \$8.7 million; forest salvage operations, \$11 million; housing, \$788 million (of course, we are building up an asset there but it still has to be paid for); marginal dairy farms reconstruction, \$239 000; national sewerage, \$10 million; natural disaster relief, \$33 million; rural adjustment, \$21 million; rural industry assistance, \$12 million; and softwood forestry, \$3 million; a total of \$910 681 million.

Why am I talking about these massive figures in the State debt? I am talking about them because no-one else is talking about them. There is talk of the budget balancing this year in the current account, yet no-one from the Government side talks about the accumulated deficit, the fact that we have \$60 million overrun for the previous year—we just hear how the Government is balancing the books this year. We hear also about the \$41 million that it has given away to win votes.

It is about time that people started talking about the State debt and recognising that at some time or other that debt, plus interest, must be repaid. It is accumulating like the family bankcard that has been chucked into the bottom of the wardrobe and forgotten about. I know that there is an exercise in rolling funds forward, but eventually the time of reckoning comes. The Public Accounts Committee is looking at a totally bipartisan exercise which will be of immense value and which will be finished in about six months. It is looking at replacing the State's assets, at the life expired of these assets, and at what is going to happen when the State has to start paying for the life expired of those assets. No exercise has been undertaken. I think that the E & WS has a small sinking fund in which money is put for the replacement of assets some time down the track, but other departments have not done this.

I ring warning bells for the House. When that exercise is completed we will see how much money a Government of either persuasion will have to put aside for the replacement of Government assets at some time in the future—assets such as buildings, water mains, whatever one likes to come up with. If one links that with the budget overruns and deficits, which are not talked about in current accounts, the

massive State debt, which is accumulating all the time, and with superannuation problems, I suggest that this Government should not just talk about the fact that in 1985, an election year, it is balancing the books.

The State has a massive debt which nobody seems to be addressing. At a time when we have a massive State debt and overrun of the budget deficit in the last two years, no Government can afford to throw away \$41 million. Our royalties for last year, this year and next year have all been blown to win votes. It is an irresponsible Government and Treasurer that will take that course of action. It is high time occupancy of the Treasury benches changed.

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

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

Motion carried.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): After listening to the member for Morphett for one hour, we agree on one point and that is the concern we share over the State deficit. It is a frightening thing, and I do not know the answer.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: You know, the longer you're here, the more conservative you become.

Mr PETERSON: When the Liberal Party was in government I did not notice any great steps forward to reduce the deficit. The problem is there and, until everybody gets together to look at some way of overcoming the deficit, we are not going to do much good.

We see the hypocrisy of Opposition members when they talk about the high taxes imposed by this Government. There is no doubt that, when the Government came to office, it imposed taxes, as do all Governments. When the Opposition was in government, it also imposed taxes. If the Liberal Party is again voted into office, I am sure the taxes will continue, but the Opposition left a deficit in the State funds: there was a shortfall.

Mr Baker interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: There is some discussion as to how much that shortfall was. Figures of \$63 million and \$41 million were mentioned. I do not know what the exact figure was, but there was a deficit. Referring to the tax concessions, if my memory serves me correctly I saw somewhere that the Leader of the Opposition said that, if he were in government, he would have given the same concessions.

I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, and in so doing I would like to pass on my best wishes to those members who will be leaving us. I assume some time this year, although as yet nobody knows exactly when. A number of members will be retiring. I refer to Mr Allan Rodda, who is a great gentleman; Mr Jack Wright, another gentleman; Mr George Whitten; and of course the Deputy Speaker.

Mr Ashenden interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: There is a lot of discussion as to who will and who will not be back here, but I will certainly be back. Among the tax cuts announced was a concession relating to electricity charges. There was an \$11 million rebate in the tax cuts, with a reduction in electricity tariffs of 2 per cent in November this year. In the interests of my constituents, the problem is that it is a once only measure, and that is bad. I sincerely believe that the only way we will gain control over electricity and gas—energy—costs in this State is by controlling the price of gas.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: I will come to the Liberals in a moment. I do not get stuck into people very much, but I will comment on the cost of gas when another Party was in power, as it

did not do much in that area. The facts of the matter are laid out in documents. In September 1982 an 80 per cent increase was granted. That was disputed, and I recall the Deputy Leader of the Opposition—the then Minister of Mines and Energy—creating a big fight and struggle and telling us what a great job he did in saving us a lot of money. However, we still ended up paying \$1.62 a kilojoule for it, so I do not know what he did exactly. A lot of kerfuffle went on about what a great job the Deputy Leader was going to do, but we still paid a lot of money. There is not much to carry on about now, but I will come back to that point. His Excellency the Governor in his speech said:

A secure supply of energy at a competitive price is essential for the long-term development of South Australia. My Government is vigorously pursuing arrangements with the Cooper Basin producers to secure long-term and reasonably priced natural gas supplies for the State.

It is also interesting to see comments made by prominent people in our community. In the *Advertiser* of 26 June this year the former General Manager of ETSA, Mr Bruce Dinham, was reported as having spoken quite strongly about the cost of gas and the fact that he believed it was considerably over priced in this State. The point he makes is as valid now as it was then. The way things are going with gas negotiations, it will be valid in the future. Mr Dinham cannot see—and I agree with him—how one State, New South Wales, can be supplied with gas at \$1.10 a kilojoule when we have to pay \$1.60. I do not understand that, either.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: The honourable member refers to the Hon. Don Dunstan. I understand that legislation was amended in 1975 at the request of SANTOS to protect the industry, which was in difficulty, and adjustments were made to the contract structure to enable it to survive. Santos certainly has not been too generous with us since then, and negotiations have been atrocious. If we pay any more for gas than we pay now, something is wrong in the system. Mr Bruce Dinham has a lot to say in that article in the *Advertiser*, and I agree with him.

One surprising comment, which was supported by Mr Clyde Cameron (a Minister for Labour in the Whitlam Government), was that our electricity charges would be 10 per cent lower if Cooper Basin gas were sold at a fair price. Mr Cameron is not one to hide his light under a bushel if he has something to say. His opinion is well respected, and he said that we are being over charged. It will be interesting to see, when the time comes, what we end up paying for gas; indeed, I and many people believe that that is the key to reasonably priced electricity supplies for this State, namely, to control the price of gas. SANTOS is not doing too badly. If we are talking about the cost of electricity in South Australia we have to be fair about it. The State Government in its own right is not taking a bad slice. I have some figures (and I am sure someone will tell me if they are wrong) giving State and local government charges, taxes and levies imposed upon ETSA.

There is a statutory levy of 5 per cent of income from electricity sales imposed by the State Government on ETSA. In 1982-83 it amounted to \$20 366 000; in 1983-84 it was \$22 366 000; and in 1984-85 it was \$26 620 000. There has not been much change. Payroll tax has increased. Land tax and council rates have increased, although stamp duty was abolished in 1984-85. Vehicle registration fees have increased. When FID was introduced, \$72 000 was collected in 1983-84 and \$120 000 in 1984-85. That is a cost imposed by the State on the producer of electricity, for which eventually everyone in the State pays.

I was interested to note that the interest rate payable on South Australian Treasury loans to ETSA was increased from 6.4 per cent per annum to 12.2 per cent per annum

as from 1 July 1983. In 1983 there was an additional cost of \$8 190 000 in that regard and in 1984-85 it was \$9 361 000. There was an extra cost in relation to the South Australian Government guarantee of .5 per cent per annum payable on all ETSA borrowings, except Treasury loans. In 1983-84 that cost ETSA \$3 454 000 and in 1984-85 \$3 790 000. Therefore, from 1982-83 to 1983-84 these costs inflated Electricity Trust charges by 50.8 per cent and from 1982 to 1984-85 by 73.6 per cent.

Mr Lewis: That went straight to the State Treasury.

Mr PETERSON: I understand that that accounted for about 10 per cent of ETSA's income. Therefore, 10 per cent of ETSA's revenue goes directly to the State Government. If we are to be fair in talking about costs, we must be fair all around. If the State takes that sum, it must be added to the cost of electricity that we buy.

Mr PETERSON: You can't blame that on Santos, can you?

Mr PETERSON: No, you cannot on Santos; but Santos, under its costing structure, appears to be doing all right. Consumers in New South Wales pay \$1.10 a kilojoule, and I do not understand why we have to pay \$1.62.

Mr Lewis: Because the Dunstan Government negotiated it that way.

Mr PETERSON: That is not quite true. That is the present price here. The former Minister of Mines and Energy talked about the show he put on, but the costs are still the same. He said that he saved us \$80 million, but we still pay \$1.62 a kilojoule. There is something wrong somewhere. If money is being saved but we are paying the same amount, there is something wrong with the maths. An article in the *News* of 15 August, under the heading '“Cut price or else” gas chiefs warn' (with which I agree absolutely—and we were talking about privatisation previously) stated:

The State Government has secretly legislated to control the price of gas unless the Cooper Basin producers agree voluntarily to a reduction.

That is pretty drastic stuff, but in the end we must control the cost of electricity in this State. It is possible that that will not happen, but we must try. We talk about industry, employment and our future, so we must consider one of the major costs—the cost of energy, either electricity or gas. Somehow, the cost must be reduced. There will be negotiations next year on gas contracts, and it will be interesting to see what happens.

I heard the federal budget speech tonight and I noted that the Treasurer said that the Labor Government is a caring and compassionate Government. I certainly hope that that is reflected in their attitude towards nursing homes. I do not believe that I need to go into the nursing home situation again here. I have raised questions and debated it on several occasions in different sections of our debate. Today I asked a question and received a nothing answer, which is usual when I request something on nursing homes. It is an issue which is, I believe, a sleeper, as one calls those things in elections. I am amazed that the Opposition has not picked it up and run a bit more with it. I believe that there is a much greater effect in the community than people realise with nursing home costs.

Mr Lewis: Everybody has a grandma or a grandpa.

Mr PETERSON: Everybody has somebody they know or is related to who wants to be or is in a nursing home. Let us be honest, it is a fate probably laid out for many of us one day, and hopefully we will be able to afford it. Unless that is picked up, unless some action is taken, unless some answers are given to people, I believe that that will grow into a much bigger problem for the Government than it can envisage.

Mr Lewis: You must keep the private sector viable.

Mr PETERSON: The private sector does all right out of it, but, as I said before, with nursing homes it is not as if they set their own rates or charge what they think is a fair cost. They are assessed by the Commonwealth Government. One has to be assessed by the Commonwealth Government as being ill enough to go into the nursing home and then what one is paid to pay for the care is not enough. If it is not enough, I still want to know—and there are many people in the community who want to know—what that alternative care is and who is going to provide it?

Again on the Budget tonight I heard talk of home care—keeping people in the home. That is a great idea when it can be done, but it cannot always be done. Some people will always have to be cared for in nursing homes. Currently there are those who need that care who cannot afford it. An answer must be given, and it must be given fairly promptly.

The Governor in his speech referred to the regular shipping service from Japan. I am pleased to say that I was wrong when I said to the Minister some time ago that I did not think we would ever see a regular service. It is there now and I hope that we can keep it. I hope that it is not just a ploy by the Japanese shipowner to screw the Victorian port authorities again to get another concession of \$90-odd for a 20-ft container which they had on last year to maintain the business in Melbourne. I hope that they are genuine and that the business can stay here. There are added costs when a ship makes a two-port call, and it will be interesting to see how long it lasts—hopefully for ever—but let us just keep our eye on that.

In the same item in his speech, the Governor spoke of expenditure and planning for fishing and recreational boating facilities. There is one item in fisheries that I have raised in this House before and I am going to raise again because nothing has happened about it, and that is the St Vincent's prawn fishery.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Oh, come on!

Mr PETERSON: I know that the member for Alexandra does not like my raising this subject because there are prawn fishing boats in Investigator Strait. I have nothing against them being there. It is great that they are there earning a living, and I have nothing against them. I have no personal interest in a prawn boat at all, but I want to raise the fact that there is a serious dispute in St Vincent's Gulf. The South Australian Department of Fisheries and the South Australian Fishing Industry Council magazine called SAFIC, in its June/July issue of this year, Volume 9, No. 3, has an article on the Spencer Gulf prawn fishery, and it is a very good article. That is a very successful fishery. It works very well. They control it and there seems to be co-operation between the fishermen there and the fisheries department. It is an organisation that works well and this article explains it. My concern is that in the St Vincent Gulf fishery, that does not occur.

There are serious problems there, although I do not know why. I have spoken to fishermen and to the Department of Fisheries: there is a great deal of animosity between those two groups. Somehow we must get them together: whether a Government organisation, independent group or a commission does that, it must happen, because a very valuable resource in this State is not being harvested correctly.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Where?

Mr PETERSON: It is in St Vincent Gulf—prawns.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Port Adelaide fishermen can fix that up.

Mr PETERSON: Port Adelaide fishermen have been around for a long time; in fact they started the prawn fishing industry in South Australia.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Those two operators in Investigator Strait are champions for the cause, and you know

it. They make a quiet living catching big prawns: they do not interfere with anyone and do not want your Port Adelaide fishermen interfering with them. They do not want to get together.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has pointed out to the member for Alexandra on three occasions that he has already spoken in this debate. He has now spoken at least four times.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: I wanted to leave and he called me back.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member for Alexandra carries on in that vein, I assure him that the Chair will deal with him.

Mr Lewis: Then you'll be able to leave, Ted.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That goes for the honourable member for Mallee, too. I ask the member for Semaphore not to debate with members, and I ask that interjections cease.

Mr PETERSON: Certainly, Sir. The fishing industry is fairly topical. As I say, there is a problem in this fishery, and I do not want to see the Port Adelaide fishery or St Vincent fishery going into Investigator Strait. That is not what I want; I want an assessment.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: Investigator Strait is interesting. Boats have been in and out of it, both approved and not approved. They started off with Commonwealth permits, but that has been changed. They still operate on permits.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: State authorities now.

Mr PETERSON: They do not have licences; they are on permits. One would assume that if the State was happy about it it would have issued licences instead of permits. However, they are still on permits and I do not feel that the previous Government was so confident about giving them ongoing licences. It kept them on a concession. The permit system can be withdrawn at any moment; the licence cannot.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: They're stamped on the side of the boat. You don't need to worry about it.

Mr PETERSON: If I was worried at all, it would not be about Investigator Strait fishermen. I am concerned about St Vincent Gulf prawn fishermen.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! It is true that, as is usual in the debate we are now experiencing, the Chair is fairly lenient with interjections, but we now have two people speaking at the same time. The Chair will not tolerate that. I assure the honourable member for Alexandra that if he carries on in the vein he is at present there will be no alternative but to carry out the Speaker's wishes in such a situation. I give the honourable member for Alexandra fair warning. The honourable member for Semaphore.

Mr PETERSON: Thank you, Sir. As I say, people in my area are being affected—not only fishermen but those who work in the fish processing plant. I have here a letter from an operator of such a plant in which he says that he usually employs 20 people but that he has not been able to employ them this year. I am also aware of 42 letters from business people in Port Adelaide who are concerned about the loss of business in the St Vincent prawn fishery and who have written to the Premier and to the Minister concerned. As far as I know, to date there has been absolutely no positive response and no progress in getting an answer.

The St Vincent Gulf prawn fishery group funded a report into the fishery. I know that that report has been sent to the Premier, to the Minister, to the Leader of the Opposition and the shadow Minister. In all, about 20 or 30 copies of the report were sent to members of Parliament but, as far as I am aware, there has not been one response to this group. True, that is the choice of members to make, and I am not criticising their response or lack of it.

However, I make the point that, when this St Vincent Gulf prawn fishery was opened, it was described as a liquid gold mine that was supposed to be an ongoing resource that could be cropped, much the same as the Spencer Gulf fishery could be cropped in an ongoing manner. It was supposed to be turned into a resource that would benefit the State for many years to come—but something has gone wrong. That is my point: something is wrong. If something is wrong, it should be investigated and corrected.

Certainly, it is not right for the State, for the Government or for the people in power to allow this problem to continue, to allow an industry to decline and a State resource to be frittered away and be lost for ever. That will happen unless it is managed correctly. After all, it is a managed fishery. There is supposed to be a plan of management for this fishery, but it does not seem to be in place.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: Something is wrong, and for some time I have been deeply concerned about this. I deal with the fishermen, the fish processors in the Port and those who supply equipment, gear and so forth. While the catch has been decreasing, nothing has been done. As I said, animosity has existed between the fishermen themselves and the Fisheries Department. Something must be done to correct the situation.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: You would know all about it. I have been tempted to move for a Select Committee to investigate the situation. Indeed, I have been trying for some time to have an investigation made of the fishery, but that has not happened. I will certainly move for a select committee, unless something is done to investigate and correct the problem. I do not care whether it is the fishermen or the department who are wrong—the situation needs to be resolved. In regard to recreational boating—

Mr Trainer interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PETERSON: Reference was made in the Governor's speech to recreational boating, which I enjoy. The only policy document I have on recreational boating happens to be the Opposition's policy document, which I have read. It is not bad. I have been told that it is a copy of the Government's paper, but I have not seen the Government's paper and, until I do, I will not know.

Mr Lewis: It's not been written.

Mr PETERSON: As I said, I believe that it is a copy, and it covers the points fairly well. It shows that there are 43 000 registered boats in this State. That number is probably controlled by the facilities available. True, facilities have changed over recent years: modern and up to date facilities are available and, luckily, most of these facilities for ocean going people and their craft are in my electorate; that is naturally a wonderful choice. People have made the right choice in coming to Semaphore because it is the best district in South Australia for boating facilities. There are plans to expand such facilities and I see that there are plans to provide a new facility at Glenelg, and this will further extend the availability of boating facilities.

The problem with boating in South Australia has been a lack of facilities and, if further facilities were provided, we would see recreational boating and yachting in this State expand considerably. That would have a further effect on our economy flowing back from suppliers of boats and equipment, fuel, moorings and all the bits and pieces that are linked to such activity.

I notice that the policy document states that it will ensure accessible departure points and identify ways of encouraging private enterprise, and includes all the things that sound right but never seem to get done. Recently, I saw an advertisement describing the St Vincent Gulf and Spencer Gulf

as the Mediterranean of the south. That is so: the potential is there for development and for wonderful boating activities. However, that will not happen unless it is fostered properly by the Government of the day. I said earlier that I have seen only one policy document.

Mr Lewis: Labor hasn't done its document yet.

Mr PETERSON: We can ask about that tomorrow. We may not receive an answer, but we can try. The points are contained in the policy document. I look forward to the Estimates Committee at which time it can be queried a little more. I now refer to another issue raised by previous speakers, and that is the kindergarten situation with its cut back in funding and the reduction in federal funding which will seriously affect the kindergartens of our State.

Mr Lewis: I haven't even got a kindergarten in my district.

Mr PETERSON: I am aware that the member for Mallee has been protesting that he does not have a kindergarten in his district. Perhaps that is just as well, given the reduction in funding. The cut backs will place a tremendous strain on the parents of children attending kindergartens. We have received no answers in relation to the funding question. No-one knows where we are going. The kindergartens have been placed in limbo and the parents, teachers and children do not know where they are going. I hope that the forthcoming State budget will include some funding for kindergartens.

The other subject to which I will refer briefly unfortunately relates to the tragedy at the Shell depot at Birkenhead, and that is the lack of firefighting and fire prevention equipment, at least on the peninsula. I am aware of a great deal of concern in the community generally in regard to the lack of fire prevention facilities in this type of installation. I have received numerous telephone calls from people in the community generally who are concerned about liquid gas storage facilities around the metropolitan area. They are concerned that if something goes wrong any outbreak of fire will not be able to be controlled. In fact, I notice in the stop press section of tonight's *News* that a liquid gas leak at Gawler today caused an evacuation.

By some odd quirk of fate, the day before last week's fatality at Birkenhead I mentioned the lack of fire prevention facilities on the peninsula. That brought forth a fairly nebulous reply from the Minister. Events since that day have now brought an active interest: reports are being raised and an investigation is being conducted. I hope that means we will get somewhere. However, we cannot overlook the fact that there is a great deal of concern in the community generally, not only in the district of Semaphore—which I will win again at the next election. There is a lot of concern about the storage of gas and oil. I think for the well being and peace of mind of the people of South Australia the Government should look at this seriously and prepare a report and survey.

Finally, I wish all members of this House well. I wish the members who are retiring well, and I hope that they have long and happy retirements and that their health remains sound. Those members (and I) who will come back after the next election will enjoy it and in respect of those members who are unfortunate enough not to win again, well, that is fate: but, good luck to all.

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

PARLIAMENT (JOINT SERVICES) BILL

Adjourned debate in Committee (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 397.)

Clause 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Repeal and transitional provisions.'

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The funds of the Joint House Committee as it exists at present will remain the property of the members through the new Joint Services Committee. There will be no alteration whatsoever in that respect. However, as provided for in a later clause, an annual report will be made available to the House. This will be a new feature to which I draw the Committee's attention at this stage. The membership will be able to identify quite clearly the property, which has been under the guidance of the Joint House Committee since 1941, and financial statements and all other matters relating to the activities of the committee will be made available to members of both Houses of Parliament on an annual basis.

Clause passed.

Clause 4 passed.

Clause 5—'The Joint Parliamentary Service Committee.'

Mr M.J. EVANS: I move:

Page 4, line 9—After 'calendar' insert 'year'.

This is a technical amendment to rectify the omission of the word 'year' following the word 'calendar' in subclause (10).

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 6 to 11 passed.

Clause 12—'Appointment of persons to offices.'

Mr M.J. EVANS: I move:

Page 6—

Line 35—Leave out '(not exceeding 2 years)'.

After line 36—Insert new subclause as follows:

(3a) For the purpose of subsection (3)—

(a) the period of probation shall be for a period not exceeding two years;

and

(b) a period of probation initially fixed by the committee may if the committee thinks fit, be extended (but so that the period of probation does not exceed the period of two years).

This is a slight amendment to what is proposed in the Bill. While I agree that up to a two-year probation period is ideal, on occasions the committee might wish to appoint an officer on probation for, say, one year. However, the way that the provision is drafted at the moment, at the end of that year the committee would have only the options of either confirming the appointment of that officer or terminating his appointment.

As the provision stands, there would be no option to, say, extend the probation period for a further six months. I think that that extra flexibility would assist the committee in its work in relation to being able to retain the services of officers who may require a further period of probation. The concept of extending the probation period, while remaining within the initial two-year period, is a concept which is well accepted outside this House and is widely used in the private sector and local government. I commend the amendment to the Committee. It will simply have the effect of allowing the committee to impose one or more, say, two periods of probation which, in total, do not exceed two years.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The Opposition is happy to accept this amendment as being part of the contemporary phraseology that is now used. I believe that there would have been the opportunity in the document as presented to undertake this course of action. However, the amendment spells it out quite clearly. If it gives additional support to the staff in the knowledge that they are being properly looked after, that there is an opportunity for counselling to take place and for them to respond during the second probationary period, I do not think that it in any way is against the principles that were discussed in the broad sense

by the committee during its deliberations. I think that the amendment is commendable.

Amendment carried.

Mr M.J. EVANS: I move:

Page 6, line 40—Leave out 'not less than the salary or minimum salary (as the case may be)' and insert 'the salary'.

This amendment simply has the effect of requiring that every officer appointed to a particular office under the section which is, in effect, all officers—because they are all appointed pursuant to this section—shall be paid the salary fixed for that office. In respect of every office of the Parliamentary service a salary classification level will be fixed, whether that is a minimum salary, a fixed salary or a salary range. It is more appropriate that this clause be expressed in positive terms to ensure that the person has a guarantee of that salary rather than expressing it in the negative sense as it presently is, which contemplates the possibility of payments in excess of the salary prescribed. This would be wrong in the context of a Public Service environment which is being translated into the parliamentary services in this case.

Certainly, if an officer warrants additional payment the classification of his office should be looked into and that office reclassified. The officer should not be paid additional payments over and above that classification which already applies. I commend the amendment to the Committee as it will simply give staff a guaranteed right to the salary applicable to their office.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: This amendment certainly puts the matter into the positive form rather than the negative form. Research indicates that the negative form has been used in other legislation in relatively recent times, notably, the Magistrates Act. However, we can find no specific reason why this clause was written in that particular way. As we are seeking to bring the legislation into a contemporary form—and I keep using the term 'contemporary form' because it is one that the Minister loaned to the House in presenting the second reading, and I think it is the general attitude adopted by the Select Committee—I am happy to accommodate the honourable member's wishes.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 13 to 15 passed.

Clause 16—'Discipline.'

Mr M.J. EVANS: I move:

Page 8—

Lines 26 and 27—Leave out all words in these lines.

Line 29—Leave out 'proposed' and insert 'taking of'. After 'action' insert '(denying, if the officer thinks fit, a liability to disciplinary action)'.

After line 39—Insert new subclause as follows:

(8) Before disciplining an officer the committee shall, if the officer so desires, afford the officer a reasonable opportunity to make representations (personally or by representative) as to the disciplinary action that should be taken.

The amendments I am moving are what I think the committee would have intended. It will afford an officer charged with a breach of discipline the opportunity to have natural justice observed in respect of his case. As the clause presently stands it will be possible under an interpretation which I might make of the clause for the committee to have to form an opinion of the officer's guilt before it notifies him and gives him an opportunity to appear.

I think that members would agree that that is contrary to the spirit of natural justice which should prevail in these matters. It would be more appropriate if the committee, in the first instance, notified the officer of the circumstances of the allegations against him and then gave him the opportunity to appear before them in relation to that matter, and subsequently, if it was necessary, to make representations in relation to penalty. I am seeking to ensure that natural

justice is observed and that the committee does not come to a conclusion about penalty before they have heard the officer in respect of his possible guilt or innocence.

It does not preclude an officer from admitting the charge and simply proceeding straight through in an expeditious way, but it means that the officer has the right to go before the Committee to discuss the question whether the Committee should formulate penalty before it in fact formulates the penalty as the clause stands at the moment. So, I seek the Committee's support to ensure that the provisions of natural justice apply in this instance.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The honourable member's period of employment in the Department of Labour is certainly coming to the fore, and it is commendable that he has picked up what is an error of omission, not an error of intent. It is very clear that the deliberations of the committee were to interpret the Public Service Act as near as was necessary to the Parliamentary scene and that in undertaking that action and being aware of the general content of the clause the membership, having recognised that there was an appeal process, had not sought to clearly link it to the first action taken, which was the determination of guilt or otherwise.

I was a little concerned in the first instance when addressing the honourable member's amendments that they might increase the period that would be taken to dispense justice or that we could find a person having to be advised of the decision taken that they were guilty, being notified and then having a period of appeal, and the committee then having to come back into session to determine what the penalty would be if the appeal against guilt had not been upheld.

However, in discussion and having regard for the practicalities of the type of action that would follow, it seems that the opportunity would be given to the member to address himself to the guilt phase in a short time; then the committee during its session a few minutes later would decide on the penalty if there was no dispute relative to the decision of guilt. We want to be totally practical: practicalities will apply in this case.

However, the honourable member would be first to agree to any amendments that are put forward by the committee in due course if it finds that the ease with which we believe that we have achieved the natural justice result for employees is not achievable in the circumstances. It is the clear intent of members of this Committee that justice be dispensed equally and properly, and we trust that we have the right formula to allow that matter to proceed. The Opposition supports the proposition.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 17 passed.

Clause 18—'Recreation leave.'

Mr M.J. EVANS: I move:

Page 9, line 17—Leave out 'for each year of service' and insert 'in each year'.

There is the potential for misunderstanding in the interpretation of this clause as it is presently printed. It might be interpreted to mean that the committee has the power to grant five working days additional leave for each year of service: in other words, a person who has been employed for 10 years might be granted 50 days additional leave—five by 10. That is not the intention. The amendment that I move here seeks to clarify that so that it is five working days in respect of each year of service, one year at a time. So, if there is a need to grant five days additional leave in a particular year that may be done. The provisions of this section are not to be cumulative year in and year out. I move that amendment in an endeavour to tighten the interpretation of that clause.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I certainly appreciate that the intent was misconstrued in the words, and not by design.

It is yet another example of where somebody can be so close to the drafting of a measure and then read over the top of it without seeing the danger. I remember that, many years ago, a Bill on oats marketing passed through this House. We passed a Bill, which called for a report biannually rather than biennially. The consequences of that different word being used were quite mammoth. It was always the intent that the report would be prepared biennially. However, when we checked, the word in every draft was 'biannually', but people had read it as 'biennially'. I think that this is another case where we knew what the words were intended to mean but where they did not exactly convey what was intended and so could be construed in the manner that the honourable member has identified. I believe that the amendment moved is necessary and fortuitous.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 19 to 23 passed.

Clause 24—'Application of certain Acts.'

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I draw the Committee's attention to the importance of this clause. It is one to which the committee gave a great deal of attention. In fact it was responsible for probably every draft from about mark 10 to mark 16, as the case may be. There is no query at all in the minds of the members of the select committee—the position of the Houses will not be compromised; that is, the privileged position that the Houses occupy. That natural justice, and indeed the necessity of Parliament to respect its own laws, is incumbent within the various subclauses of this clause, which does highlight and respect the supremacy of the Parliament and the parliamentary system.

I clearly indicate that this is a matter about which there was a great deal of debate. Nobody would resile from that being fact. It is a fact that members were prepared to sit around the table and talk until the words were, in their estimation, right so that the supremacy of the Parliament was completely safeguarded, yet the rights of the employees of the House and their expectation of proper industrial consideration have been provided for.

I believe that clause 24 as proposed is a monumental march forward in an area which has been a difficult one and that it will do a lot to overcome the very grave concerns that have been expressed by a number of members for a period of time as to just how protected the employees of the parliamentary family were or are. I believe that what was sought has been achieved, and I know that the two Presiding Officers, who have a particular role to play in the implementation of clause 24, will do that in the best traditions of the Westminster parliamentary system.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I indicate Government support for this clause and echo much of what the member for Light has already said. The importation into legislation such as this of the Superannuation Act 1974, the Equal Opportunity Act 1984, the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1972, and the Workers Compensation Act 1971, is a step which obviously would be regarded in some Parliaments in other places as fraught with all sorts of difficulties.

The select committee also faced some of those difficulties. I think that what has been placed before honourable members is a reasonable halfway point between the necessity to ensure that modern industrial conditions should apply to the people who serve us so very faithfully in this place, but on the other hand, the traditional rights and privileges of the Parliament should be maintained. I join with the member for Light in commending the clause to the committee.

Mr M.J. EVANS: I think that this is an appropriate point at which to draw attention to something that I said during the course of the debate on noting the report of the Select Committee. Of course, the provision of this section will extend to all employees of the committee, but it will not extend to employees in the House of Assembly or the

Legislative Council. Although this is something to which we want to give consideration in future, I point out, as I did in my earlier speech, the discrepancy between the application of all these Acts to some employees of this place but not others and that distinction between two sets of employees will, I am sure, create difficulties for us in the future. It is something that will ultimately have to be addressed.

We are now applying a whole series of statutory provisions to some of our employees and that is a matter which is of concern to me. As I said before, I do not intend taking the matter any further because I realise the nature of the debate that has taken place before this and the experience of other members who participated in the committee's deliberations. I think that we ought to be very clear on the fact that we are extending these, in some cases, privileges and, in some cases, responsibilities to only some of our employees.

Clause passed.

Clauses 25 to 33 passed.

Clause 34—'Rules.'

Mr M.J. EVANS: It is my understanding that any rules made by the committee will be subject to a report by the Subordinate Legislation Committee which will be laid on the table of the House and which will also be subject in the normal way to disallowance. I wonder if my understanding of that could be confirmed.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: It is the clear intention of the committee that that, without doubt, will be carried through.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Following on from the information given to us by the member for Light as member of the Select Committee, on behalf of the Government I would like to say that we will ensure that the forms of the House are so arranged, with the cooperation of members, that that indeed will take place.

Clause passed.

First schedule.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I make brief mention of the first schedule clause as being the transitional provisions. It was mentioned in the previous second reading debate that there would be some work undertaken of a preliminary nature, phasing from one Act to the other. We believe that the transitional phase is one which should not be unduly hasty, but certainly one which will not be left in abeyance for a long time. It will require the partial proclamation of the Act as provided for by a previous clause. I can assure the Government that the members of the Opposition will be quite happy to comply with the necessary discussion that needs to take place and with the nomination of the necessary representatives, from this House anyhow (and I am sure from the other House) for the new Committee, in order that those necessary transitional activities can be put in train.

First schedule passed.

Second schedule and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 415.)

Mr S.G. EVANS (Fisher): Traditionally, in this debate, when we are replying to the Governor's speech on opening the Parliament, members may take the opportunity of expressing condolences to the families of former members of this Parliament. Members also take the opportunity of referring to those who have indicated they are leaving the Parliament at the next election, and wishing them all the

best in their retirement. I do that now *en bloc*, but I will take the opportunity of expressing in more detail my sentiments in these matters during my contribution to a grievance debate at the time of the introduction of the budget. Tonight I will not take my full hour in saying what I wish to say.

Again, the things that may concern me more deeply may have to wait until I ascertain the Government's attitude when the budget is brought down. My electorate of Fisher has been cut three ways. That brings with it some difficulties, such as bumping into other people who are campaigning in that area. That aside, I have attempted to ensure that I have represented the whole of the electorate.

My electorate is one of the most difficult metropolitan electorates to represent as it encompasses two quite separate communities: the Aberfoyle Park/Happy Valley area, and the area some people refer to as Mitcham Hills, although people who live there prefer to call it Blackwood and surrounding districts. It is a large area and takes in communities such as Coromandel Valley, Hawthorndene, Glenalta, Eden Hills, Bellevue Heights, Belair and so on. However, Belair does not fall into the seat that I now represent. The other section is, of course, a major part of the Stirling District Council area.

Each of those communities has seen a massive growth rate during the past 15 years. It first occurred in Blackwood and surrounding areas, followed by the Stirling District Council area and, while more latterly, the Happy Valley council area, or that part of it that falls into the present electorate of Fisher.

That area of Fisher has enjoyed the most significant growth in the whole Happy Valley council area. There are still major problems in that community, even though Federal and State Governments have spent quite significant sums in the developing area. People in other parts of my district would be thrilled to get the same sort of recognition. I and every other member of this House know that that part of the District of Fisher will have some bearing on who wins the new seat of Fisher. Knowing politics as I do, I believe that that area will receive a lot of attention, so I am grateful that as from 1 September the bus service in that area will be improved.

I am grateful to the Government in power at present that in the past couple of years the area has been provided with services that were not provided previously. But, I point out in passing that I do not appreciate the fact that car parking for the Happy Valley Primary School has not been seen as a serious problem, and I hope that the Government takes up the challenge of convincing the Minister of Water Resources that the land alongside the Happy Valley Primary School can quite easily be made available for a car park, even if that development is some way down the track.

The Minister of Water Resources can decide to fence a certain area, and at least that area will be ready for use without increasing the potential of pollution from a drain that could overflow into the Happy Valley reservoir. The concern is so great that the Happy Valley Primary School community has decided to bring together next Monday afternoon the representatives of the relevant authorities and me (and I have no authority except that I can make representations on that subject) to consider the problem. I hope that the message is brought home to those who are in a position to make decisions.

The Happy Valley city council is another body that has bent over backwards to provide facilities that a new community expects; in fact, it has provided more facilities than developing areas have had in the past. The council has borrowed about \$5 million over a certain period in order to ensure that the community has satisfactory facilities that will attract new people to the area so that business operators

in the Hub have enough clientele to make their enterprises paying propositions.

I believe that the council has been successful to a degree, although the clientele of some of those businesses is not sufficient. I make the point that overall Australia is in debt to a greater degree than is Argentina. It does not matter from where Federal or State Governments or individuals borrow: in the end we are accountable in regard to the debt. I fear that we are imposing on future communities and on our children a debt that they will not be able to meet, particularly when one considers the ageing of the population.

That may not always be the case. Attitudes towards families may change. Migration policies might change so that we bring more young people here. They are all possibilities for the future, but the debt we have is significant.

In saying that—and I move to other parts of my electorate—I am always conscious of the requests I make to the Government about costs. Some areas of concern in my electorate at the moment are going to need quite large amounts of money if what I and others are advocating and the community is demanding is to be met. For example, there are pressures to try and resolve the traffic problem in some parts of the hills through Coromandel Valley and Blackwood, but many of the community realise that if those transport problems are solved by widening or altering roads, that will cause some concern to those who live close by, which really lowers their standard of living or, in their opinion, the environment in which they live is destroyed. In the main, they are right. Therefore, those who live on a road that is being considered for upgrading are rightly concerned and say that it should not be their road and want it to be somewhere else.

The only place that one can select that 'somewhere else' is through the property called Craighurn, where there are no houses at the moment on the north side of the river, and I think there are unlikely to be any in the future. However, on the south side of the Sturt River, the Happy Valley council area, there are already subdivisions of quite large allotments being built upon, and it is going to be an area of quite good standard homes. Therefore, to put a road through there would immediately cause those people buying those allotments to say, 'We don't want it near us.' The option that we had of being able to do something without causing concern to the community, to near neighbours of the development, is rapidly being removed. If we were to go ahead with that option, it would be the most expensive, but it would be the best in the long term by far. The Government of the day has to decide whether it is better to take that long term option than to start interfering with the quality of life of the people in the other streets.

One of the other options is to do something—not a lot—to Murray's Hill Road, but more particularly to the northern end of Murray's Hill Road which then changes its name to Coromandel Parade, which would need a lot done to it. In doing that, I believe that it would be impossible for some property holders to gain access to the street with what one might call reasonable safety. Therefore, I think that option is out unless, when the report comes out from the Minister, he can show that it will not adversely affect a lot of people, as I believe it will.

Another option is to upgrade Main Road, Coromandel Valley, and to decide whether at its northern end to route traffic over the bridge on Coromandel Parade instead of allowing most of it to pass over the level crossing at Blackwood railway station. Whatever we do there will seriously affect the quality of life of many citizens who have enjoyed a reasonably quiet environment and who would not want anything resembling a main arterial road being upgraded near their properties. The end result may be that it is better to do nothing.

It may mean that local people will be slightly inconvenienced, especially while Old Belair Road is upgraded, as is planned, towards the end of this year, but that little inconvenience may be better than having a road developed which will enable constituents from as far away as the electorate of the members for Baudin and Mawson to travel through to the eastern and north-eastern suburbs instead of travelling along an upgraded South Road, Flagstaff Hill Road or Ayliffes Road. The hills community, which has a real concern for the environment, might prefer to put up with some inconvenience rather than with the expenditure of much money. When the report is released, the community will be able to express their many and varied views on it.

Another matter concerning hills residents is the Craighurn property. On its northern side it has some 320 hectares that remains in much the same state as it has been for decades. In the middle of the property, Minda board has established a nursery and a centre for therapeutic training of the mentally disabled in the preparation of dried flowers, plants and other goods for sale.

The Golden Spur riding club, which works with the mentally disabled, also provides facilities for its members at Craighurn. Another riding school at that site caters for people within the Minda community as well as for disabled people from outside.

There is also a camp site, which raises funds and provides a resource for the mentally disabled. Other facilities include a house, a piggery and a dairy, which allow mentally disabled people to lead a fuller life and to learn skills from which they can benefit. The rest of the land is used mainly for grazing. A significant part is zoned rural A and the rest special usage. Minda board has been advised that the rural A land can be subdivided and that it retains that right by law. The rest of the land can be used only for special use and cannot be subdivided. Some time ago Mitcham council decided to attempt to rezone that rural A area into the special use category. That placed the volunteer Minda board in a difficult situation.

It knew that Governments have difficulty in finding funds to give more to different groups assisting the disabled, and it knew that if it lost equity (it was not the board members who would lose the equity) it would be the disabled people of this State who would suffer. The board took action and issued a writ and at the same time asked its consultants to submit a plan maximising the number of allotments that they could develop under law in such a proposed subdivision.

That caused much community concern because people generally had learnt to accept and believe that that open space would always be there. Rightly or wrongly, that is the view held by many people in the community. The end result was that the Government established a committee to report on the overall issue. Before that committee reported (it still has not reported) a public meeting was called to discuss the matter. A group was formed and a committee established to work to collect signatures throughout the metropolitan area for a petition to be presented to this Parliament suggesting that the Government should acquire the property for open space.

This caused me to put a question on notice asking the Government whether it has ever been offered the opportunity to buy the land or any part of it and, if it has, which parts. Also, I have a notice of motion indicating the grand work that Minda carries out on behalf of mentally disabled people and pointing out the support that Minda has given to different community groups. The motion points out that the House should recognise the public demand for Minda Craighurn farm on the north side of the creek to become open space.

Also, there is a need for sporting facilities in that area, and the Government should negotiate with the Mitcham

council to see what provisions can be made for the future and to put some money aside so that we have the money to pay for the property if it becomes available.

That is all well and good. One of my colleagues has said that we should buy it and pay it off over a period. It is not a definite figure but, say, at \$500 000 a year for whatever number of years it takes, and ratepayers could also be asked—this is a community association suggestion also—to pay perhaps \$2 a year each on their rates. There are about 30 000 rate notices, so that would be about \$60 000 a year. Both those propositions seriously disadvantage the mentally disabled people.

It is not enough money to pay interest on the value of the property. If the property is not worth what the Minda board says it is worth and the law decides that it cannot be subdivided, it might be enough money. Most people in the game who know the zoning law, and the rights of landholders with rural A land where services are available, seem to think it is possibly worth \$10 million or more. Even if we were paying only \$10 million for the land over a period of years, the interest alone per year at 10 per cent is \$1 million, without paying anything off the principal. However, the lending rate at the moment is about 15 per cent, so the interest repayment would be \$1.5 million per year without paying anything off the principal.

That worries me. I am quite clear in my view and I believe that the Minda board has done in the past and continues to do an excellent job for the mentally disabled. I believe that the only solution to the problem is this: if the vast majority of the community want the property bought, the Government should buy it on behalf of the community and give Minda the money to provide other facilities for the mentally disabled. I only put forward that proposition if the Minda board no longer wants the property. As long as Minda wants the property or any part of it for the benefit of the mentally disabled, I am quite clear that Minda should be able to retain all the property or part of the property that it wants to retain for that purpose. I want to ensure that people understand that and understand that I see the benefit of the area in question being left as open space. I will fight for that, but only if the situation is not manipulated to the disadvantage of the mentally disabled.

I am aware that the State Government provides just over \$3 million and that the Federal Government provides just over \$3 million in funding and that the rest of the money comes from the pensions of the mentally disabled (and some would say that that is all Government money, anyway). If we had to pay the total cost in helping these people, including the volunteer component and other things organised by Minda—all at the taxpayers' expense—including land, the burden to the taxpayer would be many millions of dollars more than it is at the moment.

I now turn to another area, and I hope the Minister of Water Resources takes note of this point at least. Along with others I have been fighting for years for the upgrading of Old Belair Road. I think the loss of my great grandmother was the first, if not the only, road death on the road, apart from a heart attack victim in 1888. It is not a dangerous road in terms of life and in terms of human limbs being broken. In fact, the road is that bad it is safe: no-one can speed on it. There are problems with narrowness, rough patches, and so on. Several Governments have deferred making a decision for many years, but we have now reached a point where we believe that it will be completed by the end of this year. I took the opportunity of telephoning someone in the Minister of Water Resources Department and telling them that the road has a few houses without sewerage connection. I was told that they were conscious of that fact. They sped up the process and I believe that the surveys have now been done and that there is a chance that

the connections will be made before the road surface is sealed later this year.

I hope the Minister understands what I am saying and that he will ensure that what often happens in these circumstances does not occur. Often, shortly after a nice new road surface is laid another instrumentality comes along and digs it up in order to install some connections. In this case there are not many connections involved—only five or six on the Old Belair Road and a couple on Serpentine Road. However, even if connections are not made to homes, at least provision can be made for them to be installed ready for future connection to households if necessary. I make this point because, quite often we do good work on the upgrading of roads, and then along comes another authority which digs up part of the new road. Nothing makes taxpayers more angry than seeing that happen.

In relation to the experimental orchard land at Hawthorndene, about which there is some community concern, a public meeting was held recently when it was suggested that the department might perhaps recommend that the pine forest there be cut down: it is a forest reserve and will remain that way until a proclamation which is before the House now is settled. A committee was to be set up to look at the future use of the land. The community was concerned that perhaps the committee should also consider the matter of the trees. The public meeting overwhelmingly supported that view, and that proposition was put to the Minister of Lands and Minister of Forests (Hon. R.K. Abbott). On behalf of the community involved I want to thank the Minister for agreeing to do nothing about the trees and to allow the committee to consider this matter and to submit a report. The community is very grateful and it acknowledges that there are many points of view in relation to what the land should be used for and that the negotiations will take some time.

I conclude my remarks by referring to three schools. In relation to road development, to which I have referred, the Craighburn school is concerned about the traffic that passes that primary school, with a rapidly expanding school community. The situation in relation to the Coromandel Valley school is even worse, because the adjacent road is old and no provision has been made for turning vehicles which must change from one lane to another to go on to the school property. The narrowness of the road is such that one could almost describe it as being a bullock track that has just been sealed. Therefore, the people associated with the Coromandel Valley school are anxious to have a school crossing installed, as well as some other work carried out near the school. The various authorities responsible for these matters, including the council, are aware of this. I do not intend to let this matter die.

The Hawthorndene Primary School has a similar problem, except that the road involved is not quite as narrow. The school is situated in a valley, and as people tend to take the straightest route to get to their destination, they use Suffolk Road, which goes straight past the school. With a kindergarten on the other side of the road, as well as a commercial enterprise nearby, at times some conflict arises in relation to safety factors as far as the schoolchildren are concerned. The installation of a crossing at that point is urgently required. I know that proposals have been put to the Mitcham council, but that does not help in the short term. Those involved want that school crossing there, and I believe it is important that it should be there.

Another matter that is important for the Coromandel Valley Primary School concerns a saga that has gone on for years. The community at Cherry Gardens still has a significant number of children attending the Coromandel Valley Primary School. For nigh on 50 years it had a private bus service while those private services were still operating in

the hills. Suddenly, when the STA came into operation private operators were restricted. Australia Post no longer had a post office at Cherry Gardens, and because there was no mail delivery by bus the private enterprise bus stopped and there was no replacement.

The school at Cherry Gardens was closed. The community said that that was good and that it could close, as long as there was transport to the Coromandel Valley Primary School. That was agreed. A bus to Blackwood High School was agreed. Suddenly, a new school was built at Craighburn. First, it was decided to build it, then it was decided not to build it. Twelve months later it was decided again to start building. So, the Craighburn Primary School was established.

There was then no bus for Coromandel Valley. I am grateful that the Minister allowed the bus to continue for a couple of years, after some visits and a scenic tour with him through the hills. I think that he appreciated the beauty of the area. We did not stop for golf, but went right past the golf course and looked at the area. However, now the axe has come down and there is no school bus for Coromandel Valley. The Craighburn school is getting to the point of overflowing. Two classrooms were shifted from Coromandel Valley this year because the enrolments dropped and those classrooms went to Reynella, or somewhere. Two classrooms were brought from Reynella to Craighburn because the Craighburn numbers were up. Classrooms passed from one school to the other.

Coromandel Valley Primary School has the capacity to take more children. In particular, it has the capacity to retain the children already enrolled, but there is no bus service to the school. Students are being taken out of the district of Coromandel Valley and brought to Craighburn. That is a pity. They are both good schools with good school councils and people concerned with the welfare of the children.

The Minister has agreed that the bus will go from Cherry Gardens to Aberfoyle Park High School. That service will continue. Also, he agreed that the bus could take children to the Craighburn Primary School and, if there is not enough room on one bus, a second bus would be brought on the route. Let us think that through. Why do we not have the second bus for children going to the Coromandel Valley School and pick up some of the others who are being left behind. It is about 3½ miles from the Coromandel Valley School, with no public transport. Why not give them a bus? No other part of the metropolitan area has children walking such a distance—and it is part of the metropolitan area. Why is this not done? I ask the Government to consider this matter in all seriousness.

During this speech I have stuck to electorate issues because I want to place the matters on record so that people know where I stand. However, as I indicated earlier, I will take the opportunity in the budget speech to clear up a couple of other matters I had intended to clear up tonight but have decided to leave to a later date. I support the proposition that is before the House and look forward to an interesting session between now and 30 November, or some weeks before when we stop sitting.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.1 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 21 August at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 20 August 1985

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

HOUSING TRUST RENTAL ACCOMMODATION

28. Mr BECKER (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction:

1. Does the South Australian Housing Trust maintenance of rental accommodation include removal of red-back spiders from the property and, if not, why not?
2. What insects, vermin and arachnids are included in current maintenance removal programs?

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

1. The trust will undertake eradication of spiders, insects and vermin where investigations confirm an outbreak of significant proportions. However, this rarely occurs. I believe it is reasonable for tenants to undertake minor eradication of such insects using domestic insecticides.
2. White ant eradication from trust buildings and structures is an ongoing problem that has a high priority for treatment and repair of subsequent damage. Yearly allowances are made in each regional budget for small programs to treat infestations and repair any subsequent damage.

PARLIAMENTARY MEMBERS' STAFF

43. Mr GUNN (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier: How many House of Assembly members have been given extra office staff or assistance in their electorate offices or at Parliament House, who determines members' entitlements to extra assistance and on what basis are they paid?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Nine members of the House of Assembly have more than one full-time equivalent electorate assistant, either at their Electorate Offices or at Parliament House. Since 1984 entitlements have been determined by Cabinet on the recommendation of the Public Service Board. Prior to 1984, Cabinet considered each application for additional assistance. The additional staff are paid as Personal Assistants (CO3 classification) or as Office Assistants (MN2 classification).

DRIVERS LICENCE APPLICATIONS

53. The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. How many applications for 'P' plate drivers licences were lodged with the Marion Motor Registration Division in the year ended 30 June 1985?
2. How many of the applicants were successful in gaining their provisional licence on lodgment of their first, second, third or subsequent applications, respectively, at the Marion Centre?
3. How many applications have been lodged and granted in the above categories from all State driver licensing agencies?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: No detailed statistics are kept to answer the questions raised. However, for the year ending 30 June 1985 a total of 39 506 applications had been lodged for a Class 1 driver's licence. Of these 21 712 applications were granted during the same period.

EAST END MARKET

54. The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (on notice) asked the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Agri-

culture: Has the Government undertaken to assist the horticulture industry to relocate the East End Market facilities and, if so, when is the relocation work expected to commence and what are the details of Government assistance?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Government has approved a proposal to relocate the East End Market to a new site between the Main North Road and Diagonal Road, Pooraka. Registrations of interest are now being invited from investors/developers for establishing and managing the new wholesale market. Proposals are to allow for the commencement of market operations no later than 1 July 1988. Government assistance to this stage has involved securing a suitable site and facilitating the development process.

PERRY BARR FARM

85. The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: Has the older of the two houses remaining at Perry Barr Farm, Hallett Cove, been considered by the South Australian Heritage Committee as a possible item for the interim list and, if so, when and what has resulted from such consideration?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Both cottages included in the Perry Barr Farm complex have been nominated for inclusion on the State Heritage Register on 16 July 1985. Items are currently being investigated before being sent to the Heritage Committee.

METROPOLITAN SEWERAGE RATE

91. The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: What was the average metropolitan sewer rate (not average base sewer rate) for domestic consumers for 1984-85, and what is the estimate for 1985-86?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The reply is as follows:
Average Annual Metropolitan Sewerage Rate

Year	Amount
	\$
1984-85.....	142
1985-86.....	146 (estimate)

METROPOLITAN WATER RATE

92. The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: What was the average metropolitan water rate (not average base water rate) for domestic consumers for 1984-85 and what is the estimate for 1985-86?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The reply is as follows:
Average Annual Metropolitan Water Rate

Year	Amount
	\$
1984-85.....	214
1985-86.....	219 (estimate)

STA HILLS BUS ROUTE

95. Mr S.G. EVANS (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Where does the STA third zone service finish in the hills bus route?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: There is no defined 'finish' to zone 3 on State Transport Authority bus routes in the Stirling hills. Although State Transport Authority bus routes

operate only to the Aldgate bus depot, the Bridgewater railway station is included in zone 3.

STA PSYCHOLOGICAL TESTING

96. **The Hon. D.C. BROWN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. How many psychological tests have been carried out during the past 12 months on people applying for positions with the STA?

2. What is the cost of each test and why is it necessary to screen applicants for jobs where the salary is less than \$20 000 per year and which are normal operative positions?

3. Who has carried out these tests and does it involve an in depth interview and then a three-hour written psychological test?

4. What was the total cost of such tests during the past 12 months?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. Eight.

2. The cost of each test was approximately \$350. The authority's objective is to appoint the very best applicant to each position irrespective of the salary level and accordingly has been testing the different selection techniques available which can assist it in this objective.

Psychological testing in one such technique. The authority does not intend to pursue the use of consultant psychologists

for employment purposes except for special appointments. Instead it is developing procedures in-house similar to those used by the Public Service Board.

3. PA Consulting Services, John Clements Consultants Pty Ltd, Hamilton Sheppard and Associates. Interview time frames varied, however, most would include a pre and post interview with a senior consultant of at least one hour's duration.

4. \$2 800.

NUCLEAR DISPLAY

154. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: Does the Premier intend to provide the information requested in question No. 565 from the past session and, if so, when?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Disarm Nuclear Apathy display at the Festival Centre (March-May, 1985) was mounted entirely by the Adelaide Festival Centre Gallery. No other Government department or authority was involved. The total direct cost of the display was \$1 018, which was entirely provided by private donations from concerned individuals at all levels of the community. Private individuals also donated labour and materials to construct the display.

The only on-going maintenance costs are the fixed overhead costs of cleaning the displays and display area, which are common to all displays and not specifically identified as a minor component of the centre's overall cleaning/maintenance costs.