

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 6 November 1985

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

PETITION: CLEVE AREA SCHOOL

A petition signed by 147 residents of South Australia praying that the House support the retention of existing staffing levels at Cleve Area School was presented by Mr Blacker.

Petition received.

PETITION: O'SULLIVAN BEACH TRAFFIC LIGHTS

A petition signed by 85 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to install pedestrian activated traffic lights on Galloway Road, O'Sullivan Beach, was presented by Mr Mathwin.

Petition received.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Pursuant to Statute—

Forestry Act 1950—Proclamation—Hundred of Young—County of Grey—Forest Reserve Resumed.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

Controlled Substances Advisory Council—Report, 1984-85.

South Australian Psychological Board—Report, 1984-85.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

Community Welfare, Department for—Report, 1984-85.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: TERTIARY ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS

The **Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. LYNN ARNOLD**: There has been growing community concern about the demands made upon students in their final year of secondary schooling through the requirement of five subjects to be taken in one year by those wishing to enter a university. The fact that the universities have recently agreed upon modifications to entry requirements is a pleasing indication that they recognise that there is a problem and are taking steps to deal with it. In an advertisement in the *Advertiser* on 27 September, the universities announced that students would be allowed to complete matriculation requirements by taking six subjects over two consecutive years, or by taking five subjects in one year as at present. Only those students commencing their matriculation studies in 1987 or a subsequent year will be allowed to qualify for matriculation by studying over two years. Changes to the grouping of subjects are also contemplated.

These changes, if implemented, are likely to have profound effects on the structure of secondary education in South Australia and on the organisation and curricula of

Government and non-government schools, on TAFE colleges and other tertiary institutions, on teachers and parents and not least on students taking the examinations. Indeed, serious concerns about the proposed changes, especially about the cumulative matriculation option, have already been expressed to me as Minister by officers of the Education Department, the High School Principals Association, representatives of the non-government sector, and teachers and parents. A major concern is that students, and the education system, need time to prepare. Students in years 8 and 9, or about to enter secondary schools, are of course most concerned to choose subjects which will optimise their chances of entry to their desired faculty or discipline.

The option of six subjects over two examinations in consecutive years does have some desirable features and is a step in the right direction. It will enable smaller schools to offer a two year rolling curriculum in years 12 and 13. It will provide a measure of flexibility and equity for some students and will enable many in less favoured circumstances who might not otherwise be able to study full time for tertiary entrance to undertake part-time study and part-time work. But the proposal also has many potential disadvantages. These include the danger of two years becoming the norm for all students, the danger that vocational/technological subjects will not receive proper recognition at this level and the possibility of years 12 and 13 becoming year 12 twice.

I propose therefore to establish a committee under the chairmanship of Mr K. Gilding, Chairman of TEASA, to investigate and report on tertiary entrance requirements in South Australia in 1986. I shall invite the universities to join the committee and to defer the current proposals until the committee has reported to me. I shall invite representatives of the universities and other tertiary institutions, of SSABSA, of TAFE, the Education Department and Government and non-government schools to join the committee, which will number eight or nine members, and I shall be asking it to report to me early in 1986.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table the following interim reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works:

Elizabeth Urban Aboriginal School (Establishment),

Happy Valley Water Filtration Plant Distribution System Augmentation (Revised Proposal).

The **Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Minister of Public Works)**: I move:

That the reports be printed.

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): Pursuant to Standing Order 251, I move:

That the report of the Public Works Standing Committee relating to the proposed urban Aboriginal school at Elizabeth be made an order of the day for Wednesday 20 November.

God and the Premier willing, I understand that is the next private members' day.

The **Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD**: Mr Speaker, am I in order to speak to that?

The **SPEAKER**: If honourable members look at Standing Order 251 they will note that it is procedural and not a substantive matter. In those circumstances I cannot call on the Deputy Premier.

Motion carried.

STATE ECONOMY

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

That so much of Standing Orders be suspended as to enable me to debate a motion of economic importance for South Australia.

Motion carried.

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

That the time for considering this motion be until 4 p.m.

Motion carried.

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

That this House, noting that three years ago today South Australia elected a Labor Government, which promised not to increase the rates of existing taxes or introduce any new taxes, which promised to reduce unemployment, which promised to reduce housing interest rates, and which promised to contain Adelaide's cost of living, expresses serious concern about the fact that State tax collections in South Australia have increased by 55.2 per cent over the past three years, more than in any other State in Australia and more than in this State's previous history; that the number of unemployed in South Australia is 4 500 more than three years ago; that housing rates are higher than they have been at any time in the last 50 years, and Adelaide's cost of living increase in the last financial year was higher than any other capital city in Australia; and therefore calls on the Government to put its record and its policies to the judgment of the electorate of South Australia.

I welcome this opportunity to stand again in this Parliament and discuss the economic issues that affect every South Australian. I do not shrink from debate in this place or anywhere else—unlike the Premier, who has refused to participate in debates on 5AA, 5DN, the *National* program, and three weeks ago at the Adelaide University.

The great issues are Labor's taxes, Labor's tax increases, and Labor's interest rates, matters concerning unemployment, education standards, and safety of the community. All those matters deserve the widest possible coverage. That is why I challenge the Premier to a head-to-head live television debate during prime time television. What could be a better test for a political leader seeking the trust and confidence of the electorate? It would give every South Australian a unique opportunity to judge the leaders, to judge the answers, the issues and the priorities.

Today my office has received, as has the Premier's office, invitations from each of the four television networks offering time and facilities to stage a debate. I ask a simple question: why will the Premier not stand before the glare of the television studio with me and before a panel of political commentators and put up his policies against mine? I will tell the House why. He does not want to give me the slightest opportunity to talk about the issues that are affecting every South Australian family, such as the Labor tax slug, Government waste, interest rates, and unemployment.

The Premier wants to talk about the bipartisan issues, and not issues that are affecting ordinary South Australians every day of their lives in this State. The Premier is happy to confine the debate to Parliament, where he knows that the event will be limited to a coverage of 20 seconds or one minute on tonight's television news services. But I think the Premier knows what has really happened. We know what has happened. He has had a phone call from Prime Minister Bob Hawke, and Bob warned him about the perils of live television debate with political opponents. This attitude is not good enough for South Australians. We will not be brushed off like that by Labor.

Again, I call on the Premier to meet me in a live television debate before a panel of journalists during the election campaign. Today, in this preliminary round, I look forward to putting forward squarely before this House the issues that are involved. The issues in the election have never been clearer. First, I refer to State taxes. They have increased

by a record 55.2 per cent, and include Labor's FID tax on bank accounts: the first new tax to be imposed in over 10 years.

Secondly, I refer to housing interest rates. These are at the highest real level for over 50 years, and they are really hurting the average family with a mortgage, people who are abiding by the prices and incomes accord, whose wages have not gone up to the same extent to which the Government has been prepared to slug them with a 55.2 per cent hike in taxes and charges, not to mention real interest rates.

Thirdly, let us look at the value of the Australian dollar under Labor policies. The value of the Australian dollar is currently at its lowest level in this country's history. That is putting pressure right across the board on interest rates, and putting pressure not only on the mortgages of young families buying a home but on small and big business alike. It is stifling initiative, incentive to grow and make wealth in this State and this country, and to prosper by maintaining jobs, let alone the creation of new jobs for young South Australians.

Of course, Adelaide's cost of living has led the nation, making it the inflation capital of Australia. Look at the effect on unemployment: despite all the claims and false and misleading statements by the Government, unemployment in South Australia is up to 56 400—4 500 more than it was when Labor came to power. It is no wonder that Mr Bannon shrinks from public debate on these issues, because his record simply cannot be stood on.

Clearly, decisively, the electorate understands that, and I have no doubt that, in the weeks ahead, we will hear much about the Grand Prix, about submarines, about ASER, from the Government. We might even see the Premier put a little gloss in some of the statements in these matters. So be it. He will have my support and support from the Liberal Party on those great developments for South Australia, because they are good for South Australia. Members opposite well know that in this House, repeatedly, consistently and unequivocally, we put down our support for those projects—quite clearly.

After all, we are not unacquainted with such projects as O-Bahn, the early work on the Grand Prix and discussions with Bill O'Gorman, with Roxby Downs, the ASER project, and other developments in this State. They were our initiatives followed through by this Administration. They are areas that have received bipartisan support, and I am sure that, when the Premier sits over here on the Opposition benches, he will continue the bipartisan support for those projects in this State—

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: In the advertisement this morning not only did the Premier claim credit for Roxby Downs, which he and every member of his Party opposed in this House: he also claimed credit for Technology Park, which the former Liberal Government established in this State. He claimed credit for O-Bahn, which the former Liberal Administration established in this State. I give credit: they recognised they were good projects for South Australia, they followed them through, and we support them. They are bipartisan issues. We will back those projects, because they are projects that are good for South Australia. However, that will not stop me from vigorously and aggressively putting to the people some real alternatives to the kind of deal that people are now getting on taxes and charges.

This debate is about the key issues that affect all South Australians in their daily lives, in particular, the amount of tax they pay, their cost of living, their home interest rate, and their job opportunities. In his newspaper advertisement this morning the Premier claimed that South Australia has had three good years.

I challenge him to tell that to taxpayers out there who are paying the 55.2 per cent hike in taxes. I challenge him to tell that to the families out there who are paying increases in interest rates on their family home and who go into the supermarket with inflation levels in South Australia greater than in any other capital in Australia, buying goods in the supermarket. Tell that to the families when they have reduced disposable income under this Administration, and tell it to home buyers who are having to pick up the tab of ever increasing interest rates to meet the monthly payments on their mortgage as a result of Labor Government policies.

Tell that to the unemployed in this State in view of the fact that we have 4 500 more people unemployed today than we had some three years ago when the Labor Party came into government. They are the issues which affect all South Australians in their daily lives. These are the issues on which the Premier fought the last State election. They are the issues that he wants to avoid in this election campaign. That is why he will not debate me publicly on television. He will not do it other than in this forum: he will not go out in the public arena anywhere to debate me on these issues. That is why he has drummed up a few short term schemes—bandaids—to hide his inaction.

I now refer to the YES scheme. If ever there was a con job, a play on the unemployed of South Australia, that was it; it is a very sad commentary. The Premier promised at the last election to reduce unemployment. He made that promise often and unequivocally, yet three years later we have more unemployment than when they came to government, despite some \$100 million being spent on CEP schemes in the meantime to generate employment in this State. Beyond that figure, of course, is the real tragedy of long-term unemployment.

Figures released this week indicate that 23 557 South Australians were classified as long-term unemployed for the September quarter. That was 36.1 per cent of those registered as unemployed. It was the highest level of all the mainland States of Australia. That is a record that South Australia has had for nine out of the last 10 quarterly surveys. The Premier's response, at the last minute before an election, has been to launch the YES scheme. It has been well advertised, but it is clear that much more thought has gone into the promotion than into the actual assistance that it is giving to the unemployed. The Opposition has received numerous complaints, as no doubt Government members have in their electoral offices, from young people who have called the hotline only to be informed by recorded message that they should contact their nearest CES office. Of course, that is what many of them have been doing for months—dealing through the CES office. All that this scheme has meant for them is more despair rather than renewed hope. That policy initiative plays on the emotions of young unemployed in this State, and it is not good enough for any Government to do that.

I have no doubt that in the Premier's reply he will try to ignore the unemployment figures and talk about jobs growth, but in this respect as well South Australia has been lagging behind. Since his Government came to office the growth in employment in South Australia has been 3.6 per cent—the lowest of any State in Australia. There have been very significant job losses in the key manufacturing and rural sectors of our economy—those sectors which have sustained the economic basis of the State for over 50 years. They talk about manufacturing industry, which has lost 14 482 jobs, or the rural industry, which has lost 2 100 jobs during the term of this Government. These trends have serious implications for the long-term future of our regional economy. They have developed at a time when we had great opportunity for recovery through the wages pause, followed by

the prices and incomes accord, freedom from drought and the international economic recovery.

It is clear that we have not made the most of those opportunities. We have not established the conditions necessary for a sustained long-term economic growth. It is the time for action to change direction so that we can turn the problems that South Australia faces into opportunities and so that we can make existing jobs more secure and create new jobs. But, we will not do that with economic policies that are based on more Government involvement in the economy through increased rates of taxation, through higher levels of public sector employment and through more Government regulation. That is Labor's way. It has not worked for ordinary South Australians.

Let me put into perspective this Government's record on State taxation. It has increased total State tax collections by 55.2 per cent—the highest of any State and the highest in our State's history. On a *per capita* basis from 30 June 1982 to 30 June 1985 the figure was 50.2 per cent. This was the highest growth of any State in that period. The other Labor States were next, with Western Australia at 44 per cent, New South Wales at 37.9 per cent and Victoria at 34.9 per cent.

This has been the result of this Government's decision to introduce South Australia's first new tax in 10 years, namely FID, and to increase the rates of seven other taxes. All of this, despite the Premier's election promise, three years ago, not to introduce any new tax or increase the rates of any existing tax, a promise broken not once, but eight times.

The Premier has put forward all sorts of reasons for this shameful record. But, in the end, there is only one reason—one clear, indisputable reason: the Government has increased the number of public servants by more than 6 000 already, with a further increase in the pipeline this financial year. This has increased the public sector payroll by more than \$100 million per year—the wages and salaries that taxpayers have to pay. The Premier is trying to fudge that fact.

The latest issue of the *Journal of Industry*, has published a letter from the Premier on this matter. In it, he quotes figures for growth in public sector employment. Of course, he quotes them during the period of the former Liberal Administration, which actually reduced public sector numbers—the only State in Australia to achieve that objective.

In dealing with taxation, it must also be recognised that the Premier has supported all the taxation initiatives of the Federal Labor Government: the assets test on our senior citizens and the tax on lump sum superannuation payouts. We well remember the submission to the tax summit by the Labor Government of South Australia supporting the introduction of a capital gains tax to inflict on small business, whether it be in the metropolitan or country areas, a taxation level with which they simply would not be able to survive. I refer also to small business superannuation. Their retirement benefits are their capital gains over the life of the business—all destroyed in one swipe by this Labor Administration and by a Prime Minister who said, 'Let me say in syllables that even my opponents can understand that we will not introduce a capital gains tax.' So much for the promise of Prime Minister Hawke and of Labor, and the impact on small business. This Administration has supported entirely without equivocation or qualification the introduction of a capital gains tax.

It goes further: even the VBU is at odds with this Administration, which supported the introduction of a fringe benefits tax, which will put pressure on the motor vehicle industry in South Australia and put VBU members out of work here: A Labor Government has put at risk jobs in the manufacturing industry in South Australia after seeing a reduction of 14 482 jobs in the manufacturing industry in

the past two years. That is the record of this Government, and it is hell bent on doing exactly the same by supporting the fringe benefits tax on the motor vehicle industry in this State.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: They are birds of a feather.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed they are. Labor's tax policies and devaluation of the Australian dollar have put pressure on interest rates that come down at the bottom line to affect individual ordinary South Australians who are feeling the brunt and effect of Labor policies nationally and in this State. He has done this despite the fact that the Federal Government's financial policies for higher levels of both taxation and borrowings are a major reason for continuing pressure on home loan interest rates.

The average building society loan in South Australia is now \$53 000. It requires a monthly repayment of \$691 over 30 years. Only 12 months ago, the average building society loan was \$39 000; the monthly repayment then was \$424. That means a 63 per cent rise in repayments for new home buyers in just 12 months.

Rising interest rates are pricing more and more young South Australians out of home ownership. The continuing decline in the value of the dollar will put even more pressure on. The exchange rate is the international community's commentary on the Australian economy and Labor policies. It is another reason why there must be a change in direction—an end to the economic policies of Labor Governments, both here and nationally. Not only are family budgets being eroded by higher home loan interest rates, but also the cost of food and other essentials is going up at a faster rate in Adelaide than elsewhere.

Last financial year, the increase in Adelaide's CPI was the highest of all the States. Over a 12-month period, selected State and local government charges contributed more significantly to Adelaide's rise than in any other capital. There is no doubt that taxes, the cost of living, interest rates, and unemployment are rising. By any measure and in any respect, South Australians are faring worst under Labor in those things which affect all South Australians every day of their lives. The Premier will say, because he does not want the facts set out, that that is knocking South Australia. He does not want people to have a realistic assessment of South Australia's position on which we can base economic and political decisions. This afternoon I put forward the facts about our economic position. The Premier in his newspaper advertisement this morning is now claiming personal credit for Roxby Downs after doing all he could for three years to stop it.

He is also claiming that only he can deliver the submarine project for South Australia. I regret that the Premier is attempting to politicise yet another great project for the State. He knows that the Liberals have consistently supported the submarine project since it was first proposed by the South Australian business community. He knows also that only four months ago I visited the two final tenderers for the project and assured them of my Party's full support for their continuing work in South Australia. They are undeniable facts that the Premier cannot dispute. However, the Premier insults the business community and the tenderers by claiming that only he can achieve this project for South Australia.

I have more faith than he in the decision-makers in Canberra, particularly the Defence Department personnel, who will be seeking the best possible site for this vital and costly project for Australia. Yesterday, the Deputy Leader asked why South Australia was not represented on a Federal Labor Government committee involved in the submarine project. We have been left behind. We merely asked why we in South Australia had been left off the committee whereas Victoria has three members on it, and we asked

the Premier to make representations to Canberra to get South Australian representation on that committee. If South Australia measures up as the best site (and I believe that it will) it must be chosen irrespective of political considerations. To suggest otherwise, as the Premier has done in this advertisement, is to be completely irresponsible.

I therefore throw out this further challenge to the Premier this afternoon—to join me in calling on the Prime Minister for an absolute and unequivocal assurance that, if South Australia measures up as the best site for the construction of this project on all the technical, industrial, and economic criteria being applied, we will win the project. The Premier should be prepared to put this project above politics, because it is too important to South Australia. That is why these key projects for the State that are good for South Australia have received bipartisan support from the Liberal Party over the past three years, and the Premier well knows that that is true.

Today's skirmish in Parliament is no substitute for a full-scale head-to-head debate between the Premier and me on Statewide television. Today, I have exposed this Government's failure to look after the interests of ordinary South Australians. It was the preliminary round—not the main event. I am ready, the television networks are ready and the community is ready—it is only the Premier who will not front up. I will continue to bluntly and starkly put the real choices before the community.

This election will be a choice between two different approaches to government: our way of leaner government—less taxes—or Labor's way of big spending, Government intrusion and more and more taxes to pay for it all. I am looking forward to the campaign, to the cut and thrust, to having Liberal policies properly examined and assessed by the electorate. I will meet any audience, any foe—anywhere, any time.

As members well know, I have received an invitation from the United Trades and Labor Council to go to Trades Hall to debate privatisation. I welcome the invitation to debate privatisation with the trade union movement of South Australia. Trade union members have nothing to fear from the careful and selective implementation of our privatisation policy because it will bring to all South Australians meaningful taxation relief and get big government out of the hip pocket of ordinary South Australians. I am confident that South Australians will see that we are fair dinkum, that we have the policies—and will vote to throw out Labor's taxes and Labor's charges.

It was interesting to note that the only member opposite to hold up the front page of the *News* was the retiring member for Price (Mr Whitten). No-one else held it up: he is the only member who has nothing to lose. Indeed, he is the only member who would take that full assessment on board, because all other members opposite know what the opinion polls are saying throughout the metropolitan area of Adelaide. We look forward to the challenge of the cut and thrust. I look forward to the election date of 7 December so that I may argue these issues and focus on what is important to ordinary South Australians, namely, the cost to them of living in South Australia, how there is an alternative, and how that alternative can be better.

When this Parliament resumes next year it will have been Labor's big government, Labor's waste and Labor's taxes that sweep Government members from office to the Opposition benches where they belong.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): Six months ago we had the Leader of the Opposition racing about plastering the slogan 'Olsen for action' around the city. I notice that we do not hear very much of that any more. It is Olsen for talk, Olsen for complaints, criticisms

and arguments. In his advertisement today the Leader of the Opposition has told South Australians that what he has to offer is some kind of debate led recovery. He is not interested in action any more. There is no question of policies or acknowledging what is happening here in South Australia: he wants to posture and perform in free television time and to mouth his slogans of doom and despair, hoping that I am sitting there beside him and, by so doing, somehow associating with it.

The Leader says that I owe it to the people of South Australia to participate with him in this pathetic posturing. What I owe the people is a Government that is prepared to work to achieve growth and development for South Australia; a Government that is prepared to stick its neck out, to back individual enterprise and ideas and take the sort of action in fact that has won us the Grand Prix; a Government that has got us the major new tourist and convention centres and a casino; and a Government that has Technology Park buzzing with technological development instead of being just a few empty paddocks. This Government has honoured its promise to support the Roxby Downs project, and I have done that in all the forums of my Party and in public, despite the opposition that we received in the past. For that reason, that project has a chance of going ahead.

We have introduced a youth employment scheme to give hope and jobs to young people. We have boosted education and sustained teacher numbers despite declining class sizes. My Government has backed the housing industry, and we have boosted public sector housing to record levels. This has given the greatest housing result for a decade. We have the State's finances back in shape. We have cleaned up the appalling mess left by the Liberal Government. We have cut taxes and ETSA charges. We have moved to ensure that gas prices for all South Australians are cut, that supply is secured and that we bring to an end the significant price spiral brought about by the Goldsworthy agreement in 1982, and we have done that against the opposition of members opposite.

We are at action stations in the final run to win the submarine project, to convince the Hawke Government that we have the right site in the right State. That is what the people of South Australia are owed—not politicians strutting around television studios arguing with each other. They do not want a debate led recovery: they want South Australia to start winning again, to get on the map, and for the past three years that is what we have been doing.

Let me deal with the sorry catalogue of the Leader of the Opposition's six points in his advertisement today. I will deal with four of them. I will leave my learned Deputy to cover some of the other spurious nonsenses and, if we have time, the Minister of Education can also join the fray. Let us start with State taxes. Why were State taxes raised; why was I forced into that very difficult decision, which we knew would cost us politically, to introduce a tax package in 1983?

Quite simply, had we not done so, we would not be here today—not just the Government of the day, but in fact the State and its viability. That ought to have been known by members opposite. It should have been known by the then Premier. After all, he said confidentially at the 1982 Premiers Conference (the unfortunate part was that those confidential transcripts were in fact released to the national press):

Quite frankly, we are facing an enormous budget problem. We face major increases in taxation and charges over and above the cuts we have already very successfully made.

That is what he said in July 1982. Did we hear those comments during or before the election? No way! It must have been known to the three members of the so-called razor gang—the present Deputy Leader, the member for

Davenport, and their colleague in the other place, the Hon. Mr Griffin—who had before them the information which indicated that there must be a wide range of cuts in the capital and recurrent programs and that those cuts must be made quickly or the State would go bankrupt. The facts must have been known to members of the then Cabinet, including the present Leader of the Opposition, who is posturing about this matter.

That was starting point No. 1. We move to the natural disasters, the bushfires and the floods, as well as the drought, and the effect that they had on the economy. The Leader of the Opposition has conveniently forgotten about certain matters, and we do not hear him referring to them very often. However, for example, on 5 May 1983 the front page of the *Advertiser* carried a headline 'Tax increases are needed to cover some of South Australia's budget blow-out'. That is what he said. Conveniently, for the next two years all the Leader of the Opposition has done has been to attack what the Government has done.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I should read the rest, because it outlines one or two of the areas referred to. It was suggested that fuel taxes should be raised, I seem to remember. That action having been taken, there has been no increase in our rates of taxation since that tax package of 1983. On the contrary, in our 1985 budget we reduced it. What then is the figure that the Leader of the Opposition is using? Why does he flourish this extraordinary figure referring to unprecedented tax increases in this State? The answer is that the Leader of the Opposition is confusing totally the difference between revenue and the rate of taxation, between the fruits of economic recovery that have been brought to our State and the rates of taxation.

What has happened that has brought about an increase in our revenue? It is not rates of taxation, but more jobs, which has resulted in more payroll tax, despite the major cuts that we made in the rate. Further, more houses have been built, more houses have been bought and sold, house and land values are rising; all have had an impact on our revenue. In 1982, 14 600 houses were sold at an average price of around \$47 000 in the total market. By 1984, 19 600 houses were sold, with an average value of \$67 000. That indicates an economy on the upward path and, as a result, the Government getting some advantage from it.

In fact, our tax package increase in 1983 contributed a mere 11.8 per cent of that revenue increase. So much for the nonsense that has been stated by the Leader of the Opposition about 55.2 per cent. Indeed, I shall quote from the half yearly report on the South Australian Economy by the Centre for South Australian Economic Studies, which states, despite all that has happened in this area:

Nevertheless, the State's own revenue raising activities are still at the lower end of the national scale. Much of the growth in State revenues has come from the cyclical effects of the recovery and booming property values and turnover on the budget.

So, in criticising our revenue increases, the Leader of the Opposition is saying that he does not want to see economic recovery. We know that that has been his strategy all along in Opposition, to undermine and white-ant anything good that happens here. The figures that the Leader uses about revenue are precisely part of that whole process. Incidentally, State revenue raising from other sources is also at the lower end of the national scale.

Let us remember the perspective. South Australia is the third lowest State for tax fees and fines collection: \$589 *per capita*, as opposed to New South Wales with \$781 *per capita*. One of those two States that are lower than us is Queensland. It is lower in that area. If one looks at *per capita* collection from other revenues one finds again that we are not third but the second lowest State: \$367 *per capita*,

yet Queensland collected a massive \$716 *per capita*. So, it is all very well for us to make those comparisons. In fact, South Australia is at the bottom end of the tax scale. In so doing we are still managing to deliver public sector services second to none. We have had a bit of criticism about FID.

The Hon. D.C. Brown interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The member for Davenport might like to listen to this. He probably would be better out of this place doing a bit of doorknocking in his electorate in the hope that he can hang on. We will excuse him for a moment. As to FID and the progressive and careful application of FID, has the Leader of the Opposition ever said he would abolish it? Not a bit of it. In his comments on the tax package in August 1985 he said he would be giving the highest priority to electricity tariffs, payroll taxes, land taxes and some stamp duties—all of which incidentally we have lowered—but there was not a word about FID being eliminated. What is the ogre here? How about he comes clean on that? While we are on it, where is the Liberal tax policy? Where are the precise details of what they are going to do with our tax base?

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Deputy Leader says that we will get it: it was promised in February and still it has not been delivered. What about home loan interest rates? What about the second point in this scurrilous advertisement? The Liberal record on housing interest rates bears some examination. Under the Fraser-Howard Liberal Government bank interest rates on home loans increased from 9.5 per cent in February 1980 (and they had been at or below that rate for many years before) to 13.5 per cent—the ceiling.

Loan rates obtained from other financial institutions were even higher. What is the current policy? The current Leader of the Opposition, Mr Howard, is apparently in town today—I hope he is down here enjoying what his colleague in this State has to say—and I hope in the process they have a little discussion about Mr Howard's policy to lift the ceiling to remove the interest rate ceiling of 13.5 per cent. We know what the effect of that would be: it would be to see the rate going up through the roof.

Unlike the Tonkin Government, which sat back passively and twiddled its thumbs in 1981-82, we have acted. We have acted to ensure that the State Bank takes action both in its ordinary areas and its home loan areas. We have acted to ensure that the Federal Government maintains that ceiling—contrary to the Liberal Party's policy. We have acted to ensure that there is some protection to building society borrowers—and we have been attacked by the Opposition for that. In all those areas we have done something. We have not just sat back and said that it is all too hard or thrown up our hands.

We recognise, as I recognised in 1981-82, that these things are not in the control of the State Government, that they do pose major problems in trying to deal with them. But, to the extent that we have been able to act, so we have acted. We are doing that against the background of the greatest housing boom we have ever had. We are currently developing a whole series of proposals that will ensure that people will still be able to have affordable housing at reasonable rates of interest. We will be working with our financial institutions shortly to demonstrate just how that can be achieved.

Our record on housing is second to none of any Government this State has had post war, and it has been against a background of rising values. The Home Ownership Made Easier scheme has assisted over 8 000 families in obtaining low interest loans. It has raised the level of stamp duty exemptions. It has provided a record Housing Trust pro-

gram that has ensured that the building industry has been fully employed and has been a major generator of growth.

Now, let us turn to the third point, the consumer price index. We are, according to the Leader of the Opposition, the inflation capital of Australia. He said that as long ago as August 1983. It is a great thing to say and certainly a good way of encouraging activity and investment in this State, particularly as it ignores the facts. First, it ignores the large fall in the inflation rate in Adelaide and Australia in the last few years. During the Tonkin years the CPI rose by 35.4 per cent compared with 23.1 per cent under our Government. Adelaide's inflation rate for the last year to the September quarter 1985 was 8.4 per cent compared to the previous Government's record of 12.1 per cent. So, it is interesting that he can talk about consumer price indexes.

As far as capital city inflation rates are concerned, they tend to hover around the national rate. There is no consistent pattern and many factors are involved. In the two out of three Tonkin years inflation in Adelaide was equal to or greater than the national rate, and that has been the same under the Labor Government. Indeed, in 1984 we were below the national inflation rate. In 1985 we have been above it. But, of course, the Leader of the Opposition talks about (and one notices that he used his words carefully in the advertisement for a change) last financial year. That is because he does not want to bring the up-to-date figures into the equation.

In the last quarter the CPI inflation rate in Adelaide was lower than the national average. Our inflation rate is beginning to decrease. The Leader made the staggering statement—absolute nonsense—that our supermarket prices were going up. I refer the Leader of the Opposition to the definitive survey conducted by the national consumers magazine, *Choice*. It is done on an annual basis, and its sixth annual supermarket survey was published in June 1985. What does it show? As far as capital cities are concerned, Adelaide, which was the second most expensive capital city for the years 1981 and 1982, has in 1983, 1984 and 1985 been the cheapest place in Australia for a basket of brand name groceries—the cheapest capital city, and so it is for the cheapest available basket. It was third in 1981 and 1982. For the years 1983, 1984 and 1985 it was the cheapest of all capital cities. It was the Leader of the Opposition who introduced supermarket prices. We have consistently, every year that we have been in office, been the cheapest of any capital in Australia.

This survey goes much beyond capital cities and surveys a whole range of country towns. I regret to say that I have a confession to make. Adelaide's position has slipped between 1984 and 1985. Let us get the record straight. In 1984 we were not only the cheapest capital city but also the cheapest of all cities and towns surveyed—the cheapest place in Australia, an extraordinary record. In 1985, unfortunately, I have to advise the House that, whilst remaining the cheapest capital city in Australia, we have slipped a place and are now the second cheapest to Toowoomba in Queensland in 1985. So, I guess that any housewife who goes up there to shop may be able to get something. They are the supermarket prices and that is the evidence.

Let us turn to the next area. We have heard a lot about employment and unemployment rates. The fact is that in South Australia we have out-performed the nation in terms of employment growth, and we have done it without recourse to public sector employment, as has been done in other States. Against a very tight holding of that, we have improved our position.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: 'Not true', members opposite cry. Let me not use my own words to discuss this: I will

use the ABS figures, which are very compelling. I point to the following:

After a bleak start to the 1980s when the South Australian economy performed significantly worse than the national average, the past two years have seen good growth return us to the national fold—

This is an independent survey. It continues:

Another illustration of the recent South Australian performance is the behaviour of the unemployment rate now around the national average in contrast to the one to two percentage point unfavourable gap in the early years of the 1980s.

Let me go on to speak about the employment situation. More than 20 000 jobs have been created in the past year alone. Job vacancy rates in the Adelaide *Advertiser* are at their highest level since September 1974.

Our employment growth is the best for a decade. Those are the facts. We are out performing any other State. I have already said that I could refer to the fifth and six points. I suppose we do not have to say very much about education, because we have been praised for high standards and good discipline. However, in relation to law and order, safety and protection, we will hear one or two words from my colleague in a minute.

We are now in the fourth session of the 45th Parliament of South Australia. In each of those sessions there has been adequate time for debate. We have never refused the Opposition the right to raise an issue and debate it in this Parliament so long as proper notice was given. For every day that Parliament has sat the proceedings have been publicly reported, and for virtually all that time they have been able to be televised, unlike any other Parliament. That is the proper forum for the Parties to put their points of view. The Leader of the Opposition has certainly taken every opportunity to do so.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Let me deal with that point. Now it seems the Leader of the Opposition has to go on television; he has to have lights, cameras and makeup—the full works—a catchy television debate. He hopes that the restricted medium of television will help him claw back some credibility. In fact, what he wants to do is trade on mine! I know that he does not want debate: he wants free televising of his slogans, free coverage of his complaints and a free run at knocking South Australia.

I am not prepared to be involved in that. If he wants to do it, let him go and do it in his own time and not waste my time sitting there having to listen to it. We have had enough of the way in which the Opposition has performed. They have revealed their true colours in the last few days. When we try to bring down gas prices and do something about bringing down electricity prices, what do they do—they oppose it and vote against it.

Dearer gas and higher electricity prices—that is their slogan. When we try to do something about the submarine project we have the usual snide, knocking, undermining questions coming from the Deputy Leader and his friends. Then we are told by the Leader, 'Well, of course I am totally behind the project—totally with you on it. I went overseas and saw the contractors.' Yes, he did, and I expedited that visit. Indeed, in one case I got the shipyard to open up in its annual holidays so that he could see something. So, I have no hassle about that. Dear, dear, he does not like that very much. It is true: I had to ring them up and say, 'You have to see this Leader of the Opposition, because we do want his support, and I am worried that we are not getting it sufficiently.'

They did it with the ASER project. Honourable members will notice that it is very hard to find the Opposition opposing outright, except in the gas price area. They never quite get around to it. They want to question the finance,

niggle and chip away around the sides and throw doubt on its ever happening. Question after question is asked day after day, all aimed at undermining.

They did the same with the Grand Prix. We had to listen to Mr Griffin in another place doing his best to try to bring that down, yet whenever Opposition members do this they always profess bipartisan support. When we came to office, we promised South Australians a new direction and a new start. We offered a new sense of achievement. We showed an entrepreneurial approach in Government, as well as a new sense of responsibility that was to produce economic recovery and more jobs. We wanted South Australia to be recognised internationally. We went about securing a reasonable gas price and winning a submarine project. The people of South Australia do not need artificial performances on television by the Leader of the Opposition. They know what they are owed and they know what they have been given. They will soon be given the chance to decide on that.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): At last we have flushed the Premier out. He is about to announce an election: 'The electors will soon have the chance to decide.' Plainly, he is in a complete funk. He will not front up to the Leader of the Opposition in a public forum where people can see what is going on. He hides behind the fear of exposure to the glare of television lights. Why did he want the Grand Prix on television? Why did he want all this big hoo-ha about the Grand Prix? It was so that the people could see it. Why does the Leader of the Opposition want a debate on television? It is so that the people can see it. Why does the Premier not want to have a debate on television? Because he is in a funk, knowing that the people will see it.

It is good enough to have the Grand Prix televised, but it is not good enough to have the Premier front up, because the people might be able to judge on the basis of information directly relayed to them, as opposed to a 30-second grab from a television screen of what goes on in this Chamber. In other words, 99.9 per cent of debate in this place is neither seen nor heard by the public. So much for the Premier's fear of a debate with the Leader. He was so timid that he had not the nerve even to front up to the university audience a few weeks ago. That is how brave this fellow is in wanting to let the public know what he is on about. So much for his state of funk in refusing to front up so that matters of State might be debated.

What else has the Premier to say in his sorry defence of these great years that are claimed in the newspaper advertisement? The Premier says that we have had a wonderful three years and that the Opposition has done nothing but knock. He asserts that the Opposition does not actually oppose projects, and then he criticises us for not supporting such projects. However, we support these projects and have made our support clear. When we are spending huge sums of taxpayers' funds, we believe that people have a legitimate interest in seeing that those funds are wisely spent in the prosecution of such projects. If we are to spend an enormous amount of taxpayers' funds, surely it is legitimate to see that the money is spent wisely.

The Premier, referring to the Opposition's question yesterday on the submarine project, built a great argument on legitimate questioning in this House. He advanced a whole argument because the Opposition had asked why South Australia did not have even one member on the Commonwealth Labor Government committee that was examining the submarine project, whereas the Labor Party had three prominent left-wingers on that committee. Does that mean that, because South Australia is not represented on the committee, he is not concerned or worried that the decision

will be left to the three leftwingers from Victoria? We have made clear from day 1 that we will do our best to get that project for South Australia.

All we asked the Premier to do was to cut out this vile blackmail and ask the Prime Minister to see that the decision was made on the grounds of economic merit and that, if South Australia came up as the best bet, it would get the project, rather than using this situation as the sword of Damocles by resorting to blackmail. What a way to run a country—by blackmail! We give the submarine project our full support. We only ask that the Prime Minister of Australia be honest when the decision is made, although it is difficult to ask some of these Labor leaders to be honest, especially in the light of their recent goings on.

However, that is what we are asking: that the Prime Minister make an honest assessment on the merits of the project, which has our full support. What was the record of Government members when they were in opposition? The Labor Party referred to Roxby as 'a mirage in the desert' and undertook the biggest knocking exercise ever undertaken. Labor members poured scorn, day in and day out, on the biggest mining project ever launched in this State.

They did not come out and say that the project must go ahead: after all, the left wing was in control, the same as the left wing is at present in control of the submarine project (in which case there may be something wrong with the decision-making process on the submarine project, and we are only asking for representation on the decision-making committee).

Again and again, Labor members knocked the Roxby Downs project, yet suddenly we see advertisements claiming that the project is their own, and the Premier talks about honesty in advertising! That is hypocritical. We are told that we have had three great years under Labor and that great work has been done in regard to Roxby. The public is not that gullible, nor are their memories that short.

Mr Ferguson: How about the increase in gas prices?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: We will get around to that in time. The Government's advertisement talks about 'your State tax cuts'. There has been an increase in electricity tariffs of 41.3 per cent because of the Government's new interest rate tax, which will raise an additional \$14 million, and the Premier has given two cents a day back to consumers. Will the public swallow that?

We are told that the Premier has frozen interest rates, but what has he done? He talks about misleading advertising but, despite the advertisement telling us that he has frozen interest rates, he has not done so. In fact, interest rates are set to rise yet again because of the fall in the value in the Australian dollar. That is one reason that will impel him, on Friday, to announce an election, because interest rates are about to rise yet again under this Labor Administration.

The Premier has learned one lesson, though. In March this year he said that interest rates would fall, and many people entered into home loan contracts, no doubt on the assurance of the man leading this State with his economic expertise, even though they had plenty of evidence to question his judgment even at that stage. Those home loan borrowers are now faced with capital and interest repayments running into literally hundreds of dollars as a result of the interest rate debacle. How can one say that the Premier has frozen interest rates? Like fun he has frozen them! We know perfectly well that he has not done so. Two-thirds of the loans granted by the State Bank, the people's bank, are home loans bearing an interest rate of up to 15.5 per cent. Where was the Premier when all this was going on? Did he freeze interest rates? Of course he did not.

He knows that he did not have the ability to freeze them and that a freeze can apply only in the private banking arena. The Premier knows that his own State Bank got

around it and that two-thirds of the loans were at this enormously escalating interest rate, and he knows that he has a lot to answer for in that area. From day 1 we gave bipartisan support to the ASER project. The Hon. Michael Wilson initiated the investigations, and we had Mr Pak Poy's report stating that we would need a casino to make—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: No I did not, but let me come to the Labor Party's record. They were aware of this, and when they were in Opposition the majority voted against the casino. Within months of winning government they all voted for it (bar, I think from memory, the only man who stayed with his conscience—the member for Salisbury).

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Well, check the record. After the election they all flocked across the floor to vote for a casino, because they knew that would help ASER get off the ground. Before the election and when in Opposition, most members of the Labor Party were against it. So much for their sincerity in relation to the ASER project. I wonder how the Labor Party will convince the public that we have had these three great years. The thing that interests members of the public is what it is costing them to live. Let the Labor Party talk to the housewife as she goes into the supermarket and buys the week's groceries. Let them tell her that we have had three great years. Members opposite will have their work cut out trying to convince the housewife of that fact. Let me come to the question of gas prices.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Members opposite should just listen and perhaps they will be able to absorb what I am about to say. In 1982 we had a policy to introduce legislation in this House (and with the approval of the producers so that we would not have this infernal fighting that is doing the State so much damage) to equalise the prices between Sydney and Adelaide. That would have meant a substantial reduction in the cost of gas to South Australian consumers, and we had an agreement (and I have a record of that agreement) with the producers to do just that. It would have involved introducing legislation in this House, but it would not have unilaterally torn up an indenture, nor would it have involved reaching an agreement secretly, as has happened in recent months, to increase the price of gas. That increase was agreed by both sides but, because of election pressures, the Government came into the House, tore up that agreement and unilaterally lowered the price. With the introduction of our intended legislation, we would have equalised those prices.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Of course they do not want to hear, because it gives the lie to what they have been saying for the past three years. Even though we had the agreement with the producers to introduce legislation in this House to lower South Australian gas prices, the Labor Party was not prepared to act. Members opposite failed to act because they said it looked as though there could be a legal challenge. What do they think will happen at this eleventh hour to the legislation that they introduced which will tear up this legally binding agreement? They could have introduced that legislation three years ago in order to equalise the price between Adelaide and Sydney. What would the effect have been if that had been carried through to a successful conclusion?

As a result of its arbitration, Sydney was paying \$1.01 and Adelaide, as a result of arbitration set up under the terms of indenture that the Labor Party is now tearing up, was paying \$1.10. That would have meant that we would have both paid \$1.05. In the second year, instead of AGL paying that lower price and Adelaide paying \$1.32, it would

have meant that we would have both paid \$1.15. In the third year, the current year, it would have meant that instead of paying \$1.62 we would have paid \$1.31. For 18 months (for half its term) members of the Labor Party sat on their thumbs and did nothing. If the Labor Party took the initiative at that time we would now be paying \$1.31 for gas.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: You have not been listening to what I have been saying.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am saying that, as a result of legislation in this House to equalise those prices, that price would have been discounted, and members opposite cannot get around that fact. They did not have the guts to take on New South Wales, and that is what it amounts to. They did not have the guts to have a row with Neville Wran and Australian Gas Light in New South Wales. That is the bottom line. We would do it again. Of course, the legislation is likely to be enacted and it will finish up in the same place, but we will not bear the odium of breaking a bargain and our word; we will not have the odium of being distrusted by the financial community not only in Australia but around the world.

Because the Labor Party was too frightened to introduce legislation in Parliament that would equalise the price and too frightened to take on its colleagues in New South Wales, we are paying more than the \$1.31. The multiplication of the price has not been effected, because the Government did nothing for 18 months. What was the Government's excuse? It hid behind the statement that the legislation could be challenged in the courts. The same thing is happening with this current legislation, which surely will be challenged in the courts. So, that is this Government's record. We repeat the offer to the public of South Australia: we will go down that track. Members of this Government have cost the taxpayers literally tens of millions of dollars by sitting on their backsides and not taking up the second part of the Goldsworthy package. Members opposite are very strong on talking about the first part and up until December they were prepared to raise gas prices from \$1.62 to \$1.72. We have the four letters that we read in the House, but members opposite are strangely silent now. They were perfectly happy—

Mr Ferguson: You keep repeating it.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: And we will repeat it often between now and the election date if the Labor Party wants to debate it.

Mr Ferguson: You'll have to.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, my word, quite often. I will have a debate with the Minister of Mines and Energy, my counterpart, any place and any day of the week, on the facts of this matter.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The trouble with members opposite is that they do not want the facts to emerge: they do not want the public to know the facts. They were not prepared to introduce legislation at that time even though I had agreement to it—they would not act. If they had been game to take on the second part of the Goldsworthy package, instead of paying \$1.61 we would have been paying \$1.31 for gas. But, no, they might offend their mate Neville Wran, big brother, if they took on New South Wales. They were in a complete funk then as they are now. So much for this farce in relation to tariffs.

What is the Government's record, and what are the things that are of concern to the public of South Australia? The public is concerned about the cost of housing. The Premier says that his Government has this tremendous record of a recovery led by housing, because he says enormous public funds have been pumped into this area. Of course, the

public has to pay interest, but that does not matter! We have managed to crank up this enormous housing boom.

What is South Australia's record regarding young people who want to purchase a house? I know about this, because two of my children are about to build houses and I am familiar with the enormous hurdle that they have to leap. So, what about people who do not have a well paid job like I have? What about people who are a bit further down the economic scale? How are those kids going to get into houses? We know perfectly well the problems that exist for young people trying to obtain houses. In relation to Adelaide's record in this area, on 5 August this year, under the heading 'Adelaide tops climb in house prices', it was stated in the press:

House prices rose faster in Adelaide than in any other State capital in the past financial year. On average, the price of an established home in Adelaide leapt 23 per cent, from \$60 200 to \$73 900.

How can young people leap that initial hurdle, let alone the enormous further hurdles in this race of escalating interest rates as a result of Labor Party policies, both federal and State? Members opposite are now strangely silent, as I outline their record in relation to housing.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: Boring!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Quite often I find the comments of members opposite boring. Members opposite have decided to go quiet, because they do not like what I am saying; they are bowing their heads in shame, and so they should. They are sitting over there like stunned mullets. Let me talk about employment for a moment. The Premier half quoted some statistics: he talked about what had happened in South Australia, but he forgot to compare South Australia's record nationally. That is the indicator.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Why did he forget?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: He forgot to do this because South Australia's record is the worst in the nation; that is why he forgot. Unemployment was the big issue. In relation to the Labor Party, talk about knock: all we heard from 'doom' and 'gloom', as the Premier and his Deputy were popularly known (I admit that since the former Deputy Premier has left the scene I have found that he is not a bad sort of chap), day in and day out, *ad nauseam*, were comments about shocking unemployment figures, that it was a blight on the then Liberal Government and a blight on society, and that the number of young people out of work was a tragedy. However, now the ball game has changed. Now we have the worst record around Australia for the past three years.

Let me recite to the House South Australia's most recent record. Over the past month, the unemployment rate jumped from 8.7 per cent to 8.9 per cent, the highest rate of all mainland States, and the highest rate since March 1985. It has been described as the worst in Australia. So much for 'three great years', as proclaimed by the Premier. The Premier will have a hard job selling that sentiment. The rate is also higher than that in November 1982, when the Bannon Government was elected to office. Over the last month the number of persons recorded as unemployed increased by 2 400 to 56 400. How is this for a punch line for the Premier, with his great record: there are 2 200 more people unemployed now than there were in November 1982, when the level was 54 200. In other words, more people are unemployed in this State now and more people have joined the long-term unemployed queue, more school-leavers are unemployed, than when the present Government came into office. What a wonderful three years, we can proclaim from the morning daily, having regard to those figures.

The number of teenage unemployed has increased by 500 people over the past month to 11 700. South Australia also has the highest teenage unemployment rate (22.6 per cent)

of all the mainland States. How is that for three wonderful years? These are the people we should be most concerned about, to ensure that at least they are given a chance in life. We now have more unemployed young people in South Australia than anywhere else in Australia. Three great years, all right!

The number of persons employed in South Australia increased over the past month, but let us look at the Australian figure. Since November 1982, the number of persons in employment has increased by 20 100 (this is the figure that the Premier always quotes) to 580 600. That is a growth in employment of 3.6 per cent. Of course, to paint the complete picture (we do not just pick bits out, as the Premier does to suit his purposes), one must point out that the total number of people to be employed increases each year as school leavers join the market, so that, even though there may be more people in employment, the rate will increase because the number of new jobs does not keep up with the number of people looking for work. Let us get a global picture of this.

So, there has been an increase of 3.6 per cent in South Australia, although all up more people are unemployed since the present Government came into office. Growth in employment is the critical factor. It is well below the Australian average growth in employment of 6.6 per cent. In South Australia it is down to almost half that figure, being the lowest of all the States. That is the critical statistic, namely, that relating to growth in employment around the nation and in each State.

Growth in jobs in South Australia over the past three years has been 3.6 per cent; nationally it has been 6.6 per cent. In other words, the growth in new jobs in South Australia has been at a rate half that applying to the rest of the nation. And so it goes on. I could go through the CPI indicators in South Australia on all the indices of importance to the household budget, including food, clothing, transportation, and so on.

The average household budget in South Australia shapes up to be by far the worst around the nation. Let the Premier go out and sell to the average housewife or man in the street, or to the young unemployed, that we have had three wonderful years. The Premier should not try to cloud the issues. Let him front up to a public forum where the public can see him. Let him get out of his Grand Prix car, in which he was only too happy to let people see him on national and State television. Let him get out on television again, to debate with the Leader of the Opposition matters of importance to this State, that is, its economy and its future. Let him get out of his funk-hole and front up.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): Perhaps it is understandable that over the weekend the media should have made some references to the ancient principle of *panem et circenses*—bread and circuses. It is obvious that the Opposition has decided that circuses in particular are a good thing. The Leader of the Opposition now wants a debate. A little while ago we found that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition also wanted a debate. I guess that we could go on down the front bench opposite, and could expect that the member for Murray wants a television debate with me; that the member for Torrens wants a television debate with my colleague the Minister of Education; that the member for Davenport wants a television debate with his opposite number, and so it goes on. Circuses are what they want.

We watched with a great deal of interest the performance of the Deputy Leader, because when he gets on his feet we can always guarantee a circus in this place. To be frank, he runs out of material very quickly indeed. I think today I gave him about a minute and a half, when the material

evaporated and the rhetoric commenced. Some attempts were made at the end of 20 minutes to get somewhere back on the rails, but at that stage the galleries were empty, the media people had taken the hint that there was nothing much more around the place, they had packed up their material and fled. So much for the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the member for Kavel—'gunna Goldsworthy', who is 'gunna' do this and 'gunna' do that.

This debate is a desperate move by a Leader who is rapidly slipping through the floor, going from 49 per cent down to, say, 44 per cent, and rapidly disappearing from sight. His Party is going the same way, from 46 per cent down to 40 per cent. Who gets out at that stop? Perhaps it goes even further. On present trends the Liberals are set to vie with the left-right right-left Democrats for No. 3 position. Who can be surprised, after hearing some of the Baron Munchausen sort of statistics that they have been throwing at us this afternoon? Just to take one particular item before I move to an area that was canvassed by the Premier, on two occasions now we have heard ridiculous statistics about the State Bank and the availability of market as opposed to other sorts of rates for home owners.

We were told by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that two-thirds were at the market rate, and we were told by the member for Mitcham an evening or so ago that it was 60 per cent. The facts are that the State Bank makes available 37 000 housing loans, not including concessional loans. Only 7 000 of those 37 000 are on the market rate. A fair proportion of those are investors who are not living in those homes and who should not be given any better than the market rate. The Opposition is caught out, and so they start to make a noise. We are back to circuses again. The State Bank is the cheapest bank in South Australia in this area: no service fees are charged. As I say, the Opposition wants us to go to circuses. It is interested in style rather than substance.

I would like to pick up certain aspects of that style, because it relates to a matter that was given some prominence in that strange advertisement that the Liberal Party ran today. It relates of course to that area of community security. The people who look to the Labor Party in this community—the ordinary wage and salary earners—are those people who have the most to fear from a breakdown in community security.

That is why this Government, along with all previous Labor Governments, put considerable resources into the community security field. What we have always had from the Liberal Party is a very high level of rhetoric in this area: some rhetoric which, in a word, has been quite disgraceful. There are those of us who remember the advertisement that was not a Liberal Party advertisement at all but which was run during the 1979 election campaign by a certain Mr Nigel Buick. People remember the stocking over the head and the advertisement stating 'Why has crime and violence grown . . .' and so it went on: 'Save South Australia, protest, on this occasion, vote Liberal 1.' 'On this occasion', Mr Buick was saying, and I find that interesting in view of the number of times he has run that sort of act during election campaigns on behalf of the Liberal Party.

The Liberal Party might like to wriggle out of that disgraceful piece of rhetoric, but it cannot wriggle out of this piece of rhetoric which was distributed in 1979 in the Italian press under the authorisation of the Campaign Director for the Liberal Party and which, amongst other things, states:

A Liberal Government will make the street safe for your daughters without their being molested by all those thugs who have been acting as if they own everything for 10 years now.

That statement was put out in an election campaign and authorised by the Campaign Director of the Liberal Party. Quite apart from the disgusting aspects of that type of

rhetoric, let us see what the results were, because it may be that the very small proportion of people in the community who are gullible—as opposed to the rest who are not—may have been swayed somewhat by those sorts of appeals.

Therefore, they were entitled to expect that, under the Tonkin Liberal Government, there would be considerable protection for people in the streets, that their daughters would be able to walk the streets safe from molestation now that the socialists had been vanquished. What do we find? In the first two years of Liberal Government rape increased by 68 per cent—

The Hon. R.G. Payne: By how much?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: By 68 per cent—this is from a Party that said, 'A Liberal Government will make the street safe for your daughters without their being molested by all those thugs', and so it went on. In the first two years of Liberal Government rape increased by 68 per cent. It is interesting to examine other figures that bear on the performance of the Liberal Party in government in what is after all the fundamental area of Government administration. Oliver Wendell Holmes once said, 'With my tax I buy civilisation.' By 'civilisation' he clearly meant, among other things, the freedom to be able to walk the streets free from molestation, free from attack, free from thuggery and all those sorts of things.

In the first two years of Liberal Government, sex offences other than rape increased by 20.5 per cent, from 63.7 per 100 000 in July 1979 to 76.8 per 100 000 in July 1982. In the first two years of Labor Government sex offences increased by 9.7 per cent—less than half. We can go on with some of these other figures. Offences against the person, that is, excluding rape and sexual offences but including murder, death by dangerous driving, and so on, in the first two years of Liberal Government increased by 32 per cent, from 315.3 per 100 000 in July 1979 to 415.8 per 100 000 in June 1981.

In the first two years of Labor Government the increase was 13 per cent—2.5 times less than under the Liberals. So I could go on with these figures. What about breaking and entering? The rate of increase during the first two years of Labor was 23.6 per cent, which was almost the same as the rate during the first three years of the Liberal Government, which had been 22 per cent. Let the Liberal Party take some comfort from that very marginal difference. In June 1984, for the first time in 10 years, both the actual number of offences and the rate per head of population dropped below three other States, making South Australia only the fourth highest in the country.

Now we can go on with these sorts of figures, but what I want to do is get to the resources that are put into the field by Governments in order to do something about this whole matter. We are aware that Governments, by their very presence, do not create crime. They are not responsible in that respect, although one could be forgiven, from listening to some of the Liberal rhetoric, for believing that indeed that is precisely what happens: change the political colouration of the Government and somehow you change the capacity or the willingness of people to create havoc on the streets.

It is interesting to look at the figures provided by the police as to the active police strength on a *per capita* basis compared with the other States. Only one State does better than South Australia in that respect: the Northern Territory, which of course always has had considerable Commonwealth resources available to it. These are the figures: in the Northern Territory, 1 to 225; South Australia, 1 to 416; Tasmania, 1 to 427; Western Australia, 1 to 464; Victoria, 1 to 469; New South Wales, 1 to 517; and Queensland, 1 to 525. They are the sorts of tests that we have to look at,

the tests as to the sorts of resources that Governments are prepared to put in the field.

The other sorts of tests that one has to look at include the way in which Governments organise legislation to ensure that it is possible, using due process, for offenders to be brought to book, and for appropriate sentences to apply. There is little doubt that the facts, when they are examined, certainly support this Government. Following legislation introduced by this Government in 1983 the courts now set a non-parole period to be served by a prisoner. No prisoner is released on parole without strict conditions being imposed on his release following the expiration of his non-parole period. Conditions of parole are set by the Parole Board and, based on the offence and prison behaviour reports, apply for the full duration of a prisoner's head sentence. Failure to comply with the conditions of parole obviously results in reimprisonment.

Non-parole periods have increased for every category of offence since the changes in 1983. The increase has been from an overall average of 13.9 months to an average overall of 22.7 months. Non-parole periods expressed as a percentage of the head sentence increased from 36.9 per cent to 59.1 per cent. Non-parole periods for life sentences have increased nearly 100 per cent from 142.7 months to 246 months.

I could expand considerably on those sorts of statistics to indicate what we have been able to do in government rather than the sorts of things that we or anybody else might have talked about. So, let us have an end to rhetoric: let us talk about comparative performance. Let us not have circuses but rather an indication of what people can reasonably expect as a result of what Governments have been able to achieve.

I now turn to the economic matters that are the centrepiece, in effect, of this debate. This Government will not run away from any recitation of economic factors nor from our record in that field. The Premier has already referred to the half yearly report on the South Australian economy by the Centre for South Australian Economic Studies, released on 30 September. This makes very interesting reading indeed. The centre is a joint centre of Adelaide and Flinders Universities in South Australia. It is independent and not influenced by Government or Government departments in any way. It has far more credibility than has the fast disappearing Leader of the Opposition.

If one looks at the executive summary of that report, which I have in front of me, one sees the following statements which are backed up with detailed figures. It states that this State is still a low deficit State. Also, despite recent tax revenue gains, which later on are spelt out as the fruits of greater economic activity, the State is still relatively low on the tax take stakes. It states that employment increased by 2.4 per cent nationally in the year to August and even more in this State, and I will go on to detail that shortly. It continues:

Construction, community services, recreation and manufacturing provided much of the growth which, for South Australia—

and let this be noted—

was largely in the private sector.

It goes on to state, in the executive summary:

The leading indicators of job vacancies and overtime look healthy.

In regard to prices, it states:

Overall since 1980-81 there is no noticeable difference *vis-a-vis* other States. Local prices overall have not grown significantly more than nationally during the 1980s. The inflation outlook both nationally and locally is much better than generally appreciated.

It goes on to state, as the Premier has already commented:

Real sales growth is strong, as is manufacturing production, particularly in transport and in fabricated metals.

On page 19 of the report it has a section headed, 'The Record'. I would like to share this information with the House as it states:

After a bleak start to the 1980s, when the South Australian economy performed significantly worse than the national average—and I am just trying to remember who was in office in the early 1980s, but I will pass on—

the past two years have seen good growth return us to the national fold. The survey of South Australian industry (prepared by the SA Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the State Bank) provides a good illustration of recent growth in the State.

It further states:

For the June quarter 1985, employment by respondents was up 3.5 per cent on the previous year. As to the future, only 10 and 15 per cent of respondents expected lower sales or employment respectively in the coming year, and over 40 per cent expected higher capital expenditure.

It goes on to state:

Another illustration of recent South Australian performance is the behaviour of the unemployment rate, now around the national average as in contrast to the 1-2 percentage point (unfavourable) gap in the early years of the 1980s.

Again, I am trying to remember who was in office in the early 1980s. The report continues:

Job vacancy rates have also shown an improvement over the past two years. The August 1985 newspaper advertisements job vacancy figures were at a level higher than any recorded since the winter of 1974.

That is what it has to tell us about the record. We turn to another part of this report. On page 28 it refers to tax revenue, which is also important. It states:

The growth in tax revenue, both anticipated and unanticipated, can be largely attributed to economic conditions in the State. Over half of the increase in revenue in 1984-85 can be regarded as 'induced' by higher property values and turnovers and an increase in employment.

It instances in both cases increased stamp duty receipts and increased payroll tax receipts. So much for tax revenue! It further spells out a message in relation to unemployment on page 32 of the report, where it states:

For South Australia, total employment also grew by 1.1 per cent between the three month period ending May 1985 and the three month period ending August 1985. But, over the year to the three months ending August 1985, South Australian employment grew by a more impressive 2.9 per cent. The level of unemployment fell by 6.9 per cent over the year, and the unemployment rate fell from 9.5 per cent to 8.6 per cent. Since South Australia's labour force participation rate—

and let the Opposition note this, as it is very pertinent to unemployment figures (we cannot look at unemployment statistics without looking at labour participation)—

grew more rapidly than the Australia-wide figure—from 59.7 per cent to 60 per cent—and since the bulk of this growth was concentrated in the final quarter of the 12 month period, it can be said with some confidence that recent ABS unemployment figures for South Australia have provided only a poor guide to the pace of labour market improvement in the State.

This is not the Government talking but an independent organisation that is supported by the two institutions of higher learning in this State, the two universities.

Another interesting fact should be brought into the debate, as it is very pertinent to the whole question of taxes and the physical responsibility of Labor and Liberal in government. In a previous debate along these lines when, as the Premier indicated, we facilitated the capacity of the Opposition to bring these matters before the House, I spelt out the sorry and irresponsible record of the Tonkin Liberal Government in relation to, on the one hand, expenditure and, on the other hand, receipts and the way in which they were forced to borrow money in order to pay for the groceries. We have had to make a colossal effort in order to turn around the whole process, as it had two very unfortunate

consequences. On the one hand, it robbed from the construction sector the funds that were necessary in order to get that whole vital area of our industry going again and, secondly, it was leading us to ruin.

It is interesting to look at the real net indebtedness per head in South Australia so far as the public sector is concerned. I have information from the September 1985 South Australian Treasury information paper showing trends in the indebtedness of the South Australian public sector from 1950 to 1985. It is very important information, as there are people outside who just assume that Governments, by borrowing and borrowing, are heaping a greater burden of repayment on to our children and grandchildren. The only realistic way of examining this whole question is to look at the real net indebtedness per head and not at what the State, in purely crude money terms, has to meet now or in the future. These are very interesting figures indeed, because they show that in 1970—and let us not go back beyond 1970 because most people here deliberately cannot remember beyond 1970—

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I can give those figures if the member for Mount Gambier wants them. Let us go back to 1950. The real indebtedness per head in June 1950 was \$4 273. In June 1960, after 10 years of Liberal Government, it was \$4 679—an increase of about \$400 per head. In June 1970, when there had been some sort of sharing of the Treasury benches throughout the 1960s—Labor had its three years and the Liberals had the rest—it had climbed to \$5 524.

In June 1980, after the Dunstan decade, which I think members opposite would want to characterise as a decade of high expenditure and high level of calls on loan raisings, it had dropped to \$2 625. It was less than 50 per cent of what it had been in 1970. In 1985, it is down to \$2 446. There was some sort of slight reversal of that in the early 1980s, but we have been able to turn that around. The trend which was discerned throughout the 1970s under that Labor Administration has been confirmed. The real net indebtedness of the State has declined and is continuing to decline.

But, that is only possible provided that fiscal responsibility is properly demonstrated. Where it is abandoned, as it was in those mad years of the early 1980s, we can only expect a turnaround to those sorts of figures. As I have said to this House before, what these people have displayed to us again today is that what we really have again is the Tonkin depression team.

These are the people who brought South Australia to the brink of bankruptcy. These are the people who run off to Margaret Thatcher—the milk snatcher—for policies. These are the people who admit that privatisation, their buzzword policy, 'would be complex and fairly unpredictable'. They bring people across the waves to talk to us about this whole thing—it is the jewel in their crown and the centrepiece of their economic policy. One sells off the cake stall at Adelaide railway station and a few things like that and magically one reduces taxes! That is ridiculous.

In any event, they say that 'privatisation would be complex and fairly unpredictable.' Privatisation, like so many of those other things, is part of the rhetoric. It is part of the circuses that this Opposition would want to visit on the people of South Australia at whatever time this Government decides that we should go to an election.

As the Premier has said, the people of South Australia deserve better than that: they deserve far better than a series of performances under the klieg lights and made up heavily on television. They want real politics. The people of South Australia are of the same brush as those who said to Lord Ted Dexter many years ago in an election campaign in the United Kingdom that they wanted a politician, not a crick-

eter, to represent them. That is the mood of the South Australian electorate: they want management and people who understand how that complex mix of public and private enterprise operates.

They want people who understand that that is something which has been built up over many years and which has shown its benefits through the accord. Those people would try to tear down the bases of that accord: they would try to tip the pendulum too far the wrong way with all sorts of radical policies that would seek to return to the private sector all sorts of enterprises which are properly community owned.

That is the way to the Thatcherite ruin which has been visited upon those unfortunate islands in which so many of us have our forebear. When Maggie's moon seems to be on the wane, what does the Opposition Leader try to do? He is a Joh-star. He tries to compare this State unfavourably with Queensland. But Queensland is the worst run economy in Australia. It is obvious that the Opposition Leader is drawn to failure.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): The Deputy Leader said that he understood the mood of the electorate. Let us test the mood of the electorate in an election campaign, and let us test it on the real issues that affect the average person in the street—the consumer, the ordinary individual South Australian. Let us take up the challenge and test the mood of the electorate.

It is interesting to note that the Government talks about a television debate and says that we are trying to give reasons (they are not doing a very good job) why they will not front up to a television debate. Why would not the Government front up at the Adelaide University a couple of weeks ago? They wanted a debate between the Premier and me on issues affecting South Australia. Why would the Premier not attend the *National* program for an interview on issues affecting South Australia? Why, when 5AA set up a debate, did the Premier say, 'I won't debate; he can come on half an hour after me. I won't go to the same studio as him.'

The same thing happened at 5DN when the Premier refused a call from me to be hooked up on the link to have a debate. The Premier does not want to debate the issues at Adelaide University, on radio or on television. He does not want to debate those issues out there with the people because he does not want to answer for the track record of his Administration; he does not want to answer for the track record on the ABS figures.

Members opposite are all being sensitive about not being prepared to debate those issues. I can understand that. Let us look at the consumer price index. In the 12 months to the end of September the CPI shows that food prices in Adelaide rose by 7.7 per cent—greater than the increase in any other capital city in Australia. Well the housewives know it when they go to the supermarket.

It is no good going out and getting selective figures on goods. The Premier could take a single item, such as tomato sauce, and quote on that, not on a basket of food. These ABS figures are for basket food prices. Adelaide was 7.7 per cent—higher than any other capital city in Australia; transport costs went up 10.7 per cent—higher than any other capital city in Australia and certainly higher than the national average. Prices for household equipment rose by 7.5 per cent—1 per cent higher than the average for all other capital cities. That is the track record.

In his advertisement the Premier said that he intends to freeze interest rates, but today he said, 'I have no control over interest rates.' Yet, the advertisement today talked about his capacity to freeze interest rates. This is a further indication of misleading the public of South Australia and

trying to set a full perception as to the impact of interest rates.

The Premier talks about affordable housing and says that his Government has achieved that. That is why the average house has gone from \$39 000 to \$53 000, I suppose, and why monthly repayments on mortgages have gone from \$424 a month to \$691 a month. Tell that to the people of South Australia who choose to live in affordable housing. In 12 months their mortgage interest rates have gone up from \$424 to \$691 a month.

How much disposable income has that left them to spend on other goods and services that they might like to buy? It is quite clear that the track record simply cannot be there; it is not there. The Premier said that he would like to get the record straight. It is something new for him even to attempt to do that.

Let us look at safety. The Deputy Premier said, 'We will increase the size of the Police Force.' What he did not say—and once again it is misleading—is that although he is putting on 50 police officers, the Police Force has declined by 50 police officers over the past couple of years. So, at the end of the program we will have the same number of police officers in this State. It is no increase.

Let us look at this Government's automatic early release system. No wonder we have had an increase of 97 per cent in drug offences, 45 per cent in rape, 39 per cent in house breakings in South Australia—one every 20 minutes in this State. This is because there is no deterrent in the system due to the Government's early release system, which gives one 15 days off on every 30 days for good behaviour—even when six inmates escaped from Yatala Labour Prison in June last year and shot a police officer going over the wall. The Government's system gave them 15 days for good behaviour for escaping and shooting a police officer on the way out!

That is this Government's automatic early release. That is the watering down of law and order in this State. There is no deterrent factor against would-be criminals within our society. The Government is watering it down, as it well knows it is doing. About 700 people have been released from institutions in this State: 120 of them have re-offended in major crimes.

Ms Lenehan interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Will the member for Mawson talk to the family of the unfortunate 14-year-old girl who was kidnapped and raped? Remembering that the offender, under the automatic release scheme, after being assessed, was freed and committed the same offences again, the honourable member should talk to that unfortunate girl. How would one feel to be the parent of that young girl? I know what I would say were I that parent: the automatic early release scheme, under which the prisoner is not checked before release back into society, is wrong and is not good enough for South Australia. I commend the motion to the House.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (22)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Becker, Blacker, D.C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Ingerson, Lewis, Mathwin, Meier, Olsen (teller), Oswald, Rodda, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (24)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon (teller), M.J. Brown, Crafter, M.J. Evans, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Mayes, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

HOME OWNERSHIP MADE EASIER PROGRAM

Ms LENEHAN (Mawson): I move:

That this House congratulates the Government on its recent changes to the HOME (Home Ownership Made Easier) concessional loans program administered by the State Bank to provide an initial interest rate from as low as 5 per cent and to allow families with up to 105 per cent of average weekly earnings to participate and, further, this House believes the program to be of immense value to ordinary South Australians and that it must continue.

The State Government has recently announced a major restructuring of its Home Ownership Made Easier scheme (commonly known as HOME). Introduced in October 1983, HOME includes two schemes to help low to middle income households into home ownership: the concessional loan scheme administered by the State Bank and the rental purchase scheme administered jointly by the State Bank and the Housing Trust. Under both these schemes housing finance is provided at concessional interest rates that are geared to the household's capacity to repay.

The recent restructuring was designed to ensure that real assistance continued to be provided to low to middle income households in the face of steep increases in property values in South Australia over the past two years, as well as the increase in interest rates. The changes follow a comprehensive review of home purchase policies and programs by the Minister of Housing and Construction (Hon. Terry Hemmings). Income limits determining eligibility for the HOME program have been expanded, and I especially congratulate the Minister on this move.

The loan limit and the maximum house purchase price have been raised. Commencing interest rate scales have been adjusted to ensure that the new loan amount remains affordable to new borrowers. The new conditions apply to applications approved from Monday 7 October. Existing loans remain unaltered.

Under the new HOME program, concessional interest rates charged on a scale according to level of income have a new floor of 5 per cent per annum compared with 5.75 per cent previously. Commencing interest rates for new loans to households with dependants have been reduced by 1.5 per cent at each income level, while those for couples without dependants and for single people have been reduced by .75 per cent at each income level. Income limits have been raised from 95 per cent to 105 per cent of average weekly earnings for a couple, or lone parent with two children, and from 90 per cent to 100 per cent for a household with one child.

For couples without dependants the income limit has been raised from 85 to 90 per cent of average weekly earnings and for single people the limit is now 65 per cent compared with 55 per cent previously. Average weekly earnings are currently \$404 gross per week. A household with two dependants with a total gross income of up to \$425 can now qualify for this program. The rate of interest charged depends on the level of income. The maximum purchase price for a house bought under the program has been raised from \$65 000 to \$72 000, while the maximum loan has been increased from \$42 000 to \$48 000. I believe that this realistically reflects the increase in housing prices and, indeed, in the amount which people need to borrow to be able to secure a home in South Australia.

Combined with the assistance available under the Federal Government's first home owners scheme, the HOME program now provides sufficient assistance to enable households to choose from a wide selection of housing types and locations. The median house price in Adelaide for the first six months of this year was \$72 000, which means that 50 per cent of houses sold during the period were priced below this figure. First home buyers also benefit from the State

Government's stamp duty concessions. The stamp duty exemption level was raised to the first \$50 000 of purchase price in August 1985, compared with up to \$40 000 previously, and it provides a benefit of up to \$1 008 to all first home buyers. HOME also provides assistance under the mortgage relief scheme to households having difficulty in meeting their mortgage repayments due to increased interest rates or a fall in household income. The income limit determining eligibility for mortgage relief was increased under the new HOME program.

I have moved this motion because many of the significant advances contained in the revised HOME program directly affect my constituents who have benefited tremendously under not only the new revised HOME program but also the mortgage relief scheme. I am delighted in being able to congratulate the Minister of Housing and Construction on the initiatives that he has taken in relation to public and private sector housing in South Australia. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

DISABLED PERSONS HOUSING POLICY PROJECT

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I move:

That this House applauds the Government on initiating a consultative process through the Disabled Persons Housing Policy Project, under the auspices of the Minister of Housing and Construction's Housing Advisory Council, to discuss housing needs of and means to resolve housing difficulties faced by disabled persons; and supports this initiative to understand and assist this important section of the community.

The purpose of moving this motion is to draw to the attention of members the consultative program that is now being undertaken for disabled people so that their housing needs may be looked at and we may be able to develop our policies in this area. In that way it may be possible to utilise to the best advantage moneys available from the Commonwealth.

Other States have looked at this same process, but they have not tackled the problem with the same degree of thoroughness with which South Australia is tackling it. It is hoped that with a proper consultative process we will be able to come up with the sort of policy that will lead the rest of Australia in relation to housing for disabled people. During the last month the housing needs of disabled people were examined in a series of State-wide workshops. Those workshops were organised on behalf of the State Minister of Housing and Construction and as a first step towards developing the policy that I have already mentioned.

Many disabled people choose to live independently in the community, and quite often the only reason that they cannot do so is the impediment of unsuitable housing. The workshops have provided important opportunities for disabled people, and perhaps more importantly, those people who advise disabled people, to provide the Government with a better understanding of their problems in relation to housing.

Full-time consultants have been appointed by the State Government, and in particular Mr Gary Halliday was appointed to attend workshops in regional and metropolitan centres. Mr Halliday provided a report outlining the major housing problems faced by disabled people, and his recommendations, which are now being studied by the State Government, will be looked at in full.

In the metropolitan area there have been meetings at the Fullarton Park Community Centre, the Western Domiciliary Care Centre at Woodville, the Department for Community Welfare at Enfield and the lecture theatre at the Panorama College of Technical and Further Education. The

country meetings included one at the Department for Community Welfare at Port Augusta, the Berri Uniting Church Hall, the TAFE lecture theatre at Mount Gambier, and the Lower Eyre Peninsula Activity Therapy Centre at Port Lincoln.

As I mentioned before, this matter was taken in hand by other State Governments, but unfortunately New South Wales in particular looked at it in a hurried fashion, and that did not really produce any beneficial results. It is hoped that the staging of this project in South Australia will perhaps lead the rest of Australia, as we so often do in regard to such projects. In relation to staging of the disabled persons' housing policy project, it has been divided into a series of phases. The first phase will involve a project over 16 weeks. The duties of the full-time officer, Mr Gary Halliday, who has been appointed to this project and who has been seconded from the Crippled Children's Association, include:

1. To review literature, including recent inquiries, reports and publications, where relevant to disabled persons' housing needs.

2. To collect information from the current Commonwealth, State, local government and non-government programs related to disabled persons' housing needs.

3. To conduct workshops. As I mentioned earlier, Mr Halliday has already started that process at metropolitan and country venues. The purpose of conducting workshops is to identify disability groups, that is, involving people handicapped physically, psychiatrically, etc; and to identify major issues in the field of disabled peoples' housing, looking at housing availability, costs and appropriateness, housing/accommodation options or lack of options, support service requirements, which is an area of extreme importance and one in which I have taken a great interest in the western areas, and we have had some success in this area with the introduction of the new HACC program, which will hopefully mean that support services in the western area will greatly increase.

The workshops will also involve looking at the matter of service gaps. Further, workshops will attempt to encourage consumer organisations, individuals, non-government and Government agencies to discuss needs for the improvement and coordination of housing and housing related services for the disabled, and to take advice on the composition of a policy development advisory committee to oversee formulation of policy, involving Disabled People's International, the Department of Community Services, the Intellectually Disabled Services Council, the South Australian Housing Trust, etc.

4. To prepare a report for the Minister which will outline results of the preliminary consultation, that is, the major housing needs identified through a literature review and the workshops; to recommend how the consultation should proceed in the second phase, perhaps by public advertisement for submissions; and to recommend membership of an advisory committee to oversee the second phase of the policy project, perhaps involving representation from consumer groups, the South Australian Housing Trust, the Intellectually Disabled Services Council, and other organisations.

Phase 1 is almost complete. That phase is to be undertaken over 16 weeks. The second phase is to be under the auspices of the advisory committee to the Minister. The second phase will also involve a series of tasks. Advertisements and calls will be made for submissions, and arrangements will be made for written and verbal submissions. Information collected from consultation undertaken during the first phase, submissions received and follow-up meetings as required will be collated. The next stage in the second phase will involve the development of a final policy outline

and a presentation to the Minister of recommended policy. The third stage will involve a release of South Australia State Government policy on disabled persons.

The establishment of the disabled persons' housing policy project was recommended to the Minister by the Housing Advisory Community Committee. The Minister accepted the recommendation and approved funds to employ a consultant for the first 16 weeks of the project to assist in setting it up. Mr Gary Halliday, from the Crippled Children's Association, was seconded to work on the project from 22 July to 8 November 1985.

The Office of Housing is to provide resources to continue the work done by Mr Halliday, following a report to the Minister; to organise further consultation; and to provide information to and service any advisory committee appointed by the Minister. It is certainly my wish to have an advisory committee appointed in this area, and I know that there would be people within my sphere of influence in the western area who would be only too pleased to participate in advisory committees set up by the Minister. Following that work to be done, the draft recommendations will be made and a policy document will be produced.

This project has been received with great enthusiasm by disabled people, disabled people's organisations, the Disability Adviser to the Premier, housing organisations, and the relevant Commonwealth and State departments, all of which have been particularly enthusiastic about it. It is certainly going a step in the right direction. The message from all sources is the same: there is a need to look at housing problems faced by disabled people. A thorough look at the problems involved is long overdue. People in all organisations associated with this area have welcomed the initiative taken by the Minister of Housing and Construction, and it has received praise from many areas.

Some of the major points that have been identified so far include, first, the need for disabled people to have more choice in housing. Previously many disabled people had to live either in institutions or with their families. In fact, many people in those circumstances would like to live independently or in community housing. I am very interested in types of community housing projects that are being discussed. Certainly, the Western Community Hospital is currently developing a project with the Housing Trust, and I hope that that project also includes some space for disabled people in my electorate. This project will enable people to have more choice about accommodation. Also, housing availability must be coordinated with the provision of support services. The area of support services is becoming more and more important.

The recent decision taken by the Federal Government to freeze funds for nursing homes has brought this matter to my attention. Support services will allow people to be maintained in their homes, and I certainly see this system being able to be used by disabled people. I doubt that there will ever be enough money in this area to provide the sort of services that politicians will be satisfied with, but the amount of money that is being injected through the recent provision of Commonwealth money will certainly go a long way to do something in this area.

Disabled people and their organisations wish to be closely involved in advising the Government on the development of a State housing policy, and that is only to be expected. I know that there are some anxieties in the area of deinstitutionalising disabled people, and I am sure that the parents of some of these disabled people would be very interested in providing the sort of advice that is necessary to the Government so that it can look after all their needs. The Government is recognising all disability groups, including the psychiatrically disturbed people and other groups who

may be disadvantaged by the lack of a choice of housing in the community.

I now make these concluding remarks. I would like to pay tribute to the South Australian Housing Trust for the amount of work it has done in the electorate of Henley Beach in respect of design and changing design of housing to assist disabled people. Recently I had the pleasure of attending the opening of a new group of cottages in Cudmore Terrace, Henley Beach, and inspecting them and their architectural design. I note that they were specifically designed for people who are disabled through age and other disability. They are a credit to the sort of planning that is now being introduced by the trust.

I have mentioned previously the cooperative effort being made by the trust and Western Community Hospital, and I pay another tribute to that hospital for the sorts of undertakings in which it is now involved in assisting the aged and disabled.

The introduction and use of Commonwealth money to build a new day care centre in that area can only be commended by anyone with an interest in looking after the community. It is my hope that shortly we will be able to proceed with this joint venture with the trust, with the trust providing substantial amounts of money to introduce new cottages on vacant land owned by the hospital adjacent to its grounds. Plans for this project have been on the drawing board for more than two years, and the money that has now been made available by the Commonwealth for cooperative housing projects will shortly allow this project to proceed.

As I mentioned previously, the project will contain some buildings architecturally designed especially to assist the disabled and I hope that, resulting from this series of conferences that has been set up by the Minister of Housing and Construction, the knowledge gained can be put to good use by the trust in its designs and be of assistance in projects such as this that are now occurring in my electorate. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

SPECIAL SERVICES STAFFING

Mrs APPLEBY (Brighton): I move:

That this House commends the Government for increasing Special Services staffing from 14 as at November 1982 in the

former Kindergarten Union to 24.5 as at October 1985 under the Children's Services Office and calls for further improvements in this important area.

Mr Baker interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Ferguson): Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mrs APPLEBY: I suggest the honourable member read the Notice Paper. In moving this motion, I congratulate the Government and the responsible—

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs APPLEBY: In moving this motion I congratulate the Government and the responsible Minister. I am appalled by the mischief and misrepresentation that can be and has been initiated to feed on the emotions of parents and service providers in the kindergarten and other children's services area. I believe that any person or group (including members opposite) who uses such tactics in the face of the facts is eventually undone by a growing understanding by the community. This Government has and will continue to provide services that ensure the highest quality of service possible. The Childrens Service's Office has already given our State the resource and ability to upgrade services, such as my motion indicates. The services I speak of, for those members of this House who might not understand what special services are in regard to kindergartens, are social workers, psychologists, speech pathologists, special educators, community health nurses and, in varying degrees—

Mr Mathwin: There is only one in the southern area.

Mrs APPLEBY: If the member for Glenelg waits for about five seconds I will disprove his assertion. Kindergartens in my area come under the Central South Region, and I have a document that I wish to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it for the benefit of all members of the House so that they can read factually rather than continuing to misquote in the community. I seek leave to have this table inserted in *Hansard*.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Does the honourable member assure the Chair that it is of a purely statistical nature?

Mrs APPLEBY: Yes.

Leave granted.

SPECIAL SERVICES STAFFING AS AT 4 OCTOBER 1985

CENTRAL SOUTH	CENTRAL EAST	CENTRAL WEST	CENTRAL NORTH	NORTHERN COUNTRY	SOUTHERN COUNTRY
Vacancy Senior Psychologist	(Tilly) Psychologist	Slattery Psychologist	McHugh Psychologist		
Baas Social Worker	Farrant Senior Social Worker	Gordon Social Worker	Archer Social Worker		
Foord Speech Pathologist	Derrington Senior Speech Pathologist	Porter Speech Pathologist	Tuesner Speech Pathologist	Vacancy Speech Pathologist	
			Brebner Speech Pathologist		
Parkin Special Educator	Vacancy Special Educator	Kenny A/Senior Special Educator	Grant Special Educator	Woolard Special Educator	Smith Special Educator
			Furber Community Health Nurse (0.5)		
Total	4	4	5.5	2	1

Positions	New position Special Educator/ Speech Pathologist				New position Special Educator	New position Speech Pathologist New position Special Educator
Total	5	4	4	5.5	3	3

Mrs APPELBY: I seek leave to conclude my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

UNION DEREGISTRATION

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

That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should immediately align itself with efforts of the Commonwealth and Victorian Governments to deregister the BLF and, in the event that the BWIU continues its intimidatory and obstructive stance against the building industry, proceedings should be instituted against that body for the purpose of deregistration and that these actions should be pursued with utmost vigour in the interests of the building industry in this State and especially the needs of hundreds of South Australians seeking a home.

I will quickly analyse my motion. I suggest that it has five main parts: first, that it is to be the opinion of this House, that is, that I am seeking a bipartisan approach to an issue that is of considerable concern to many people in this State. The second point is that the Government should immediately align itself with efforts of the Commonwealth and Victorian Governments to deregister the BLF, an action which was commenced by the previous State Government, and which is still actively in train under the Commonwealth and Victorian Governments but which was stopped by the present South Australian Government. We might ask why the Commonwealth and Victorian Governments are persisting with their attitudes at a time when they are being hampered from within their own ranks by the reds and the socialist left.

It is quite well known that the special meeting of the Victorian ALP sought to pull the rug from under the feet of the Premier of Victoria, Mr Cain, and also refused to accept the counsel and advice given to it by the Hon. Mr Willis, the Federal Minister, who very clearly pointed out the reasons why it was important for the Commonwealth to proceed. One can only guess that those who are bucking the pursuance of this action are mates in every sense of the word with the Norm Gallaghers of this world and are in cahoots with those people who have ratted on their mates and who know no principle, in that they are prepared to live off their mates and live off the benefits which they claim they are seeking on behalf of those workmates whilst in fact they are creaming the good off the top for their own benefit. So, those who would not want to align themselves with this positive action that has been persisted with by the Victorian Labor Government and the Commonwealth Labor Governments, are obviously against the interests of those two Governments in trying to assist the people of the Commonwealth on the one hand and the people of Victoria on the other hand.

The third component is that, in the event that the BWIU continues its intimidatory and obstructive stance against the building industry, proceedings should be instituted against that body for the purpose of deregistration. It may well be said that the Premier of this State has tended to go to bat and defend the actions of the BLF as not being all that bad and to say that it has a reasonably good record in this State. We saw how good its record was yesterday when work was not being done on eight building sites around this State.

We recognise that on the previous day a certain action saw the loss of a considerable sum of money associated with concrete which was delivered but which was not allowed to be poured. There are numerous activities which the BLF

is perpetrating against the people of this State at a cost to such people. Let us not fool ourselves about this type of activity. I am not talking about a genuine industrial matter, where safety, health or welfare matters are involved, as I give them full marks for going to the barricades in relation to those important issues. But, these trumped up activities, which are so frequently perpetrated on the public by the BLF, are happening in this State. I suggest that the self-same activities are under way by the BWIU in this State, and I am very clearly advised that at least one confrontation per day is perpetrated by the BWIU against members of the building industry in this State.

Again, I pose the question, 'Who pays for it?' Eventually it is the people of this State. The South Australian Housing Trust has to pay more for its stock and the individual must pay more for his home. It is the people of this State, in a total sense, who must make up the losses and extravagances that are being held against the people. Mr Ben Cairslake, the Secretary of the BWIU in South Australia, ably at times supported by Mr Terry Carroll, can be real thump merchants—there is no argument about that. We have Emmanuel, a person who is active on the sites but unable to write his own name and unknown by surname. He is the main hit man on site. We have Mark Ctinko and, from time to time, we have Ray Montana. These five people, one of them the Secretary and one of them his assistant—

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: What has a person's literacy level got to do with it? Some very wealthy businessmen could be illiterate also.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Very much so. They mark their place with a cross. I am putting, for the benefit of the Minister of Education, the facts regarding these people who are hit persons and who are perpetrating massive financial losses against the people and the Government of this State.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:

Mr Baker: He supports them.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Obviously the Minister is going to the defence of these people, when we are simply putting down an indication—

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: What about other illiterates in society? Do you attack them as well?

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: If they were perpetrating against the people of this State these sort of illegal activities—

Mr Trainer interjecting:

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Mr Acting Speaker, I ask you to grant me leave to continue my remarks after we have heard from members opposite.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Ferguson): Order! I ask the House to come to order. The honourable member is the first speaker in this debate. Other members may like to take the opportunity to enter the debate at a later stage if they feel that certain matters need to be redressed. I ask that the honourable member be heard in silence.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Thank you, Sir. What are the sorts of actions that these people are taking on average once per day in South Australia? Their major action seems to be against subcontractors. They are threatening subcontractors on site, over the telephone and in a variety of ways that, unless they pay up and become members of the union, they will never work again in the industry in South Australia. There have been instances where subcontractors have been beaten up because they would not bow to the demands of these people. Supplies are being denied or the first comment made is that, unless those involved fulfil the dictates that

they are about to be given, no further supplies will be delivered to the site. This is happening not across the border in Victoria, New South Wales or elsewhere (heaven knows it is happening there also) but here in Adelaide on a daily basis, and at a cost to the South Australian building industry. These sites are being banned by way of picket and by other intimidatory activities.

What about the pressures that are being brought to bear on people working on site? In the middle of winter when it is a natural phenomenon in the workplace for there to be an element of mud—I am talking not about mud up to the ankles but about a thin smear of mud on site—the area is determined as black. What about the special subbies who go on site and who leaving cement out of the mortar so that a wall is built purely and simply with sand and a little colouring but no cement? When action is taken to have the work corrected there is a refusal and, unless there is greasing of the palm to put the whole matter back into a positive form, the site is declared black. What about brickies being told that, even though they have entered into a contract, they are not being paid enough and that, therefore, the site is black? They are called out because they are not enjoying sufficient returns for their endeavours—so these people say.

The secondary boycott aspects of BWIU activities are another matter again. They are all interwoven and the end result is disastrous for the building industry. I accept what the Premier says—that it might not be as obvious in this State as it is interstate and that we might not hear as much about it here as one hears interstate, so that we do not have to get too excited about it. I suggest to the Premier and his colleagues in this action in which I seek to be bipartisan that we recognise that, if only one site is affected per week or per month, it is against the best interests of the building industry, and that we should not walk away from the rights of these organisations to call their people out in cases affecting health, welfare or safety, because that is their right. However, these are trumped up activities which are not in the best interests of the building industry.

Whilst talking about activities of the BWIU and going back more specifically to the actions of the BLF, there is a question whether the BWIU is about to involve, or has perhaps involved, itself in the infamous bus fund which is associated with the activities of the BLF on site. Large sums of money are being accumulated: they are being looked after by eight directors, one of whom was, and I believe still is, Mr Norm Gallagher. Those funds are being extracted from the building industry. Some actions have already been identified, and, although I do not intend to go into those at present, they could seriously disturb the economic balance of the Commonwealth.

We have clear evidence that those actions work against the best interest of the public of Australia. On that basis, if these actions continue, South Australia should align itself with the action that has been taken by the Commonwealth and the Victorian Governments. I say all power to them for being persistent, having recognised the cancer that the activities of these people is on society and being prepared to seek to remove that cancer before irreparable damage is done.

The fourth part of my motion indicates that these actions should be pursued with the utmost vigour. I do not mean, 'I have heard about it; I will look into it.' We have had enough mirror action from the present Government, looking into it forever, but not doing anything about it. It is extremely important that positive action be taken. A Liberal Government will certainly take positive action. I am not suggesting that the gauntlet will be thrown down, but very clearly there is a clear determination by a Liberal Government to give equity to the rights of all individuals—not just sectional rights to such individuals who want to thumb their nose at

society and walk all over it. We want the matter pursued with the utmost vigour so that we can be proud of our industry, of the effort put into it and results for the workers, because there is a clear and proper recognition and representation by the union hierarchy of the just needs of those people whom they represent.

The fifth point can be divided into two. We have called for action to be taken in the interests of the building industry. This was launched by the Premier this afternoon. We have consistently acknowledged this and sought to be part of it, namely, the importance to the economy of this State of the building industry. The second and by no means lesser of the two components is the need of hundreds of South Australians who are seeking a home. Those people are, in many cases, in desperate need of assistance. They are crying out for it. The Government, with the support of the Opposition, through the vehicle of the Housing Trust and various other crisis centres, is seeking to provide assistance for those people, but it is not able satisfactorily to supply those benefits whilst there is this intimidation and deterioration of a positive and satisfactory work site caused by people who are interested only in their own pleasures or self promotion rather than that of the industry overall. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

TRANSPORT POLICY

Mr TRAINER (Ascot Park): I move:

That this House—

- (a) deplores the cynicism shown by the Liberal Party towards residents of the southern metropolitan area by unrealistically proposing that a sum exceeding \$250 million be spent on an unwarranted freeway through heavily populated areas;
- (b) Supports the cost effective plan of the Government to construct a third arterial road south of Darlington, upgrade the Darlington interchange, and continue to improve the existing road system; and
- (c) deplores the callous Liberal Party attitude towards residents of the western suburbs in reviving the spectre of the outdated, divisive and destructive 1968 MATS Plan.

I approach this subject with some passion, because it is one about which I feel strongly and on which the member for Davenport has accused me several times of losing my cool. I do not consider it a particularly negative situation to be accused of being vehement in support of the interests of my constituents and the interests of many other people in the western and southern suburbs of the metropolitan area.

The Liberal Party in general and the member for Davenport, as shadow Minister of Transport, in particular stand condemned for their transport policy. It is extremely deceitful towards those people living in the southern metropolitan electorates of Fisher, Bright and Mawson, and it is callous towards those living in the western suburbs in the electorates of Hayward, Mitchell, Walsh, Peake, and so on.

I say, 'deceitful' because their propositions are a complete fraud. Indeed, I suggest that one could almost describe the transport policy of the member for Davenport as a 'Hungry Jack's approach': he is trying to sell whoppers. He twice accused me of having been untruthful; in fact, he used the most unparliamentary term 'lies' to describe some statements that I put out in a leaflet and some comments that I have made in the House. By way of personal explanation, I have proved that those accusations were completely unfounded and that, as far as this serious issue is concerned, I have at all times been truthful. I do not believe that I have spoken one word in public or put one word in print that was not the truth as I believed it to be, and that was factual.

Let us examine some of the incorrect aspects of what the member for Davenport has put forward on behalf of the Liberal Party. For example, he says that the Government has taken no steps to alleviate the traffic problems of the southern and western metropolitan area. Yet for some time I have been in possession of a Government document that has been circulated widely and has the support of the Southern Metropolitan Region of Councils. The document is entitled 'The Southern Regions Transport Plan' and, later in this debate, I intend to read part of that document into the record to spell out what the Government intends to achieve in the next five years, in the next five to 10 years and in the next 10 to 15 years, as part of a coherent and cohesive transport policy.

The one-shot hit-in-the-arm motorway proposal of the member for Davenport is not an efficient or cost effective solution. Indeed, it is extremely costly compared to other alternatives that are available to extend the road network and improve its efficiency. Furthermore it will not solve immediate transport problems. Nevertheless, the honourable member has deceitfully tried to con the people of the southern metropolitan area into thinking that somehow, if a Liberal Government is elected (and that eventuality becomes less likely each day), a freeway would spring up overnight like a mushroom, whereas, even on the terms put forward by the honourable member, it would be towards the end of the century before such a monster could be created.

A further subterfuge (although it may not be a deliberate subterfuge but a misunderstanding on the part of the honourable member) is the way that he regularly uses several terms interchangeably (for example, the terms 'corridor', 'alignment', 'motorway' and 'freeway'), as if they were synonymous, when in fact they are not. One absurdity of which he is guilty in this House is that he has regularly talked about 'constructing a corridor', when in fact the Highways Department with its machinery cannot 'construct' a corridor. A corridor is not a concrete object such as a freeway: it is an abstraction, a line on a map to indicate a concept. The corridor is a dotted line on the map to indicate where a facility, whether a motorway, a railway line or some other transport facility, may be installed later. Within such a corridor, which may be extremely wide (up to one kilometre in width), there may be several alignments that are potential routes that may be followed by transport facilities. Such road alignments may be motorways or freeways. The terms 'motorway' and 'freeway' are more generally understood by members of the public.

By playing the pea and thimble trick, the member for Davenport frequently interchanges these concepts so that many of the people who listen to him end up not sure of what he is saying. The honourable member further confuses those geographic parts of the overall motorway plan that he apparently has in mind. At times, when he talks about his motorway, his freeway or, to use the incorrect term, his corridor, he talks only about the Liberal Party equivalent of the Government's third arterial road south of Darlington. At other times, when he talks about the freeway, the motorway or the corridor, he refers to that section which is north of Darlington and which he has disinterred from the long dead MATS Plan. Again, at other times when he talks about the north-south corridor, the north-south freeway, or the north-south motorway, he is referring to the whole lot from Reynella up through the western suburbs: in other words, both the sections to which I have just referred.

The emphasis which he puts on these depends on the audience that he is addressing. The honourable member also has a highly selective memory, and I never cease to be amazed at the sort of thing that the honourable member can say with a straight face. He never points out in the

south the impracticability of a motorway, as a result of which most of the western suburbs would have to be demolished because it would have to go through the districts of Hayward, Mitchell, Walsh, and Peake, to mention but a few. He never points out to the people down south that the mirage that he dangles in front of them would be impossible to achieve. It is not feasible to carry out construction on a scale that would carve a swath of destruction through the western suburbs by demolishing about 800 homes, plus community facilities, and there is a list of facilities to which I will refer later.

The member for Davenport never explains why the Government will not go along with the destructive, extravagant and impracticable proposals that he puts forward. He glibly rattles off his references to the motorway, but he never points out its disadvantages and its impracticability. If it really was as simple and straightforward as he says it is, why does the Government not buy that option? It is because far better options which are more cost effective and which are not destructive of entire communities can be put into operation far sooner than the end of the century and can meet the immediate traffic problems now. The options to which I refer are alternatives that have not been looked at while the dotted line has remained on the map as a hangover from the old MATS Plan. As long as that corridor has existed on the map, the solutions for transport problems have been predicated on its existence. Indeed, South Road would probably have been widened many years ago but for the fact that Highways Department engineers could perhaps look at that map and say, 'Let's not bother to widen South Road. Let's leave it to the magical solution of a motorway.'

What has created much scepticism in my district, and the electorate at large, especially in the metropolitan community, is the honourable member's suggestion that he could easily find \$250 million for this work. Indeed, it is no wonder that people refer to the honourable member as the 'half billion dollar man' because, apart from this \$250 million motorway that he can apparently pull out of thin air, he has also drawn up a transport policy that lists about \$250 million worth of other roadworks, many of them concentrated almost entirely in the District of Davenport simply because he is facing a determined challenge from someone who is a good grass roots worker, the current member for Fisher (Mr Evans).

I am not sure how seriously the people of Davenport take that proposition. It may well be that, if the honourable member has been able to get \$250 million worth (or anywhere near that amount) of roadworks suggested for the District of Davenport and written into Liberal Party policy, his constituents might as well vote for the Independent Liberal candidate, because that member will do just as good a job in ensuring that such a program is put into effect.

The member for Davenport never explains whence the \$250 million is to come. Every time that he is challenged on that subject in the media, at a public meeting or in this House, he comes up with the glib answer, 'There's about \$15 million in fuel tax going into general revenue each year. All we have to do is earmark that for the next few years to pay for the cost of this extravagant white elephant.' He never explains how he will replace that \$15 million in revenue so that those things on which it is being spent at present may continue to be done. As I understand it, of the \$15 million fuel tax, only about \$3 million goes into general revenue, \$12 million being earmarked for use by the Highways Department. In other words, every road and road improvement that is planned for many years to come would have to go into the dustbin: it would not be proceeded with while all that revenue went into this single project. That is ridiculous. As for the \$3 million that goes into general revenue and is presumably directed towards needed pur-

poses in the community, what would happen with those needs if it was cut off?

It is easy for the member for Davenport to come up with these grandiose schemes and to draw textacolor lines on a map as he has been doing for several months now. Indeed, the honourable member's idea of a transport policy is to get hold of a street directory and a nice cheap set of textacolor pencils and make spidery lines on a map, saying 'Let's put a freeway here and there. That's our transport policy'. It is nice and easy.

It is a little like the generals of the First World War and their cigar butt strategy. Someone with a cigar butt would point at a map and say, 'We are going to go in there' and would ignore entirely the consequences of that plan, or (again referring to First World War strategies of carving through no-man's land) someone else among the generals in staff headquarters would use an irresistible pencil point to go forward across the map and never stop for barbed wire, mud, or any of these entanglements.

Likewise, the member for Davenport's textacolor goes inexorably across the western suburbs not stopping for the Glandore kindergarten, or the Field of Remembrance in South Plympton, where RSL people hold their Anzac Day services in April each year, or for any of the sport facilities or 800 homes that would be destroyed. The inexorable textacolor of the member for Davenport carves its way across the western suburbs, and no thought is given to any of those details. It is all very well for someone sitting in Burnside to put textacolor lines on the map, but it is another thing to come down to the western suburbs and meet the people who are at the pointy tip of that pen. By contrast with this sort of election stunt by the member for Davenport as part of the Liberal Party's transport policy, the Government has a cohesive overall plan.

It is obvious that the election stunt of the member for Davenport has only two aims. The first one, to which I have already referred, is to help prop him up in his own electorate against a challenge from the current member for Fisher. The other is to try to woo a few votes in the marginal seats in the south. In that process Liberal members are quite prepared to treat the Labor electorates in the western suburbs with contempt. It is quite obvious that the honourable member has nothing but disdain for working class people in working class suburbs.

One just has to compare the attitude that is shown to this sweeping proposal of hacking a freeway through the western suburbs with the attitude that was adopted by members of the Liberal Party when the original MATS Plan was first floated in 1968-69. Who can forget the shock and horror that greeted the proposals to carve through the eastern suburbs of the metropolitan area? Who can forget the about turn when some members of the then Liberal Government of Steele Hall were taken by the Mitcham council on its annual tour of that area? The bus stopped at one point and I think it was the Town Clerk who pointed out several rows of houses that would be demolished under the old MATS Plan. The reaction by most of those Liberal members on the bus was shock and horror. Mysteriously, that part of the plan very quickly vanished.

On the other hand, at that time they had a different approach to those aspects of the MATS Plan that went through working class areas: they remained as part of the plan. We had the then Minister of Transport (Hon. Murray Hill), despite what would have appeared to be one or two conflicts of interest, vigorously supporting the destruction of large areas of housing by the MATS Plan. At one time, I think in 1969, an organisation in conjunction with the *Sunday Mail* conducted a survey by means of a questionnaire that was printed as a cut-out coupon in that newspaper. The answers started to come in and it was quite

obvious that there was a genuine grassroots response opposing the idea of covering most of metropolitan Adelaide with concrete, tar and cement.

Suddenly, the figures started to change; many clip-out coupons came in in favour of the MATS Plan. Someone connected with the organisation became a little suspicious, particularly when something like 400 of them were in the handwriting of only two or three people and they all came in in the one big brown envelope from the Hyde Park or Unley Park area. Investigations were undertaken and, when the newsagent in the Unley Park/Hyde Park area was approached, he said, 'Yes, we did have the Hon. Mr Murray Hill ordering 400 *Sunday Mails* last week.' Lo and behold he was caught, metaphorically, with his fingers in the till, because the Hon. Murray Hill, then Minister of Transport (and I think Minister of Housing at the time), had been calling his friends in and they had been filling these coupons out as fast as they could from his bulk order of the *Sunday Mail*. He thought that he would give the survey a little encouragement and obtain a crooked result. That shows the extent to which Liberal Party members in those days were prepared to go. Fancy doing something like that—it is appalling.

It is obvious that the member for Davenport has nothing but contempt for people in my Walsh electorate and the people in the electorates of Mitchell, Hayward, Peake and others on the western side of the city. Presumably he thinks that they are Labor Party electorates and, because they have Labor majorities of 55 per cent or more, the Liberal Party will not win those anyway, so he can treat those areas with contempt. The member for Davenport thinks that his party can talk about hacking through those electorates and not face any electoral consequences whatsoever.

On the other hand, he believes that, if he can maintain this illusion of cutting through the western suburbs with this giant edifice of a freeway, his Party may pick up that vital handful of votes in the electorates of Fisher and Bright. The only time that I have seen or heard the member for Davenport express any compassion (and I think that would be using the word rather loosely) for people in my area was when he quibbled about the exact figure that I used in relation to the number of houses that would be destroyed in the western suburbs. Perhaps compassion is irrelevant in that context, but that was the only time I caught a glimpse of what could be called concern, and I even think it would be going a little too far to interpret his reaction as concern.

The member for Davenport claimed that the number of houses affected was 500, but that was simply because he had completely misunderstood what the Minister of Transport said in response to another question: it was because he misunderstood the words 'require' and 'acquire'. I referred to the number of homes that would be 'required' to be destroyed and that was about 800. The number of houses that would have to be acquired was 500: in other words, that was the number of houses that the Highways Department did not yet own. I am using rounded off figures, because for this discussion it is easier to talk in terms of hundreds. About 300 of the 800 homes were already owned by the Highways Department and that would leave 500 that would have to be acquired. Possibly the member for Davenport deliberately attempted to confuse the issue: that would not surprise me at all. But it is a little strange when all the honourable member can do is quibble about the exact number of homes that are to be destroyed. One would think that he would express some concern about the fact that any homes at all would be destroyed by his mad project.

He may think that he can treat the people of the western suburbs with disdain because they are situated mainly in Labor electorates, but I am fairly sure that they will be re-electing the members who represent them at the moment.

I think that he should bear in mind that there are two elections that take place on election day: there is a separate election for members of the Legislative Council. Those people in my electorate who have approached me and expressed their anger will be voting for the Labor candidate in the House of Assembly, if they carry through what they have said to me, but they will go a little further and will also express their anger against the Liberal Party in general by voting against the Liberal Party ticket in the Legislative Council.

Whoever is the unlucky person in the No. 6 position on the Legislative Council ticket (I do not know who it is, because it is such a nonentity) will probably rue the fact that the member for Davenport did not think of that possibility. What he proposes with contempt towards Labor electorates in the western suburbs will rebound on whoever that unfortunate No. 6 candidate is on the Legislative Council ticket. In fact, the way that the Liberal Party is standing in the polls at the moment, the person occupying the No. 5 position on the Legislative Council ticket could also pay the price for this attitude of contempt towards the good working people in my area of metropolitan Adelaide.

Having been in this place for six years, I never cease to be surprised at the things the member for Davenport can say and still most of the time manage to keep a straight face, but the degree of cynicism that he has shown in this instance is probably unsurpassed in the period that he has been a member of this House. As far as the marginal seats in the south are concerned, it is quite obvious that the Liberal Party wanted a gimmick for an election stunt. It was not interested in a cohesive and coherent transport policy but, rather, something it could dangle in front of the electors of Fisher and Bright to try to give the impression of progress. Never mind the \$250 million bill that could never be met. Never mind the fact that there are cheaper and more cost effective alternatives.

Never mind the fact that the member for Davenport is confusing them by using terms as if they were interchangeable when they are not. Never mind the fact that the people of the western suburbs will not tolerate having their homes destroyed for an unwarranted freeway. Never mind all those things, but just dangle in front of them the idea of a freeway and do not talk too much about the ramifications of it or about the details of it. Just dangle it as a simple election stunt and by so doing perhaps 10 or 100 votes can be picked up—just a handful of votes in the south, relying on the hope that people could be that easily deceived by a stunt. Just put a textacolor line on the map—a nice easy stunt; just be the member for Davenport, the half billion dollar man, with his textacolor transport policy.

What the Liberals are trying to sell in the south is a mirage. By reinstating the old MATS Plan's route in my area they are reviving a spectre. So, in the south we have a mirage and in the north a spectre. In trying to combat this I feel as though I will have to call in 'The Ghostbusters'. Most of the people in my area, and most people in the southern metropolitan area, can see this proposal for the fraud that it is. By and large, I find that people in the community are not taking seriously the Liberal Party's transport policy, and they are not taking the Liberal Party seriously.

For a start, they do not believe that the Liberal Party is likely to win the next election. In my area I have reassured many people by pointing out to them that it is unlikely that the Liberal Party will win the next election. What the ramifications of that will be for the spectre of the old MATS Plan is that the MATS Plan proposal for this freeway will go back in the rubbish bin. I have pointed out that, having dragged it out of the rubbish bin to use as an election stunt

at this election, if it does not work this time the Liberals will not try it again in three or four years time.

Mr Hamilton: I don't know—they are silly enough.

Mr TRAINER: It is true that the Liberals have not learnt from their mistakes, judging from the number of mistakes who have again been preselected. Even those people who think that there is a possibility that the Liberal Party might win do not take the Liberal Party's transport policies seriously. They think that the Liberals would not do something like that, that they could not possibly want to put a freeway through an area like the one in question and try to destroy it. Other people say, 'Well, look, you are talking about the year 2000 and even if they did get into government by some mistake they would be out so quickly that they would not be in a position to continue to implement such a policy.' People cannot believe that the Liberal Party has a policy like this and that it could seriously consider implementing it. But even those who do think, 'Perhaps this is not just an election stunt; they really do mean it,' have pointed out to me that the Liberal Party will not be able to find \$250 million for the freeway.

Obviously, every person in the community objects to paying what they consider to be unfair taxes. People do not like contributing their money to consolidated revenue, the fuel tax fund, or anything else. However, people have lots of ideas on how to spend money, although very few have many ideas on where to get it from. Very few can clearly say from where the Liberal Party would find a huge astronomical sum like this or provide any practical solution.

Because of my responsibilities towards the community that I represent, I have been informing people there of some of the details of just what it is that the Liberal Party is proposing to do. The member for Davenport obviously has read some of the articles that I have had in the local Messenger press as a result of my press releases. He said that I would not be prepared to put those press releases into the Messenger press publications circulated further south, and yet as far as I can recall every one of those press releases has been provided to the *Southern Times* as well as the *Guardian*. I am quite prepared to address that problem.

I am prepared to join my colleagues in pointing out to the residents of the southern metropolitan area that the Liberal Party is trying to pull on them a con job that means nothing. Even if the proposal were to be put into effect, that would not be until the end of the century and it would do nothing whatsoever to solve their problems in the meantime. It is absolutely appalling that, two years after the MATS Plan was finally buried, the Liberal Party has disinterred its rotting corpse in a case of political necrophilia.

The member for Davenport says that I lose my cool on this subject, that it is something on which I am impassioned. However, I think I would be a pretty poor representative of the people in my community if I did not take a strong stand on this issue. I think that, if I was not to respond to the threat of attacks by the member for Davenport on my constituents, they would be entitled to say, 'What is our member doing about this? Why doesn't he stand up for us against that silvertail from the eastern suburbs?' I have a responsibility towards the 20 000 people in my electorate, and I am prepared to discharge that responsibility by keeping them advised and informed on the threat that is posed to them.

The information leaflet which I produced, which was distributed to a large number of homes in my electorate, and which is entitled 'An information leaflet with my compliments in response to the question "How would the Liberals \$250 million motorway monster affect you?"' was received very well indeed. Obviously the member for Davenport is aware of how well it was received, because, since

it was distributed, some of my constituents have been passing on to him their disappointment at his mad proposal.

All the member for Davenport could come up with, in expressing his anger at the fact that such an effective publication had been released, was to criticise the scale which was used in the map, even though in no way is the map purported to be fully to scale. It merely illustrates, using colour to distinguish it from the black used for the rest of the roads in the area, the impact of the proposed route on the electorate of Walsh. The red line used does not purport to be the road itself. It merely indicates (and it says so at the bottom) the approximate route for the 1968 MATS corridor. It illustrates the route only, and is shown superimposed on the Walsh electorate to illustrate the community facilities affected.

That map gives far greater detail than the member for Davenport has been prepared to provide. In responding to representations from constituents in my electorate all he did was to provide what looks like a page torn out of the inside cover of a street directory and photocopied showing the entire western area of the metropolitan district, with this thin spidery textacolor line on it. People studying the map look at it and think, 'Does that affect us or not? It looks like that little spidery line is about half way between South Road and Marion Road, and it looks like perhaps it might go through our suburb.' But they are not too sure, because the member for Davenport does not provide them with too many details. I am not surprised that that is the case.

His plan does not indicate which streets would be affected. The reason for that is that the member for Davenport has not really thought out this proposal. He would not have come up with some of the whacky remarks that he has made had he been aware of the actual lie of the land. For example, at a public meeting recently, when someone said 'Would this freeway of yours be the same sort of monster we used to see in the MATS Plan, 20 feet above the ground?', he said, 'It would not be like that. I saw a freeway overseas below ground level to try to reduce the noise impact.' At that stage the member for Davenport was also trying to convince one constituent that he could fit a six-lane freeway, a median strip, the run-offs, sound reduction areas, safety barriers, and landscaping, all in the depth of one house allotment. I reckon that the honourable member ought to get a new title of Mandrake if he can do that.

The point I was attempting to make in relation to someone referring to an elevated freeway and the honourable member's response that, 'No, it would be a sunken freeway,' is that I assure the honourable member that if he was to try to implement a sunken freeway along Towers Terrace, for example, in my area, he would get a bit of a surprise, because the watertable is close to the surface of the ground in that area. If the honourable member was at all aware of the western and south-western areas he would know what a terrible drainage problem there has been in the area for many years. It was not until the mid-1960s, when the South-Western Drainage Scheme was implemented, that it ceased to be a problem for places like the Parkholme Shopping Centre, which used to be a foot or two under water every winter.

If by some terrible chance this proposal was put into effect, it would mean that, rather than it being the north-south corridor, freeway, or motorway, it would become the north-south trunk canal. Perhaps for the sake of international transport we could go back to that concept of the last century whereby, I think under Colonel Light's original plan, Port Road was to be a canal from Outer Harbor into the city, and then we could have a marvellous new 'wet' Liberal transport policy. I understand there are still a few wet Liberals over there, although most claim to be with the

dries and others are only slightly moist. We could have a new wet Liberal transport policy whereby boats from Darlington could sail north and end up in the Port River and take produce overseas.

I point out that the map that I used, unlike the one distributed by the member for Davenport, is at least a map that was in the public domain. I used as a map of Walsh, with the red line indicating the proposed freeway route superimposed, a map from the Electoral Department. I understand that it is in the public domain. Certainly, if I have infringed copyright, so has every other member in this place and just about every candidate in South Australia, because these are very handy maps to use for electoral purposes.

By contrast, I draw the attention of the House to the map circulated by the member for Davenport in the area of my colleague the future member for Hayward. This map has obviously come from a Universal Business Directory. Across the bottom of the page it states 'Universal Business Directories Pty Ltd'. At the top right hand corner it says 'map 53', and then we have one of the marvellous textacolor lines that he likes whipping across where people live, a big thick dotted line. I am not sure if it is a corridor or a freeway but it looks half a kilometre wide. At the bottom righthand corner of the map it says 'Copyright'. That is another example of where the member for Davenport has been a little bit naughty, using a map labelled 'Copyright' and circulating it in that manner when perhaps it is the sort of thing he should not do. Bearing in mind some of the other things he has done that he should not have, perhaps one should not be at all surprised.

Looking at what I had to say in the leaflet for my constituents, I see I asked:

How would the Liberals' \$250 million motorway monster affect you?

I went on to say:

Our newly created electorate of Walsh would be almost destroyed as a community by this Liberal election stunt. The suburbs of Edwardstown, South Plympton, Glandore and Kurralta Park would be the worst affected.

I am not sure whether the member for Davenport is concerned about the impact on those suburbs. I am not even sure whether he knows where they are, but the people who live there certainly do. My leaflet continues:

Up until now the Liberals have been very vague about this grandiose proposal to carve up our neighbourhood, probably deliberately so. The only map they have circulated shows none of the essential details of the controversial section of the route that residents need to know about. Of course, one part of their north-south corridor proposal is less controversial and that is the southern section.

Although these are some substantial differences basically, what the Liberals propose to do in the south is copy from what we have proposed to do with the third arterial that will constitute the Darlington bypass. The leaflet goes on to state:

That part is in the less heavily populated countryside past Darlington to Reynella, and looks remarkably like the Government's plan for a new third arterial road to the south.

No wonder it looked like the Government's plan—it was pretty well copied from it. I go on to state:

Presumably that part was copied from the Labor Government's transport plan and is relatively unobjectionable. The disastrous part of the Liberals' election gimmick is the addition of a northern section of multi-laned freeway, slashing through our densely populated residential suburbs from Darlington to Thebarton.

That component is very similar to the obsolete 1968 MATS route abandoned by the State Government two years ago on Transport Department advice because it was hideously expensive and socially unacceptable. It was scrapped by the Labor Government for good reasons that are still valid and to talk of bringing it back is a quite irresponsible election stunt on the part of the Liberal Opposition.

Inside the leaflet I provide further information. Certainly, no-one disagrees with the proposition that we face an ever-increasing amount of traffic on our roads. There is a certain amount of disagreement about the rate at which that is increasing. Some interpretations put it as low as 1 per cent. The member for Davenport claims 4 per cent, and I believe that figure is closer to 2.5 per cent. He talks in terms of absolute—

Mr Mathwin: Every quarter of an hour tonight we will call a quorum.

Mr TRAINER: I do not understand that interjection.

Members interjecting:

Mr TRAINER: I am not supposed to respond to interjections. I am sorry, John. I did not realise that you suffered from industrial deafness. There is agreement that provision has to be made for increasing traffic, but traffic is not growing as quickly as predicted. If the 1968 MATS Plan statistics had been followed, Adelaide would have been unnecessarily covered with concrete and bitumen by now.

It was interesting that one of my constituents who attended a meeting addressed by the member for Davenport rang me to express his disappointment. He described what he heard and said that the member for Davenport was talking in terms of the roads being totally clogged, using the same sort of eschatological terminology that was used by those persons years ago discussing the 1968 MATS Plan.

That 1968 MATS Plan, which would have covered Adelaide almost entirely with concrete, was due for total completion by 1986. Adelaide, we were told, was in such a chronic state of traffic chaos then, ever-increasing chaos, that by 1986 it was absolutely essential that the entire MATS Plan be implemented. We are not just talking about that section of the MATS Plan on which I have dealt for the last few minutes and which particularly affects my area, but the entire MATS Plan—a giant network of freeways and interchanges all over the metropolitan area, including the silvertail suburbs of the eastern part of the metropolitan area.

They were telling us in 1968 that we must implement the billion dollar proposal or else: that there will be total chaos on the road. The MATS Plan was scrapped and we are in 1985. We have not got the total chaos that was predicted in 1968 because these traffic figures are notoriously unreliable, and so often are over estimated. Had the proponents of the MATS Plan, the Hon. Murray Hill and so on, in 1968 had their way, we would have been today only 12 months short of the complete implementation of the MATS Plan and by now—1985—Adelaide would have been covered with concrete and bitumen. It just would not have been the community that we have all grown to love and be so proud of. I then point out:

The Government is already taking remedial measures such as constructing a third arterial road to the south, removing the Darlington bottleneck, upgrading the existing road system (e.g. the Emerson Overpass) and improving public transport.

These measures are more cost-effective than a grandiose \$250 million edifice that we cannot afford (except by 'robbing Peter to pay Paul') and which would devastate the area from Darlington to Thebarton.

Perhaps the member for Davenport really is serious and is not as cynical as he seems. Perhaps he is really genuinely obsessed with constructing this \$250 million edifice. Perhaps as a result of his childhood he has a strange edifice complex, but we cannot afford this, either socially or fiscally. It is possible that at a later stage, sometime in the beginning of the next century, the measures that we plan to implement would need to be supplemented by a freeway at that stage. If that proves to be the case, the Government of the day will produce a revised transport policy to accommodate that situation. In my leaflet I had this to say:

If in the next century an additional north-south freeway does become necessary—and that is a big IF then a less disruptive route can be designed based on the traffic needs of the time instead of digging up an old discredited 1968 plan.

When we come to the year 2 000 or 2 010, if one of these creations has to be erected, it should be erected along the line dictated by the traffic patterns of the year 2000 and 2 010, not simply by pulling out of the dust bin an old 1968 plan that is obsolete and trying to breath life into it. It is not only wrong to revive a plan like that because it is obsolete and would not necessarily follow the most appropriate route, it is also wrong—

Members interjecting:

Mr TRAINER: Members opposite seem to be objecting because I have spoken at some length on this subject. I draw their attention to the fact that the member for Davenport had a motion on the Notice Paper dealing with a similar subject. He sought and was granted leave twice to continue his remarks later, in effect gagging the Government from responding to his proposition for the last two weeks. How disruptive would the Liberal proposal be? I point out that the urban blight that was lifted from the western suburbs by the Bannan Labor Government would return. When the MATS corridor was finally abandoned in 1983—

MR GUNN: Mr Acting Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House. If Government members want to play rough, we will get rough.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr TRAINER: It seems that I must have sparked a twinge of conscience in members opposite as they have been getting a little agitated over recent minutes. I presume that it is because I have made some quite telling points about what a fraudulent policy the member for Davenport has put forward. I am pleased to have had this opportunity today to make my opening remarks on this issue, but because members opposite are so agitated, I will try to do something placatory. I cannot play any music in here to soothe the savage beast, but, if I seek leave to continue my remarks, in view of the way that I have upset members opposite, who have threatened to respond by calling 'quorum' every 15 minutes, that may induce a favourable response. I therefore seek leave to continue my remarks later.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Peterson): Is leave granted?

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: With some reluctance, leave is granted, but not for the reason stated by the honourable member.

The SPEAKER: Is leave granted?

Mr Becker: No.

The SPEAKER: An honourable member has called 'No'. Leave is not granted. The member for Ascot Park.

Mr TRAINER: I am not sure about the member for Hanson. Apparently he does want me to continue, so I express my appreciation of such an appreciative audience. I was pointing out that the Liberal Party proposal would be extremely disruptive in my area. I pointed out that, when the MATS corridor was finally abandoned in 1983, the area along the old route became rejuvenated. If the Liberals win this State election and reimpose the old MATS route, residents will again be under a planning cloud for another 20 years. Land sales, housing improvements and commercial developments will be sabotaged and slums could develop.

In the period of time since the member for Davenport made his announcement, we have had just that sort of impact on that area. One house dropped \$35 000 in value overnight, I was told, because of the member for Davenport. Prices have been markedly lower, and I have one constituent who wrote to the member for Davenport to express his bitter disappointment at the policy that was announced by the member for Davenport. The letter from a Dr Hamilton, living at 8 Allambie Avenue, Edwardstown, is as follows:

I refer to your public notice in the *Advertiser* on Saturday, 25 May 1985. I would like to thank you and your colleagues for the great unease and distress that you are causing me, and no doubt many other people affected by your notice. By this action you have revealed your callous disregard and contemptible dismissal of those people whose lives and property you have affected. I venture to suggest that your Party at least is consistent in its approach to the people. When I purchased this property, which I am pleased to call my home, it was with the knowledge that it was required in the future for the north-south corridor.

He then went on to point out the impact that the member's policy announcement had, in stating:

And now comes the heavy clod of the Liberal Party, with the announcement that a Liberal Government will proceed with the corridor (when the Liberals get into power, that is). But, what happens in the meantime (and who knows how long that meantime may be—decades perhaps)? Such people as myself who have the misfortune to be on the original plans are in a state of limbo. We cannot now invest in home improvements, because there is no point in risking our savings. We can however rue the dollars devoted (prior to your announcement) to increasing our enjoyment of our properties. We cannot now enjoy it.

We cannot sell with a happy feeling of handing over well loved and secure homes to a buyer, because we know that there is this ill defined, all pervading threat hanging over the properties. If we are honest and tell all potential buyers that there is a possibility that these houses could be in the path of a freeway, you can imagine how the buyers would flock away from our doors. If we do not tell potential buyers of this sword of Damocles and someone purchases in ignorance, then as soon as your Party gets a chance, you will destroy the peace and happiness of those persons. Does this make you feel good?

The final crunch is that, when we are unable to sell our properties because of your cruel and shortsighted notice, we have no right to sell to the Highways Department, because your intentions are not Government policy. So, what do we do, when we are unable to sell our homes because of your notice? Do we apply to the Liberal Party to buy the properties as a sign of honesty and commitment to that public notice, because surely the Liberal Party would be able to sell those properties to the Highways Department if the Liberal Party gets into power? And, should the Liberal Party not get into power, then you will be in the same boat as we are now, which is, after all, only fitting, since you should be prepared to suffer those slings and arrows of outrageous fortune that you are so fond of inflicting on others. I must add, that I had a buyer lined up for this particular property, but that offer has now been withdrawn as a result of your action.

I am pleased to be able to advise the House that Dr Hamilton was eventually able to sell that property, because the Hamiltons were able to find a person who was not expecting a freeway to be built in the near future and was prepared to take a gamble on it being as far away as the year 2000. It is probable that the buyers did not expect the Liberals to win.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr TRAINER: Judging by the recent polls, not too many people outside do expect the Liberals to win.

Mr MATHWIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ASSOCIATIONS INCORPORATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Mr GUNN (Eyre) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Associations Incorporation Act 1985. Read a first time.

Mr GUNN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to put into effect some of the recommendations of the select committee which investigated Peterborough Steamtown and other associated matters. Those members of the select committee who so diligently went about the business of investigating this most difficult problem came to the final conclusion that the only manner in which the matter could be resolved once and for all was for legislation to be introduced to allow these people who desired to become members of Peterborough Steamtown (in excess of 120 persons) the opportunity to do so, because to

this point they have been denied the opportunity to become members. It will also allow those persons who were expelled, including a life member, again to become members of that organisation.

This Bill gives the Commissioner of Corporate Affairs, where he has received the authority of the Attorney-General, the opportunity to accept membership. Of course, it also provides that a member may call for a special general meeting of Peterborough Steamtown. I believe that, when this Bill becomes law, after the Commissioner accepts those memberships, the matter will resolve itself and that that organisation will then be able to get on with the business of running a steamtown service for tourists and other interested people.

It is especially important as we approach our Jubilee 150 year that steam trains operate at Peterborough then. This measure, which I have circulated to the Minister of Transport, the Attorney-General and other members of the select committee, should receive support of the Parliament. It is not a draconian measure. It applies only to incorporated associations that have been investigated by a select committee.

That course of action will not apply to many organisations. I sincerely hope that it will not be necessary again to have to use legislation of this nature. However, because of the problems at Peterborough I have found it necessary to bring this measure before the Parliament. Any fair-minded person who sits down and reads the evidence of the select committee will come to the same conclusions as it did that there were problems beyond the select committee's ability to resolve without legislation. Therefore, I accept full responsibility for bringing this measure into the Parliament. I believe that it has the overwhelming support of the community at Peterborough and those who are familiar with this organisation. I did not want to take this course of action, but I believe that in the long term it will benefit the area. I therefore commend it to the House.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD secured the adjournment of the debate.

RENTAL ACCOMMODATION

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

That, in recognition of the paramount importance of the building industry in maintaining employment opportunities, and because of the growing list of applicants for public housing, this House advises the Prime Minister that demolition of negative gearing financial arrangements for the building of rental accommodation will have an adverse effect on the availability of accommodation for all age groups in our community.

It is not possible to develop the full argument on this matter at this time, but there are in our community those people who will always want to rent. Some find themselves in positions of having to do so. Age and sex are not barriers and certainly a large number of people who have children find it particularly difficult to find accommodation. Therefore, it is essential that we actively seek funds for the development of rental accommodation if we are satisfactorily to provide housing for many people in our community. I will pursue those matters on another occasion. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

WORTHING MINE

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Mathwin:

That, recognising the important heritage significance of the Worthing Mine situated on the Field River at Hallett Cove and its environs, which is reflected in the fact that the mine is on the

interim list of the State Heritage Register, this House calls on the Government, and in particular the Minister for Environment and Planning, to ensure that the surrounding land, in particular areas known as 505, 506 and 507, is not disturbed by any mining lease and that no tenement be issued under the Mining Act to allow further mining, and further calls on the Government to encourage local government to declare the area a conservation zone.

(Continued from 30 October. Page 1670.)

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): In view of the time and, indeed, the amount of time that I spent on this matter last week, I can wrap up my speech fairly quickly. I have now had the opportunity to discuss this matter with my colleague the Minister of Mines and Energy, who confirms the information that I gave to the House last week. Its effect is that, although it may be possible under the Mines and Works Inspection Act to place certain conditions over any attempt by the industry to extend its operations over the remainder of its private mine, for the most part this is a matter for negotiation.

There appears to be really no power in either the Mining Act or the Planning Act which effectively simply prohibits any aggressive attempt on the part of the industry, if that is what it wants to do (and I have no information on that), to extend its operations. So, we really are into negotiations.

As I indicated to the House, I am fairly familiar with the area, although the Minister of Mines and Energy is not. However, he has undertaken to inspect the site and enter into negotiations with the industry to see exactly what sort of conditions would be reasonable in the event of any attempt being made by the industry to extend its existing operations. That is a reasonable situation. Although I obviously have sympathy with what is behind the motion, since it is based on a couple of false assumptions as to what powers are available to the Government, technically I invite the House to reject the motion.

Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg): I thank the Minister for his remarks. Perhaps I did not understand him correctly. He did not say whether he had had the Crown Solicitor's advice on the matter.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I had advice from the Mines Department itself, and I will make it available to the honourable member.

Mr MATHWIN: I did have legal advice on the matter, and it seems a shame that it has not gone that far. I still hope that there is a loophole and that the motion is successful.

The House divided on the motion:

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

Noes (24)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon, M.J. Brown, Crafter, M.J. Evans, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood (teller), Keneally, Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Mayes, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.
Motion thus negatived.

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

NORTH HAVEN (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) BILL

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister for Environment and Planning) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the North Haven Trust Act 1979; to make

provision for the subsequent repeal of that Act; and to make provision for certain matters relating to the land affected by that Act. 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 amend the North Haven Trust Act 1979, and to make provision for certain matters which are a consequence of the agreement of sale of the land by the Government. The Bill also provides for the sale of the remaining assets of the trust and for the eventual repeal of the North Haven Trust Act 1979 when the trust's work is considered to be finished.

The North Haven Development Act 1972 ratified an indenture agreement between the South Australian Government and the Australian Mutual Provident Society for the sale of land at North Haven to the society for development. The indenture provided that the society was to undertake certain works at North Haven including the construction of a boat harbor. The society was given an option to lease land within the harbor area for marina and commercial development. After partial completion of the boat harbor, the society decided not to exercise its option, over the harbor land. The Government then stepped in to complete the harbor, and a trust was established by the North Haven Trust Act 1979 to undertake and promote development in the harbor area, which is referred to as the 'prescribed area'.

In 1983, approximately 70 per cent of land in the 'prescribed area' was sold to Gulf Point Marina Pty Ltd, a private consortium, which is proceeding to develop and sell off portions of the land purchased. In 1984, approximately 5 per cent of the land in the 'prescribed area' was sold to the Cruising Yacht Club of South Australia, being the area that club had previously leased from the trust.

The North Haven Trust, as part of the agreement of sale to Gulf Point Marina Pty Ltd, undertook to use its best endeavours to ensure that the area of water which is owned by Gulf Point Marina Pty Ltd is never assessed or rated in respect of land tax, sewer rates or water rates and that any land owned by Gulf Point Marina Pty Ltd would not be assessed or rated likewise until such land is connected to both sewer and water mains or until the expiration of the period of eight years from the date of settlement of the deed of sale on 31 August 1983, whichever shall first occur. The North Haven Trust is liable for the payment of any amounts so assessed or rated contrary to the provisions of the agreement of sale.

The Bill therefore provides for exemption by proclamation of certain parts of the land sold to Gulf Point Marina Pty Ltd in the 'prescribed area' from assessment or rating under any or all of the following Acts: (a) the Land Tax Act 1936 (b) the Sewerage Act 1929, and (c) the Waterworks Act 1932. Any exemption would be capable of being varied or revoked by proclamation by the Governor. The passage of this Bill will assist in meeting obligations flowing from the agreement of sale between the North Haven Trust and Gulf Point Marina. I commend the Bill to the House.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides that the measure is to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

Clause 3 provides a definition of the term 'the prescribed area' used in subsequent provisions. 'The prescribed area' is defined by the clause as the area that became vested in the North Haven Trust by virtue of the operation of section 13 of the North Haven Trust Act 1979.

Part II (comprising clause 4) provides for the amendment of section 14 of the North Haven Trust Act 1979. Section 14 of that Act sets out the functions of the North Haven Trust, namely:

- (a) to undertake or promote residential, recreational, commercial, marine and associated industrial development within the prescribed area; and
- (b) to provide services and manage facilities within the prescribed area for the benefit of the public or any section of the public.

The clause amends the section so that the function referred to in paragraph (b) above is limited to the provision of services and management of facilities for the public where it is in the opinion of the trust appropriate to do so having regard to the nature and stage of development of the prescribed area. The clause also inserts a new provision into the section designed to make it clear that the trust has and always has had power to dispose of part of the land in the course of the development process and ultimately to dispose of all of the land at the completion of the development process.

Part III (comprising clause 5) provides for the repeal of the North Haven Trust Act on a day to be fixed by proclamation. The clause also provides for the winding up of the North Haven Trust by providing that the Governor may, by proclamation, transfer or distribute any property, rights, liabilities and obligations of the North Haven Trust to or between one or more of the following:

- (a) the Crown;
- (b) a Minister or Ministers of the Crown;
- (c) the Corporation of the City of Port Adelaide.

Finally, the clause makes a necessary provision to continue the prescribed area as part of the area of the Corporation of the City of Port Adelaide.

Part IV (comprising clauses 6 and 7) makes certain provisions relating to the land affected by the North Haven Trust Act.

Clause 6 provides that the Governor may, by proclamation exempt a specified part or parts of the prescribed area from assessment and rating under all or any of the following Acts: (a) the Land Tax Act 1936; (b) the Sewerage Act 1929; (c) the Waterworks Act 1932.

Clause 7 empowers the Governor by regulation to exempt the prescribed area from the application of Part III of the Harbors Act or to declare that a provision of that Part applies to the prescribed area as if it were a harbor and with such modifications as may be prescribed.

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

PARLIAMENT (JOINT SERVICES) BILL

Consideration in the Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1 Page 4 (clause 6)—Leave out the clause and insert new clause as follows:

6. *Secretarial services.* Secretarial services shall be provided to the Committee as follows:

- (a) when the President of the Legislative Council is the chairman of the Committee—the Clerk of the Legislative Council or a person nominated by that Clerk shall act as secretary to the Committee;
- (b) when the Speaker of the House of Assembly is the chairman of the Committee—the Clerk of the House of Assembly or a person nominated by that Clerk shall act as secretary to the Committee.

No. 2. Page 5, lines 3 and 4 (clause 7)—Leave out 'the secretary to the Committee' and insert 'the Catering Manager'.

No. 3. Page 13, lines 26 and 27 (clause 24)—Leave out all words in these lines and insert 'approval of both Houses of Parliament'.

No. 4. Page 14, lines 10 to 12 (clause 24)—Leave out 'the President of the Legislative Council and the Speaker of the House of Assembly shall jointly give due weight and consideration to that certificate' and insert 'copies of the certificate shall be presented to the President of the Legislative Council and the Speaker of the House of Assembly who shall cause the copies to be laid before their respective Houses as soon as practicable after their receipt.'

No. 5. Page 14, lines 14 and 15 (clause 24)—Leave out 'the President of the Legislative Council and the Speaker of the House of Assembly think fit' and insert 'may be determined by both Houses of Parliament'.

No. 6. Page 15, line 5 (clause 26)—Leave out paragraph (e) and insert new paragraph as follows: (e) the Catering Manager.

No. 7. Page 15—After line 17 insert new clause as follows:

26a. *Officers may be regarded as members of the Public Service in certain situations.*

(1) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other Act, applications may be made in respect of positions in the Public Service, appeals may be made against the nomination of persons to positions in the Public Service and vacant positions may be filled in the Public Service as if officers were members of the Public Service.

(2) In this section—

'officer' includes an officer of either House of Parliament or a person under the separate control of the President of the Legislative Council or the Speaker of the House of Assembly.

No. 8. Page 15, line 19 (Heading to Part VI)—Leave out 'CONTROL AND'.

No. 9. Page 15, line 20 (clause 27)—Leave out 'control and'.

No. 10. Page 16, line 9 (clause 33)—Leave out 'thirty-first day of March' and insert 'thirteenth day of September'.

No. 11. Page 16, line 12 (clause 33)—Leave out 'calendar' and insert 'financial'.

No. 12. Page 18, Second Schedule—Amendment to section 47 of the Public Service Act, 1967—Leave out 'and substituting the following paragraph:

(b) 'Officer' includes—

(i) an officer of either House of Parliament or a person under the separate control of the President of the Legislative Council or the Speaker of the House of Assembly; and

(ii) a person holding office under the Parliament (Joint Services) Act, 1985.

Amendment No. 1:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1 be disagreed to.

This amendment is not acceptable to this Committee. In the modern context, it is not acceptable that a parliamentary officer be secretary of a committee such as this. We believe that the workload and specialised training require that this role be carried out by a specialist officer. It seems to me that members of our place are not aware of the range of joint functions which need to be carried out within the Parliament. By virtue of the fact that we are housed in the one building, catering services, airconditioning, electrical maintenance, plumbing, other building maintenance, telephones, fire safety, and security (to name a few) are common needs and require much better coordination than we have had in the past. If we include *Hansard*, the Library and the Accounting Section the total number of staff involved is about 80.

One of the main reasons that the joint functions have not been delivered as effectively as they might otherwise have been in the past (and this does not cast any reflection on the individual staff employed in those areas) is that there has not been proper coordination of those functions. Initially, about two years ago the Secretary of the Joint House Committee was invariably an officer of the House of Assembly who was paid an allowance to perform the duties out of hours. The reality was that by 1983 the Secretary was performing up to 50 per cent of his normal duties on Joint House activities. Needless to say, when the last Secretary resigned because it had become too onerous, there were no volunteers readily available to take on the job.

The committee temporarily resolved its difficulty by drafting the Catering Manager as Acting Administrative Officer. The duties, I understand, he reluctantly agreed to on a short term basis and he would be very happy to be rid of them as soon as possible. There is no doubt that the position of Secretary has become a full-time one. Allied with that is the need for expertise in finance, management and personnel relations, among other functions. With due respect to Table Officers of both Houses, the skills and expertise for which they are trained to bring to their respective Houses is different from the skills needed by the proposed Secretary to the Joint Services Committee. For these reasons the amendment proposed by the Legislative Council to have the Clerk or one of his officers act as Secretary is inappropriate, and I urge the Committee to reject it.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I concur in the Minister's remarks. Over a period it has become increasingly difficult to obtain the services of a member of the staff, either voluntarily or drafted, to perform this function. I have been aware of the difficulties that have been caused to members of staff who felt duty bound to fill a role beyond that of their paid employment. I congratulate those members of the staff who through the years have provided the service at some expense to themselves, especially bearing in mind the lack of understanding that some members from both sides and from both Houses have of the duties that such officers were called on to perform, as well as being the meat in the sandwich in matters involving members of Parliament and other members of the staff.

During the whole discussion of the creation of this service, it was clearly understood that this was a specialist position and not one that would introduce major changes to the role of any staff member. It was anticipated that the officer in this position would coordinate the services available not only to the House but also to all staff members and that they would benefit from additional training and be able to attend various seminars and training sessions that might be of advantage to them in their ongoing employment. When the current Catering Manager was appointed, he showed a flair for that job as regards supervising the kitchen and providing expertise in a whole range of catering activities. As a member of the Joint Committee over a period, I recognise the manner in which it was necessary to prevail on him to provide these additional services because of the delays attendant on bringing this matter to Parliament. However, anyone who would seek to continue the arrangement as outlined in the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1 would show a complete lack of understanding of the work necessary from such a person. Therefore, on behalf of the Opposition I support the motion.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 2:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 2 be disagreed to.

The Catering Manager, Mr Temay, does an excellent job in the area of his expertise. However, it is unfair to expect him to carry out the other functions I outlined earlier in addition to that task. In any event, I am advised that he has no wish to take on the duties and in fact would appreciate the matter being speedily resolved so that he can get back to doing what he does best. The duties the Legislative Council would have the Catering Manager carry out under this amendment more appropriately belong to the position of the Secretary to the Joint Services Committee, and I urge the Committee to reject the amendment.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I agree with the Minister's remarks. I referred in my previous comments to the subject of this amendment. We have been fortunate in the appointment of Mr Tim Temay as Catering Manager and in Mrs

Nancy Bickel's availability as Acting Manageress from time to time. If we were to support the Legislative Council's amendment No. 2, Mrs Bickel would be expected to take over certain secretarial duties which she would not want, in which she has never expressed interest and for which she has no expertise. It is unreasonable for the other Chamber to expect such a change to occur. I support the motion.

Mr MATHWIN: Is the Secretary of the Joint Services Committee or the Catering Manager to be the responsible officer?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Under the existing Act the Chairman undertakes that role.

Mr MATHWIN: That being the case, the Chairman is the Speaker. I take it that the Minister said that the Catering Manager has objected to taking on this extra duty?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Well, he is reluctant.

Mr MATHWIN: He is reluctant?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I understand that it is not in his area of expertise.

Mr MATHWIN: It is not a very hard job to become a secretary, surely. If he is reluctant, I suppose that we cannot force him to do it against his will. On the other hand, he is in a position where he would be far more practical than the Speaker, whoever he or she may be, in relation to this division.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I think that I have slightly misled the honourable member. I will try and assist in this way: it is anticipated that that would be taken up by the position of Secretary to the Joint Services Committee who would be operating on behalf of the Chairman. As I indicated when inviting the Committee to reject amendment No. 1, there is an enormous range of services that could potentially come under the purview of such an officer. There is electrical, maintenance, other building maintenance, telephone, plumbing, fire services and security. We do not believe that it is reasonable that these additional burdens be placed on that officer.

Motion carried.

Amendments Nos 3, 4 and 5:

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

That the Legislative Councils amendments Nos 3, 4 and 5 be disagreed to

Mr Chairman, you may be indulgent enough to allow the Committee to consider amendments Nos 3, 4 and 5, because they are all related. They are not acceptable and they do not take account of the higher responsibility of the Presiding Officers over Parliament jointly and separately. I point out that the effect of the amendments from another place is to require that approval be given by both Houses, presumably on a motion being passed. I believe that this is unnecessarily wide in these matters which largely relate to the rights of staff in industrial matters and may result in simple issues relating to protection of staff rights being unduly delayed, particularly if either House is not in session. We often go many weeks when we are not in session.

In any event, in appointing our Presiding Officers, we are asking them to act on behalf on our respective Houses. Should their actions not meet with the approval of members, then obviously appropriate sanctions are available. For these reasons I would urge the Committee to reject amendments Nos 3, 4 and 5.

Mr MATHWIN: I am surprised that the Government has objected to the fact that this must be done with the approval of both Houses of Parliament. It deals with superannuation and mentions the application of certain acts, as follows:

The provisions of the Superannuation Act 1974 are extended to officers as if an officer were an employee as defined in that Act.

And so it goes on in subclauses (2), (3) and (4). Para (a) of clause (c) with which we are dealing, provides:

The following may not occur at Parliament House without the joint approval of the President of the Legislative Council and the Speaker of the House of Assembly.

It would appear that the Upper House was quite right in saying that it should be with the approval of both Houses. I cannot see any strong objection to this; nor can I see any strong reasons for the Minister's refusing to accept this amendment.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I invite the honourable member to consider what really is so different about the employees in this place compared to employees in any other institution. It is clear that this place is different for any other institution, in that it is the only place that can pass laws for this State. But, in terms of people who are involved in the general tasks of the Parliament, whatever they may be, I wonder why some of these matters have to be resolved by way of a resolution through the Houses of Parliament which have these other very, very important responsibilities placed on them.

I believe that we can properly delegate those powers to the Presiding Officers and obviously, as I have said previously, although it is something that would be used only in extreme circumstances, sanctions would be available to either House where they felt that their Presiding Officer did not act properly.

Mr MATHWIN: I draw the Minister's attention to the fact that on a number of occasions since I first entered this place in 1970 we have fought tooth and nail in this place to ensure that the Parliament has the right to make decisions. According to the Bill, that power has been placed in the hands of the most powerful men in the State, namely, the President of the Legislative Council and the Speaker of the House of Assembly. Nevertheless, you are giving them the power when I believe that the power should remain with the House, that is, with the members who are elected by the people of the State.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: What, over a broken leg on the parliamentary kitchen?

Mr MATHWIN: If you like; it depends whose leg is broken. If it was mine, I would like the full parliament to decide on my broken leg.

The Hon. B. C. EASTICK: I cannot agree with the views expressed by my colleague. We must recognise that Parliament House is a conglomerate of departments and sub-departments. Also, it has two officers who have undisputed rights in respect of their own departments, namely the Department of the Legislative Council and the Department of the House of Assembly. The role that is given to the President of the Upper House and to the Speaker of the Lower House carries with it a great deal of importance in the sense of fair play in the parliamentary system and in regard to the people who are employed in the system.

I suggest that it is not right or proper for a motion of the Legislative Council to determine an action relative to a member of the staff of the House of Assembly, nor is it right for the House of Assembly to determine an action in respect of a member of the Legislative Council. Because they are separate and because the President and the Speaker collectively will have rotating responsibility as the Chief Executive Officer of the joint committee, it is only right that those people who have the confidence of the two Houses of Parliament should be charged with the responsibility of proceeding with any action that is drawn to their attention.

If there is to be any concern by members of either House, then it would be by way of a vote of no confidence in the Presiding Officer of the respective House for having failed

to carry out directly his respective duties. I believe that that is where the matter should rest.

Mr M.J. EVANS: I point out that Parliament has already made a number of decisions in this matter. The Parliament has already decided that the Equal Opportunity Act should pass as law in this State and that it should apply to employees generally throughout the State. It has already decided that the Workers Compensation Act and the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act should apply to employees throughout this State. There is no logical reason to differentiate those employees who work at Parliament House.

However, there is a perfectly valid argument to say that the ancient privileges of this Parliament should operate to prevent any so-called 'inferior' court, if one likes to view the Parliament as the High Court of the land, to interfere in the rights of members of this Parliament by coming into this place and making certain inspections, taking photographs, and the like. The Bill clearly provides that that cannot occur without the joint approval of the President and the Speaker. I think that that provides adequate protection against unreasonable intrusion by those lower courts and tribunals into the workings and privileges of this place.

However, the fact is that we have already decided as a Parliament that it is reasonable and equitable that employees throughout the State should have the benefits, rights, privileges and responsibilities of those several Acts that I have mentioned, and it is perfectly proper that the employees here should enjoy them. All we need to do is to ensure that our privileges are not unreasonably interfered with in the course of investigations under those Acts, and that is adequately protected by the President and the Speaker having to act jointly in relation to this. I do not see that it is necessary for a joint resolution of both Houses of Parliament to take effect. All we are doing is applying the normal laws of the land which this Parliament has already approved.

Mr MATHWIN: It seems that I will have to give in to the three-pronged attack by the Government, the Opposition, and the Independent.

Mr Plunkett: You are having a bad day!

Mr MATHWIN: Yes, as my friend from Peake says—

Ms Lenehan: That's fine, John.

Mr MATHWIN: I thank my female colleague, too.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to come back to the amendment, and not to draw the bow too wide.

Mr MATHWIN: Thank you, Mr Chairman, it is very kind of you to protect me in that manner. From time to time we fight in this place for the rights of Parliament and for Parliament to make the decisions. This should not be palmed off to other officers of the highest calibre, that is, the President in the other place and the Speaker in this place, who have enough duties to undertake, enough people to look after, and enough things to worry about. However, they are to be saddled with some more, and I do not think that that is fair to those people. I am a bloke who looks after the workers—unlike members of the Government. As far as I am concerned, the Government is being most unfair. I think that members opposite, those on this side of the House and the Independents are being most unfair.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 6:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 6 be disagreed to.

This amendment is not acceptable. This matter is ancillary to that dealt with in amendment No. 2, on which the Committee has already spoken, and I urge the Committee to similarly reject this amendment.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 7:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 7 be agreed to. The member for Glenelg might be reassured to know that I am not completely unreasonable, and I urge the Committee to accept this amendment. It provides rights of transfer to all staff of the Parliament to offices within the Public Service. Obviously it is a reasonable amendment, and I urge the Committee to accept it.

Motion carried.

Amendments Nos 8 and 9:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 8 and 9 be disagreed to.

I must disagree with these amendments. They are curious in that the Bill provides that:

The Joint Services Committee shall have the control and management of the dining, refreshment and recreation rooms, lounges and garages of Parliament House.

While there may be an emotive connotation around the word 'control', this provision is not new and the statement is taken directly from the Joint House Committee Act, section 13 of which indicates, in part:

The committee shall have the control and management of the following parts of the building . . .

I see no good reason to change the phraseology in place.

Motion carried.

Amendments Nos 10 and 11:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 10 and 11 be agreed to.

These amendments change the year under which the committee operates from a calendar basis to a financial one. This is in line with modern accounting practices. I have no objection to these amendments, and I would urge the Committee to support and accept them.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 12:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 12 be agreed to.

This amendment relates to amendment No. 7, which we have already accepted.

Motion carried.

The following reason for disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 1 to 6, 8 and 9 was adopted:

Because the amendments make it difficult to effectively provide the necessary joint services to the Parliament.

METROPOLITAN MILK SUPPLY ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 31 October. Page 1713.)

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): Dairy farming in South Australia is a very important rural pursuit. Indeed, it is a sensitive science. In many of the industry regions the farmers are victims of harsh seasonal fluctuations, long distance deliveries to the market, and there exists a wide variation of the premium market opportunities for some of these producers. This Bill proposes to give the Minister of Agriculture in South Australia a unique authority. It is an authority to withhold money from certain dairy farmers in this State in a way never contemplated before by a Minister of Agriculture.

This measure is not required by the industry and in current circumstances it is not necessary. The Liberal Party believes that the measure is not justified. Our dairy industry is currently being disrupted by the Minister of Agriculture's

interference in a particularly delicate and internal industry arrangement, introduced by the industry itself and designed to overcome some of the income disparities and industry action, understood, condoned and supported by Governments of both persuasions in the past.

The arrangement involves an industry initiated and funded augmentation process, which has prevailed since 1978-79, between two geographically separated dairy regions of the State. The dairy farmers of each region, namely, the central region, servicing and located around metropolitan Adelaide, and the South-East area are and for many years have been represented by the South Australian Dairymen's Association (SADA) and the South-East Dairymen's Association (SEDA).

This Bill was introduced in the Legislative Council on Thursday 24 October 1985. It was introduced without consultation with industry at large or without consultation with many of those people directly implicated in paying augmentation levies or those specifically identified in the legislation as the fund collectors and distributors to act on behalf of the Minister, that is, to act as his agent. The Bill dismantles the industry initiated augmentation scheme, the subject of an industry agreement to share certain produce returns of SADA farmers with their SEDA counterparts and replaces that with a blatantly Party political act by the Minister, as provided for in this legislation.

This legislative action has already been dubbed as the Blevins South-East ALP campaign Bill. We all know that politics enters this forum from time to time, particularly in Question Time, sometimes in general debate and on other occasions when motions of no confidence are moved in the Government of the day, and perhaps in other situations during the sittings of Parliament, but seldom, if at all, do we experience a case where a Minister of the Crown introduces legislation of a sheer Party political kind to cover a political scene in a specific area, and never before can I recall that sort of thing happening, as in this case, on the eve of a State election.

It is not necessary to canvass this point any further to demonstrate our regard for the action that has been taken in this instance. The Minister's action has been seen for what it is—a Party political ploy at wide industry level. His action has shocked and dismayed many people who have been associated with the industry for generations.

He has stirred the wrath of the United Farmers & Stock-owners, the SADA, Dairyvale Metro Co-operative Ltd, and its 700 shareholders, Southern Farmers Cooperative Limited, and its many dairy farmer clients and their families. These organisations and individuals are understandably very concerned about the Minister's unprecedented act at State level to meddle with their personal and family incomes. This Bill is seeking the authority (at law) to enable the Minister to take large sums of money from certain farmers' returns without their authority.

Prime Minister Ben Chifley tried that caper in the late 1940s, when he sought to meddle with individual accounts in an effort to nationalise Australia's banks. We all know what were the public reactions and the political consequences for that Prime Minister and his Party at that time. In Australia the Commonwealth Taxation Act empowers its respective State based Commissioners to take from individual incomes certain money by way of income tax for distribution by the Federal Government to other citizens and community projects.

The authority given to the Minister of Agriculture under this Bill is designed by a curious and shabby method to take from one group of dairy farmers in South Australia and give to another group in South Australia in the same industry. The action is unprecedented in the rural industry, and Party politically loaded in this instance. The Bill, albeit containing an antecedent clause, does fly in the face of

section 90 of the Australian Constitution and as a result may be subject (in that context) to legal challenge before it is put into effect, that is, after its proclamation and regulations actually committing the Government to the intent as outlined in the Bill. Section 90 of the Commonwealth Constitution (I quote from the volume) provides:

On the imposition of uniform duties of customs the power of the Parliament to impose duties of customs and of excise, and to grant bounties on the production or export of goods, shall become exclusive. On the imposition of uniform duties of customs all laws of the several States imposing duties of customs or of excise, or offering bounties on the production or export of goods, shall cease to have effect, but any grant of or agreement for any such bounty lawfully made by or under the authority of the Government of any State shall be taken to be good if made before the thirtieth day of June, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight, and not otherwise.

In other words, subsequent to that latter date it is unlawful for the States to apply an excise. As I say, and as referred to in my earlier remarks, the Minister's action in a shabby and somewhat shallow way has sought by inserting effectively a two month antecedent clause in the Bill, to get around that situation. I do not know anything about the law in this respect outside our Parliamentary activities, and far be it from me to suggest what might occur should that challenge be mounted. But, from my lay observations, from information that I have received from outside the House, it is my understanding that the opportunity for challenge is clearly there, as it was in the tobacco franchise legislation and the Liquor Licensing Act when both those Acts were tested in the High Court subsequent to their passage through Parliament.

Even though, as I am informed, the High Court decision favoured the Government of the day in the technical sense, in the respective judgments in those cases the position was outlined as to indicate that the excise (for want of a better term) was applied with the antecedent factor incorporated and applied to the retail sale price of those goods and not the product itself. In this case we are dealing with a product of a raw kind and at the wholesale level, and it would seem simply in that context to present some grounds on which the signalled challenge may be mounted. I will have a little more to say about that aspect later in the debate.

In the meantime, for the benefit of those members who are still assembled in the Chamber I wish to explain the background of this incredible situation with which we are faced at the moment and hopefully put into perspective the relative regional factors applicable to dairy farming in our large and seasonally dry State of the Commonwealth. As a matter of background, historically the South Australian dairy farming industry developed to supply a need for market

milk in population centres throughout the State. In addition to the supply of market milk (i.e. whole liquid milk) farmers also catered for consumers' needs for other dairy products, particularly butter and cheese.

As milk surplus to market milk requirements moved from the farm to the local dairy factory, export markets in the United Kingdom established a demand that allowed for the expansion of milk production. Small farmer cooperatives developed alongside proprietary companies and larger companies were formed by amalgamation.

South Australian milk production reached a peak of 483 million litres in 1969-70. Production has since declined to 382 million litres in 1983-84. South Australian butter production has declined dramatically since the 1940s. Cheese production has increased from approximately 10 000 tonnes in the 1940s and 1950s to 25 000 tonnes in 1983-84.

This period of increasing cheese production and decreasing butter production was brought about by conversion of cream collection and can-milk collection, to refrigerated bulk milk collection from the dairy farmers and changing consumer preferences for products. With these changes in milk collection, larger factories were built, as evidenced by changes in licences issued by the Department of Agriculture under the Dairy Industry Act. I seek leave to have a table of a statistical nature inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Production Statistics		
Year	No. of Companies	Factories
1962-63	26	45
1983-84	14	23

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: The number of licensed dairy farmers in South Australia has declined from 3 289 in 1976-77 to 1 372 in 1984-85. Dairy cow numbers (in milk and dry) have declined from 138 000 in 1976 to an estimated 100 700 in 1984. These details I have drawn from the Australian Bureau of Statistics records for the year 1984. The rate of decline in cow numbers has lessened since 1980 to 102 000, reflecting a stabilisation in our State's dairy industry. Average dairy cow milk production figures in South Australia are the highest in Australia at 3 589 litres of milk per cow per lactation for the year 1983-84. South Australia is Australia's fourth largest producing State, accounting for 6.4 per cent of the milk produced. To demonstrate the milk production, the production per cow as against the number of dairy farms I seek leave to have a six line table inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

1983-84 (Australian Dairy Corporation Figures)

State	Milk Prod. (m litres)	Prod. per cow (litres)	No. of Dairy Farms
Victoria	3 400	3 385	10 800
New South Wales	940	3 258	2 987
Queensland	629	2 700	2 611
South Australia	382	3 859	1 550 (1 372 1984-85)
Tasmania	340	3 452	1 205
Western Australia	232	3 387	825
Total	6 923		19 858

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: The drop in figures for the number of farms for 1983-84 compared to 1984-85 can be partly explained by the cessation of collection of cream from those farmers who produce cream only for butter manufacture. South Australia's major dairy regions are the Adelaide Hills (central and southern areas), Fleurieu Peninsula, River Murray swamps, the lake irrigation areas and the South-East. All of these areas except the South-East

centred on Mount Gambier constitute the metropolitan milk production area. The minor dairying regions, where dairying is mostly carried on as a sideline to other farming pursuits, are the Mid North, Eyre Peninsula and the Riverland. Again, I seek leave to insert in *Hansard* a table which identifies those several regions, the number of dairy farms and the locations of factory, processors, etc., without my reading it.

Leave granted.

1984-85

Region	No. of Dairy Farms	Location of Factories/Processors
Metropolitan Milk Production Area	962	Adelaide (2), Mile End (2), Clarence Gardens, Gawler, Mount Compass, Murray Bridge, Jervois, Kensington, Croydon, Mount Barker
South East	288	Mount Gambier (2), Moorak, Suttontown, Mil Lel, Bordertown
Mid North	109	Laura, Clare, Port Pirie
Riverland	8	Renmark
Eyre Peninsula	5	Port Lincoln
Total	1 372	

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: In going back to that table and taking from it the number of licensed dairy farms, I draw to the attention of members the fact that the figures in the table are those applicable to the 1984-85 period and therefore apply to 30 June this year. To indicate the deterioration in numbers of dairy farmers or persons involved in that dairy farming pursuit, I indicate that number of licensees in the central region at the end of June 1985 had already, by the end of October this year (but a few months later), declined to 938 licensees from the June figure of 962. The 288 licensees listed as at 30 June 1985 for the South-East is already down to 281 licensees. The 109 licensees in the Mid-North is back to 105 licensees. The eight licensees in the Riverland is back to six licensees, and on Eyre Peninsula, in the Port Lincoln region in particular, where there were five licensees at 30 June, that number still remains as at the end of October.

In addition to those licensed dairy farmers, 23 factory processing premises are licensed. These plants provide direct employment for approximately 1 000 people. Approximately 550 milk vendors are involved in retail and wholesale distribution of the milk. The gross retail value of dairy produce is estimated at \$244 million for South Australia in 1983-84. It is indeed therefore a very significant rural industry in this State.

Of South Australia's 382 million litres of milk produced in 1983-84, approximately 30 per cent was used for market milk—as explained before, that is whole milk—and 45 per cent for cheese manufacture. South Australia manufactures approximately 14 per cent of Australia's cheese production. Cheddar cheese is the most important variety manufactured with other varieties, including edam, gouda, romano, pepato, fetta, mozzarella, cottage, quark, ricotta and others. Other products manufactured include flavoured milk, cream, ice cream, butter, custard, yoghurt, skim milk powder, full cream milk powder, cultured buttermilk, cultured cream and butter oil. The sale of market milk is characterised by five regional marketing schemes designed to share the returns from market milk amongst all dairy farmers participating in each of the schemes.

The schemes are unusual—indeed, I understand unique—by Australian standards, and the success of the schemes has contributed to the industry's stability in this State. The schemes operate with a high degree of industry self-regulation, and the administration of the industry by a State-wide marketing authority and the use of farm milk quotas or contracts has not been necessary in South Australia as indeed it has been in Victoria and beyond, I understand. It is terribly important to recognise that here we have an industry spread over a very wide geographic area of this harsh climate, the driest State in the Commonwealth, and the servicing of the community at large has been almost without disruption. It involves very high quality products by Australian or any standards. In all fairness to the industry at large, it is a product processed and delivered to the customer at a very fair price when comparing it with other prices around Australia.

The largest scheme for market milk equalisation is that operated by the Metropolitan Milk Equalisation Committee for dairy farmers in the metropolitan producing areas. The scheme is designed to equalise market milk and manufacturing milk returns and to ensure adequate supplies of market milk for the Adelaide metropolitan area. It has legislative support under the Metropolitan Milk Supply Act. The Metropolitan Milk Equalisation Scheme achieves equalisation for three variables for all producers participating in the scheme; first, the price paid to producers for market milk is the same for all producers in a given month. Secondly, the scheme equalises each producer's share of market milk sales by the two companies in the area.

Thirdly, the scheme involves a basic negotiated price paid for manufacturing milk. The producer price for market milk is based on an annual cost of production survey conducted by the Metropolitan Milk Board. The individual dairy companies in the Mid North, Riverland and Port Lincoln regions operate company market milk equalisation schemes in association with the producers of those regions. Most milk supplied in these three regions receive market milk prices. Some milk is being purchased from metropolitan producing areas as accommodation milk to cover periods of shortage for market milk. That situation particularly applies in the Mid North. It is not necessary to explain to members of this House the difficulties that that region of the State has in furnishing its customers with a continuity of supply during dry periods. The Mid North, Riverland and Port Lincoln regions have, by self-regulation, eliminated large manufacturing milk surpluses and tailored production to market milk needs.

Surplus milk in spring is sold to processing factories in the Adelaide Hills and Murray swamps. I am not sure of the situation at Port Lincoln, but I am sure that, if the member for Flinders is around later in the debate, he will either reinforce or correct my understanding in relation to that scene. As far as I am aware, it is a very tidy local situation, geographically divorced from other regions of the State but indeed servicing well the consumers of milk in Port Lincoln without a great deal of surplus or under-production. That situation is to be commended.

In contrast, only about 5 or 6 per cent of the milk produced in the South-East region is used for market milk. The South-East Market Milk Equalisation Committee—hereafter to be described as the SEMEC—equalises market milk returns for dairy farmers supplying milk to the several dairy companies in that region. Because the South-East region was the only region in South Australia not receiving a significant market milk return, the report of the committee of inquiry into the South Australian dairy industry in 1977 recommended that some funds from the Metropolitan Milk Equalisation Committee (MMEC) pool should be channelled off to the South-East to SEMEC for distribution to South-East dairy farmers. However, this recommendation was not adopted.

Following discussions between MMEC and SEMEC, agreement was reached on an augmentation scheme—the very nub of this Bill that we have before the House—

whereby the MMEC would make contributions to the South-East dairy farmers on an annual basis. Those contributions were to be on a progressive scale, commencing on 1 January 1979 at 2 per cent of the net MMEC levy pool, increasing to a maximum of 10 per cent by 1986. The MMEC agreement was amended in 1979 to incorporate this augmentation scheme.

The scheme is operational and money has been transferred to South-East dairy farmers, even though they are not supplying milk to the metropolitan area of Adelaide. The producer and processing sectors of the industry have rationalised and cooperated to ensure industry control over marketing arrangements. Dairy farmers are receiving returns which are encouraging production all the year round where needed. Farmers are not bound to produce to quota levels or to produce milk all the year round. Milk is being distributed to consumers at retail prices competitive with prices elsewhere in Australia.

In order to acknowledge this disparity between the returns of central region farmers and those of South-East farmers, a little more background to the industry initiated augmentation scheme is necessary. It was negotiated between the executive committee of the South Australian Dairymen's Association (SADA) and representatives of the South Eastern Dairymen's Association (SEDA) together with managers of the three South-East cheese factories—Kraft (which incidentally is the ultimate buyer of all South-East manufactured cheeses), Mount Gambier Cooperative and Eight Mile Creek.

The scheme was negotiated as an alternative to that proposed by the Webb committee which was set up in 1976 to make recommendations concerning the probable impact of Federal dairy legislation that was pending at that time. The scheme as negotiated was far more generous than that proposed by the Webb committee. I am talking here about the local industry initiated scheme which, as events turned out, would not have provided any revenue to the South-East, as the ratio of milk sales to production in the central region has not in the nine years since reached the proposed trigger point of 45 per cent.

The scheme involved payment from the central region to the South-East of a proportion of the net levy pool—the total of the difference between prices paid to dairy farmers by the two Adelaide dairy companies for milk sold as market milk and those paid for milk sold for manufacturing purposes. The proportion was to be 2 per cent for the first year (1978-79) and 4 per cent in the second year, rising by a further 1 per cent annually to a maximum of 10 per cent, the annual increment being altered in any year in which the ratio of market milk sales to milk production fell to 42 per cent or lower. The terms of the augmentation scheme as agreed between the parties were set out in a letter of intent signed by both associations under their common seals in March 1982.

Much has been said about this industry initiated augmentation scheme—this internal inter-regional arrangement—in the dairy industry in South Australia. I have read the letters of intent and I am aware of their content. In fact, I was Minister at the time that negotiations to have those letters of intent signed by the various parties were taking place. I have a copy in my possession, and I am satisfied that since the inception of the schedules certain contributions have been made. I seek leave to have the schedule of contributions between 1978-79 and 1983-84 incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

The SPEAKER: Is the material contained within that document purely statistical?

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: It is absolutely statistical, Sir. It deals with dates in the respective years and amounts in dollar terms.

Leave granted.

Contributions	Year	per cent \$
1978-79 (5 months)	2	88 211
1979-80	4	379 727
1980-81	5	503 871
1981-82	6	630 823
1982-83	7	813 909
1983-84	7	849 198

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: The total of that schedule of payments made under the letters of intent to which I referred is \$3 265 739 during the six years. Duplication of payment at the rate of 7 per cent in 1983-84 was due to the milk sales, that production ratio falling from 43.1 per cent in the previous year to 39.4 per cent in that year. The \$3 265 739 is the actual figure that has been transmitted from central region dairy farmers to the South-East dairy farmers in that period to date.

Payments have been made in accordance with the terms of the letter of intent. No notice has been received from the South Australian Dairymen's Association seeking any amendment or renegotiation of the scheme. In May 1984, I asked the Minister to provide to the industry a copy of the draft Bill which now forms a portion of the Bill before us, as well as a letter in which the Minister stated:

I wish, however, to reiterate my earlier advice that it is not proposed to introduce these amendments unless they are necessary to ensure full implementation of the augmentation scheme.

That is augmentation of the full 10 per cent of the levy pool. It is in this respect that the Minister's second reading explanation of the Bill delivered on 24 October 1985 is misleading. He claims to have been involved with the matter before the House at the moment for the past 2½ years. That is not true. On 31 May 1985 the South Australian Dairymen's Association staff wrote to Mr R.L. Clements, General President of SEDA, requesting a meeting between SADA and SEDA to 'examine the likely impact of the proposed new federal dairy legislation on the dairy industry in the two regions and consequent changes that may need to be made in the augmentation arrangements'. Before this meeting could be arranged, the South Australian Dairymen's Association was informed that at the State ALP conference in June 1985 a resolution was passed on the motion of a Mr Peter Humphries (ALP candidate for the electorate of Mount Gambier) in the following terms:

This conference recognises that the South Australian dairy industry is a State wide industry and that producers in the South-East should be granted a more equitable share of the market milk premium.

Resulting from that resolution, the meeting between SADA and SEDA did not discuss the likely impact of the new Federal legislation but the objections that SEDA now expresses to the augmentation scheme in its present form. In subsequent discussions during which SEDA proposed that SADA make a contribution equal to 'full two region equalisation less cartage' to be funded by an increase in retail milk prices of 2 per cent per litre, SADA offered initially to waive the 42 per cent rule immediately and increase the 1985-86 contribution to 8 per cent, although the ratio—that is the market milk manufacturing ratio—of the central region is still only at the level of 39.4 per cent, payable in instalments instead of annually and, finally, to increase the 1985-86 contribution to 10 per cent, amounting to approximately \$1 693 000, payable to the South-East growers monthly.

As one compares this offer with the \$983 500 subsidy entitlement for 1984-85 under the scheme, one wonders why it was not accepted by the South-East dairymen. However, this offer was rejected by a public meeting in Compton Hall, Mount Gambier, on 6 October 1985.

It is ironic, and indeed relevant, to note also that in the meantime, in July this year, and again in the same month of October as the public meeting at Compton Hall, the SEDA secretary wrote to the Liberal Party, as follows:

Re equalisation of market milk premiums on a Statewide basis and extending the metropolitan milk supply area to include the South-East of South Australia:

The purpose of this letter is to request that your Party states in unequivocal terms your attitude towards the full State equalisation of market milk premiums and the extension of the metropolitan milk supply area to include the South-East of the State.

As a Party, we have never argued that, while the South-East dairy farmers are denied access to the metropolitan area whole milk market, they should be paid an equitable share of premium prices paid to current central region dairy farmers. On that aspect, in order to scotch some of the rumours, let me reiterate for the record:

Central region producers only sell approximately 40 per cent of their total product as whole (or market) milk.

Anyway, the Liberal Party has put down its position on the subject as required by the South-East Dairymen's Association, and this was done in writing by the Party on 30 July 1985, as follows:

Your request for a 'more equitable share' of the market milk premiums accruing to dairy farmers of South Australia is both reasonable and supportable by the Liberal Party, given the recent downturn in prices paid by the local factories for milk supplied by your South-East members. It is further understood that negotiations between delegates of SADA and SEDA have already occurred and that parties have agreed to continue discussions with a view to achieving the 'fairer sharing of producer returns' that your South-East dairy farmers are seeking.

I understand that one of the options being pursued at the moment involves amending the joint industry agreement wherein removal of the clause governing percentage ceiling payments would enable higher annual premiums to be paid to South-East dairy farmers, thereby overcoming the current disparity without Government intervention. In the meantime, it is not appropriate to commit the Liberal Party in Government to amending the Metropolitan Milk Supply Act. Proceeding in the direction the parties are currently negotiating would seem to be by far the most preferable course of action to overcome the prevailing differential affecting the South-East dairy farmers.

Then, in October, when the SEDA executive, on behalf of its producer members, advised us of the intention to reject the pending offer of the SADA as outlined, we put down again a firm policy position which we would adopt in Government, as follows:

(1) Liberal Government will give the two industry groups until 31 December to negotiate an appropriate amount of funds to be transferred from SADA dairy farmer returns to SEDA dairy farmer accounts.

(2) If an acceptable figure is not agreed by both parties by 31 December, then an independent accountant will be nominated to consider all of the factors and determine an appropriate amount for transfer.

(3) If the independent arbitrator's determination is not accepted by 31 March 1986, the Metropolitan Milk Supply Act will be amended to enable free trade and access to the metropolitan market place by SEDA producers and/or any others who choose to seek that whole milk market.

The SEDA executive has played right into the hands of the Minister, and I think that we all understand why. They see a potential for getting more money than is currently being offered by industry negotiations if this legislation passes and is proclaimed and if the draft regulations are implemented as threatened. It means that the internal industry agreement that has prevailed, albeit inadequately in recent times to meet the disparities of disadvantaged South-Eastern farmers, now flies out the window. However, in fact, it might just backfire.

It is our view, and that of the industry at large (surrounding metropolitan Adelaide and beyond and involving processors, farmers, organisation representatives, etc.), that indeed the Minister has made a serious political mistake. Indeed, he has made a serious industrial mistake in interfering as he

has done. Before going into Government in 1979 until 1982, the Liberal Party had a policy on rural industry, that we were there to service and facilitate and not to dictate. In fact, what the Minister is doing in this instance is dictating terms to an industry with which there has been no consultation whatsoever. He has thrust upon that industry an action that can be described only as a blatant political act and one that will do neither him nor his Government any good.

To substantiate my claims about the concern of industry people in the field, I refer to a couple of remarks made by each of those organisations. I turn first to a letter addressed by the General Manager of Southern Farmers to the Minister of Agriculture on 28 October, only a few days ago and subsequent to the introduction of this Bill in the Legislative Council. That letter (from Mr Bob Barker) states:

We were most concerned to learn of the legislation to amend the Metropolitan Milk Supply Act 1946, introduced by you on 24 October, and we would sincerely urge you to take into account the following comments in your further deliberations on this matter.

You are aware that in 1977 a State Government committee of inquiry (of which the undersigned was a member) acknowledged that a disparity in unit returns per kilogram of butterfat existed between the South-Eastern region of the State and the metropolitan milk supply area and, accordingly, recommended that an augmentation scheme be set up. The committee made this recommendation, notwithstanding the fact that a major piece of evidence submitted to that inquiry was a report by the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries which showed that dairy farmers in the South-East had a higher average disposable income than their counterparts in the metropolitan milk region. It should also be noted that the committee of inquiry expressed no desire to dilute the returns of producers in the metropolitan milk supply region, as specifically stated ('... the transfer to the South-East of funds from the metropolitan milk levy pool at a rate geared to the decline in production in the Adelaide hills area').

Clearly the decline which occurred during the mid-1970s due to a large number of farmers exiting from dairying has not persisted, with the result that numbers of farmers are now fairly stable and, aided by productivity increases and very favourable seasons, production has again risen to pre-1977 levels.

The effects of augmentation, together with the diluting effect of current production levels, indicate that producers in the city milk region have suffered a very substantial decline in real unit returns from market milk, as the following table shows.

	1977	1985
Retail price of milk per litre	37c	69c
Gazetted farm gate price . . .	11.4c	32.32c litre
City milk bonus (weighted average over whole year expressed as cents per kg butterfat) (1)	104c(2)	136.8c kg

(1) 1976-77

(2) 1984-85

Another most important factor which you should consider and examine is the matter of disparity between the manufacturing milk price paid in the South-East and that prevailing in the city milk region.

Currently, this disparity is believed to be in the order of 70c per kg butterfat. You are no doubt aware that the South-Eastern dairy industry sector is now basically controlled by a major international food company, which determines the manufacturing milk price in accordance with its policy in other parts of Australia. The fact that it is some 70c lower than the price paid in the metropolitan milk region should be the subject of questioning. It is simply not fair to expect producers in the city milk region to subsidise a company of this magnitude.

We switch now to a reflection on a major international company in the South-East which is the real recipient of these funds rather than those people to whom the subsidy payments were designed and intended to apply. The letter continues:

Furthermore, any disparity in returns should not simply be related to market milk returns. For example, in the South-East it is very difficult to find products such as flavoured milk produced by the South-Eastern processors, a market almost completely dominated by the Victorian Dairy Industry Authority, with its Big M product.

Whilst not in any way supporting the concept of this legislation, we must applaud you for your repeated use of the word 'equitable' in discussing these matters, for we believe this is the key to the whole issue. In order for equitability to be established, one must carry out a total objective comparison between the two regions. The fact the South-Eastern region of the State has one of the lowest rainfall variabilities in Australia, and therefore is an extremely low cost region because of the total seasonality of production, must be taken into account, and this can only be done by a further survey of costs of production and disposable farm income.

The fact that a small vocal group in the South-East has chosen to use the comparison between unit returns between the two regions should not be accepted as justification for further diluting returns of producers in the city milk region. Preoccupation with unit returns has unfortunately led to a great deal of dissention in the dairy industry in Australia, for such comparisons ignore such important elements as cost of production and degree of difficulty of producing milk all year round, as distinct from seasonal production which is the case in the South-East. Accordingly, we urge you not to proceed with this legislation, but instead to conduct a comparative cost of production survey without delay, and therefore establish on the basis of equitability whether or not additional funds should be channelled to producers in the South-Eastern region of the State.

I think that letter is very clear. It is from a company that has been in existence for a very long time and knows its business. It has its feet on the ground and its finger on a very real problem, that associated with the dominance of the Kraft enterprise in the South-East to the extent that it is really milking the system and being subsidised in its activities in terms of the price that it pays to dairy farmers in the South-East for manufacturing milk as against that which is paid at manufacturing level by the two companies within the central region in the State.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: The central region price is \$3.10 and the other is—

The Hon. H. Allison: \$2.45.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Yes, as I am reminded by my colleague the member for Mount Gambier. As pointed out, it is not fair and it is not cricket. It is having the effect during a fairly free flow period of milk production in the State of subsidising the company, when indeed the whole intent of the augmentation scheme from the outset was for the central dairy region to subsidise the incomes of the farmers concerned.

Mr Lewis: Do you think Kraft—

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I do not want to use this forum to criticise Kraft and I do not have any real evidence to back that criticism. I am simply placing on the record the material that has been given to us and it appears to be well founded and well based in that respect. I understand that there is a desire to carry out some other short-term business of the House and on that basis I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT AND EMPLOYMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1 Page 1—In the Title—Leave out 'establish principles governing management and employment in the public sector' and insert 'provide for the efficient and effective management of the public sector and the provision of public services of the highest practicable standard'.

No. 2. Page 2, lines 17 and 18 (clause 4)—Leave out the definition of 'the Commissioner'.

No. 3. Page 2 (clause 4)—After line 20 insert definition as follows:—

'the Director' means the person holding, or acting in, the position of the Director of Public Employment.

THE WORD 'COMMISSIONER' WHEREVER IT OCCURS IN THIS BILL HAS BEEN STRUCK OUT AND THE WORD

'DIRECTOR' HAS BEEN INSERTED IN LIEU THEREOF (EXCLUDING 'the Electoral Commissioner and the Deputy Electoral Commissioner' in Schedule 2).

No. 4. Page 2, line 29 (clause 4)—Leave out 'a nominee of that Minister' and insert 'the Director'.

No. 5. Page 4, lines 7 and 8 (clause 4)—Leave out the definition of 'senior position' and insert definition as follows:—

'senior position' means—

(a) a position classified in accordance with the classification structure for Executive Officers; or

(b) a position classified in accordance with any other classification structure at a level the rate of remuneration for which equals or exceeds that for positions classified at the lowest level in the classification structure for Executive Officers,

but does not include a position of Chief Executive Officer;

No. 6. Page 4 (clause 4)—After line 28 insert paragraph as follows:

(fa) the Electricity Trust of South Australia established under the Electricity Trust of South Australia Act, 1946;

No. 7. Page 6, lines 13 to 23 (clause 6)—Leave out subclause (3).

No. 8. Page 7, line 20 (clause 10)—After 'person' insert 'employed in the public sector who has been'.

No. 9. Page 7, line 26 (clause 10)—After 'Board' insert 'appointed to the board on a full-time basis'.

No. 10. Page 7, line 37 (clause 11)—Leave out 'official duties' and insert 'satisfactorily the duties of the office'.

No. 11. Page 9—After line 6 insert new clauses 15a and 15b as follows:

15a. (1) *Members of Board to disclose pecuniary interests.*

Each of the appointed members of the Board shall disclose pecuniary interests of the member to the Minister responsible for the administration of this Act in accordance with the regulations.

(2) The Minister shall, at the request of any person, review the information disclosed by a member of the Board under this section and report whether there is, in the Minister's opinion, a conflict between the member's pecuniary interests and official duties.

(3) Failure to comply with subsection (1) constitutes misconduct.

15b. (1) *Extent to which Board is subject to Ministerial direction.* Subject to this section, the board is subject to direction by the Minister responsible for the administration of this Act.

(2) No Ministerial direction shall be given to the Board—

(a) requiring that material be included in, or excluded from, a report that is to be laid before Parliament;

(b) requiring the board to make, or refrain from making, any particular recommendation or comment when providing any advice or making any other report to a Minister or Ministers under this Act;

(c) requiring the Board to refrain from making any particular review of public sector operations.

(3) A Ministerial direction to the Board—

(a) must be communicated to the Board in writing; and

(b) must be included in the annual report of the Board.

No. 12. Page 9, lines 9 to 12 (clause 16)—Leave out all words in these lines and insert:

review and—

(i) to establish, and ensure the implementation of, appropriate policies, practices and procedures in relation to personnel management and industrial relations in the Public Service; and

(ii) to advise the Minister responsible for the administration of this Act and other Ministers on policies, practices and procedures that should be applied to any other aspect of management in the Public Service or to any aspect of management in other parts of the public sector;

No. 13. Page 11, lines 5 to 7 (clause 19)—Leave out subclause (5).

No. 14. Page 11, line 26 (Heading)—Leave out 'COMMISSIONER FOR' and insert 'DIRECTOR OF'.

No. 15. Page 11, line 27 (clause 21)—Leave out 'Commissioner for' and insert 'Director of'.

No. 16. Page 12, lines 8 to 21 (clause 22)—Leave out subclauses (6) and (7) and insert subclause as follows:

(6) the Governor may remove the director from office for:

(a) misconduct;

(b) neglect of duty;

(c) incompetence; or

(d) mental or physical incapacity to carry out satisfactorily the duties of the office,

No. 17. Page 12, lines 35 to 37 (clause 22)—Leave out paragraph (g).

No. 18. Page 12, lines 39 and 40 (clause 22)—Leave out 'or (7)'.

No. 19. Page 13, line 30 (clause 26)—After the last word in this line insert 'and by the Board'.

No. 20. Page 13, line 31 (clause 26)—Leave out 'Ministerial'.

No. 21. Page 14, lines 3 to 5 (clause 27)—Leave out all words in these lines and insert:—

(a) to ensure the implementation of the policies, practices and procedures established by the Board in relation to personnel management and industrial relations in the Public Service;

No. 22. Page 14, line 46 (clause 27)—After '(1)' insert '(b), (c), (d), (e) and (f)'.

No. 23. Page 15, line 14 (clause 27)—After 'Act' insert 'or by the Board'.

No. 24. Page 15, line 42 (clause 29)—After 'Act' insert 'or the Board'.

No. 25. Page 16, line 23 (clause 29)—Leave out 'shall' and insert 'may'.

No. 26. Page 16, lines 28 and 29 (clause 29)—Leave out 'may be referred to in the annual report of the Commissioner' and insert 'shall be referred to in the Director's annual report if it has not been sooner referred to by the Director in a special report under section 33'.

No. 27. Page 18 (clause 33)—After line 32 insert subclause as follows:

(2a) The Director may, at any time, submit to the Minister a special report under this section upon any matter relating to personnel management or industrial relations in the Public Service or any part of the Public Service.

No. 28. Page 18, line 34 (clause 33)—After 'subsection (1)' insert 'or (2a)'.

No. 29. Page 27, lines 44 and 45 (clause 48)—Leave out paragraph (a) and insert as follows:—

(a) an appointment may be made on that basis for the purpose of filling a position without seeking applications in respect of the position and, in that event, the appointee shall, on being appointed to the Public Service, be assigned to the position by the appointing authority;

No. 30. Page 28, lines 1 to 10 (clause 48)—Leave out paragraph (c).

No. 31. Page 43—After line 28 insert new clause 80a as follows:

80a. Confidentiality of information as to pecuniary interests disclosed under Act. No person shall communicate any information as to another's pecuniary interests disclosed by the other in pursuance of this Act except insofar as the communication is necessary for the purpose of—

- (a) keeping proper records of the information disclosed;
- (b) reviewing the information and reporting upon the existence or otherwise of any conflict of interests in accordance with this Act;
- (c) giving directions with a view to resolving a conflict of interests in accordance with this Act; or
- (d) taking disciplinary action under this Act, removing a person from office under this Act, or conducting legal proceedings of any kind.

Penalty: \$2 000.

No. 32. Schedule 2, page 47—Leave out paragraph (k) of subclause (1).

No. 33. Schedule 3, page 50, clause 11—Leave out from subclause (2) '\$1 000' and insert '\$2 000'.

The Legislative Council drew the attention of the House of Assembly to amendments Nos 2 and 3 in the schedule and intimated that it had as a consequence amended all references to the word 'Commissioner' wherever it appeared elsewhere in the bill, excluding the 'Electoral Commissioner' and the 'Deputy Electoral Commissioner' in schedule 2, and had inserted in lieu thereof the word 'Director'.

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be disagreed to.

The reason for disagreement is that the amendments distort the effectiveness of the Bill. We have before us 33 amendments some of which are consequential but most of which cover separate areas. There were one or two of those that members in another place jointly felt were appropriate, and I am sure that in further consideration of them we may be able to incorporate them. However, it is also clear that some

fundamental differences of opinion were expressed by the majority of those members in another place and this House. Where that fundamental difference of opinion is present and where it affects our perception of the way in which the Act and its basic principles should operate, we have no alternative but to reject the amendments as proposed.

I propose to move that they be rejected *en bloc*, so that, if the Legislative Council insists on all or any of them, we will naturally have to have recourse to a conference, and that conference could well determine the various matters of principle. So, I do not think it is either necessary or desirable to canvass those 33 amendments. While one or two of them are acceptable, a large number are not, because they strike at the fundamentals of the Bill. Unless the Legislative Council sees fit to back down from the stand taken, we have no alternative but to press them through the procedures that have been established in this Parliament.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: The Opposition opposes the motion. As there are 33 amendments, we do not propose to canvass them one by one, as that would simply involve regurgitation of the Committee stage of the Bill, because the amendments cover so many clauses. I am a little disappointed that the Premier was not prepared to indicate which of the clauses the Government did accept in the Upper House. I know only one of them. But, at least I do accept the Premier's explanation that it was for reasons of saving time. I think it is important to indicate that I understand that at least one of the amendments that the Government was prepared to accept was that the definition of 'senior positions' should be above the classification of Executive Officer 1. The Committee will remember that in the previous debate the Opposition moved an amendment similar to those terms, that senior positions should be defined as being above Executive Officer 3 or its equivalent.

It is ironic that the Government accepted in the other place that it should be Executive Officer 1 or equivalent. That is rather interesting because by doing that the Legislative Council has flushed out the Government's intention in this matter concerning the Executive Officer 1 designation. The Premier would recall that the Opposition asked questions on that view.

The other very important amendments that I want to canvass are those dealing with powers of the board *vis-a-vis* the Commissioner. The Legislative Council has in some way supported the Opposition's former thrust in this place to give the board policy direction over the Commissioner—now to be called the Director—and to make the Director subject to the dictates of the board. The Opposition supported that proposal very strongly in this place before. We divided over it; we lost it, but the Legislative Council has seen fit to reinstate that proposal. So, it will be very interesting to see how that comes out of the conference. The Opposition opposes the motion.

Motion carried.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the amendments distort the basic principles of the Bill.

METROPOLITAN MILK SUPPLY ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).
(Continued from page 1881.)

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Prior to that short delay in the debate I had indicated to the House that under this Bill the Minister is being given an authority to determine a figure by regulation which effectively authorises the Minister to nominate virtually any amount that he may choose to withdraw from one group of dairy farmers to be made

payable to another. It is in that context that the industry has reacted violently to this matter. I now refer to comments made by the South Australian Dairymen's Association, representing 930-odd members, in relation to whom the Minister seeks to meddle with their money. There are volumes of correspondence involved in relation to exchanges in recent days between the South Australian Dairymen's Association Executive Officer and members of the Liberal Party, the Minister and officers of the Government.

I do not propose to refer to all the matters involved, but my attention has been drawn specifically to a very brief summary at the end of some correspondence dated 25 October, forwarded after the introduction of the Bill. The Executive Officer of SADA stated:

The Bill contains no indications of the magnitude of transfers and, more importantly, no safeguards to ensure that the transfers are of an order of magnitude that can be absorbed by acceptable adjustment in the pricing schedule.

He goes on to say:

The statement in the Minister's media release concerning strong representations is tantamount to an admission that the Bill itself is being used as electoral propaganda for the ALP candidate.

The media releases referred to in that instance were produced by the Minister of Agriculture on the day that he introduced the Bill into the Legislative Council, that is, on 24 October. The Executive Officer of SADA further states in his paper:

The passing of the Bill before the next State election could provide more tangible electoral leverage in the form of additional cash transfers from central region dairy farmers to South-East dairy farmers, which by implication would become involuntary donations to the ALP candidate's election fund.

That is pretty strong stuff, but it does demonstrate the very deep concerns that the paying element of the industry feels about this legislation. There is a large volume of material available from that source to demonstrate their concern, not so much at the principle of transferring funds, as whilst the South-East dairymen are denied access to metropolitan market sales there is no real argument about those farmers receiving a fair and equitable share of money transmitted to them from those who are enjoying the central and metropolitan markets, but in relation to the way that it is being done and the way that the Minister is interfering in an area when there is absolutely no need for him to do so. It is alleged that this is capitalising on an opportunity to meddle with the dairymen's finances for alleged Party political purposes. I support the industry's expressions of concern.

I turn now to some other correspondence which demonstrates concern at yet another level. The Dairyvale Metropolitan Cooperative Limited is a milk and milk product processing factory located within the metropolitan Adelaide region. It, too, wrote to the Minister, on the same day, 25 October, immediately after the introduction of the Bill in another place. The cooperative wrote to the Opposition as well. In their correspondence they noted with concern matters contained in the Minister's press release announcing the introduction of the Bill to amend the Metropolitan Milk Supply Act, which they say will alter the existing licence fees paid by the milk treatment plant. The letter from the Dairyvale Metropolitan Cooperative Limited stated:

I am astounded to learn that you have taken such action without prior consultation with treatment plants so affected by this proposal. My limited understanding of the intention is that my company will be required to pay licensing fees that may amount to something like \$1 million each year from our general trading funds. I normally keep our 700 shareholders informed of relevant industry matters through our monthly company newsletter. The deadline for printing the next issue is Friday, 1 November 1985. To enable me to accurately publish the facts surrounding the intent of this proposed Bill, I would appreciate having answers to the following questions:

Dairyvale's Executive Officer's questions are:

1. Why companies so affected were not consulted prior to the press release and introduction of the Bill to Parliament?

2. What amount of money is to be generated from the licence fees?

That is the term given to the moneys subject to transmission. The questions continue:

3. Why companies similarly licensed under the Dairy Industry Act such as Golden North Dairies, G.W. Falland and Co., etc. are excluded from making contributions when their milk suppliers are receiving milk payments substantially in excess of these received by producers in the 'Central' area of our State?

4. Does the quantity of milk treated in section 30aa (2) (b) [of the Act] include milk destined for use as flavoured milk?

5. When are the proposed amendments programmed to be instituted, and under what circumstances would they be invoked?

The writer in this instance, Mr Robin Steed, General Manager, Dairyvale, concludes by saying:

I would appreciate replies to the above before next Friday or, hopefully, the opportunity to meet and discuss them with you personally before that date.

I met with Mr Steed on the deadline of Friday. He had neither been facilitated with the opportunity for discussion, nor had he had any reply from the Minister. There has been absolute abdication of consulting responsibilities by the Minister in this instance. He has gone off as a tangent, as claimed in some quarters, in order to uphold an undertaking he gave his ALP candidate colleague in the South-East that he would intervene in this instance. I was not privy to those discussions between the two ALP members, but certainly evidence indicates that it has consistently occurred throughout this propaganda exercise. It has now come home to roost in the form of an outrageous Bill.

My next reference involves a transcript of an interview between the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Frank Blevins) and Jill Singer of the ABC's *Country Hour* program of 25 October 1985: again, just one day after the introduction of the Bill. They were talking about the equalisation payments under the scheme in the early part of the interview. The transcript reports questions of the Minister by Jill Singer:

Q: How, then, is the exact equalisation payment going to be worked out? Who is going to construct the formula?

Min: Well, I am; the Government is. The Government will construct the formula, draw it up in the form of regulation, and gazette those regulations.

Q: So, what is it going to be?

Min: Well, I want some more discussions with the two parties first, once I've got the legislation. I'm still hopeful, less hopeful than earlier, that they can get together and they can sort out the few remaining differences between them. Surely an industry that is as regulated as the dairy industry shouldn't be asking for more regulation; however, they have.

In that part of the interview the Minister was dealing with untruths, because at no stage has the South Australian Dairymen's Association—one of the parties cited in the Minister's remarks—asked for this sort of legislative interference with which we are faced in the form of this Bill. True, the recipient parties in the South-East have asked the Minister for the legislation, albeit through the local ALP candidate and the ALP conference in June, if not otherwise. To claim what the Minister has in this instance is blatantly misleading. The interview continues:

Q: Why are you pre-empting the efforts being made nationally, because the latest ADIC plan which is still under consideration, includes a half-a-cent a litre transfer levy on market milk?

Min: I don't think it's going to solve the problem here that we have with these two regions in this State; that's why, if I thought it would, and that somebody else could sort it out, I would be happy to let them, but I don't believe that that's going to be the case, and my advice is that's not going to be the case, but we really have to sort this one out here. It's a domestic problem within this State; that's my advice and I'm acting on that advice.

The next question and answer are as follows:

Q: Who did you get that advice from?

Min: I get lots of advice from lots of quarters, both from dairy farmers, advice here in the department, and other advice.

The interview then continues. It was clear from the extracts from that transcript that the Minister was uncomfortable

about the situation in which he was put by the ABC interviewer in that *Country Hour* program. Indeed, he was acting on a limited number of the dairy industry; he was flying in the face of conflict with a significant number of the dairy industry, not only in the central region but across the State. He was flying in the face of the principles supported by the UF&S, the South Australian Dairymen's Association and by the two processor groups I have cited and many farmers across the State. Indeed, the Minister was flying in the face of principles that the Liberal Party seeks to uphold in South Australia, that is, wherever possible to keep Government's and Ministers' sticky little fingers out of internal industrial affairs.

True, there has been a problem in recent times about the actual amount of money payable to the South-East because farmers there are denied entry to the metropolitan market, but that issue could have been overcome, given a bit more time. In our view it was quite unnecessary for this sort of interference and, as I have said over and over again both within and without this Chamber, it is our view that it is a politically convenient act by the Minister. It was not well and soundly motivated and is not in the interests of the industry at large. Indeed, it will backfire.

I have just a couple of other matters that I want to refer to because after a long address on a subject as complex as this I am sure members might be a little confused about the background detail and the many statistics addressed. To clarify in their minds precisely what this means in money terms I refer to more material provided to me in recent days.

Based on 1984-85 production in the dairy region surrounding metropolitan Adelaide and the South-East, central region dairy farmers—every single jack one of them—will pay 17.75 cents per kilogram of butterfat on their production: putting it another way, an average of \$2 184 per farm in the metropolitan milk region. If a central region farmer supplies 30 000 kilograms of butterfat per year, his annual contribution will be \$5 325. Each farmer will be able to work out his or her personal contribution under the new legislation, once it becomes law. The 30 000 kilograms of butterfat annual production might not mean much to some members, but a farmer milking between 125 and 140 cows produces about 30 000 kilograms of butterfat per annum.

It is a medium to large dairy farm in South Australian dairy terms, and that is the sort of figure that each of those farmers at that production level will be paying out of their returns under this new legislation. Yet another way of describing the situation, from the proposed recipient's viewpoint is that the South-East dairy farmers, of which there are only 281, will, based on their 1984-85 production returns, receive a subsidy of 61.3 cents per kilogram on all butterfat produced. The 281 South-East farmers will receive on average a \$7 331 subsidy per farm under this new Blevins scheme. A farmer in that region of the State producing 30 000 kilograms per annum, regardless of whether he produces it seasonally or not, will receive an annual subsidy from the central region fund via this legislation of \$18 390.

I do not want to canvass the argument whether or not those figures are fair, appropriate, too low or too high. I have never been in a position, nor indeed seek to be in one, to understand or indeed put down a figure that shall be paid by one farmer to another in circumstances of this kind. There are plenty of experts around the country who can take onboard all the details and the fair formula factors that may be required to derive an appropriate amount to be paid to the South-East farmers, given their current restricted trading areas.

The situation is as crook as all hell, mark my words. The Minister has so far declined to address the people who do understand the subject in his calculations. For him to go

ahead in the way that he has, like a bulldozer, and to superimpose his authority over the Parliament and to abuse the system to the extent that I have outlined, in order to take money from one group of farmers and give to another, is in my view and that of the industry totally unacceptable.

In conclusion, I wish to raise one or two other matters before handing over to other speakers on this matter. There will be a few speakers, although they will not be speaking on it as long as I have. However, some people are keen to put forward a viewpoint. In summary it is fair to say that dairy farmers in the metropolitan milk supply region are expressing shock and dismay as they learn about the effects of the legislation introduced into the State Parliament a little over a week ago. By means of a licence fee imposed on processing companies, the Minister will have power to enable moneys to be distributed to South-East producers on what he believes to be an equitable basis.

The calculations that we have seen indicate that transfer payment to South-East producers, based on 1983-84 returns, will amount to \$2 060 000—more than double the amount of distribution that is currently being paid under the mutually agreed terms of the SADA and SEDE. As I indicated before, I do not know whether or not this enormous increase in the contribution is justified.

Industry people whom I represent directly and generally across the State indicate to me that it is totally unjustified. But, that is not the real nub of the argument. The argument is the way in which the Minister has jumped into this situation, and sought to capitalise on it pre-State election, to interfere and meddle with people's returns under the canopy and authority of the law, whilst refraining from letting the industry sort out its own problems or assisting it in so doing rather than, as in this instance, stirring up a hell a lot of trouble in the dairy community.

I wish to raise another matter regarding consultation or the lack of it. The area of this subject which gives me greatest concern is when a Minister, in policy during lead-up to a previous election, undertook to consult with the industries that he purported to represent and then just ignored the commitment of consultation and walked over the top of those involved. He prepared draft regulations (about which I do not want to talk at this stage, during the second reading of the Bill). For the benefit of certain people in the community, I am not too sure where this copy came from, but it encloses a telex to one of the dairy industry groups advising of the Minister's intention to proceed with the legislation, except that of course if the SADA and SEDE groups come together in a few days between the lodgment of the Bill and its passage through Parliament he may back off.

In response to that challenge—I call it blackmail—the association in question contacted the South-East Dairymen's Association executive and indeed put to it the proposal to pop in, albeit belatedly, and negotiate this subject. However, their offer was rejected by the South-East people, anyway. The aspect that disturbs me most in the papers attached to the telex involves paragraph 3.3 which, over the Minister's signature, states:

The regulations and notice have been drawn up in consultation with the Parliamentary Counsel and the Metropolitan Milk Board. I do not know what the hell the Parliamentary Counsel has got to do with a subject like this. They are a tremendous service group in this Parliament but they are there to take instructions and not to dictate what the legislation shall be or how it will be effected by the Government thereafter. They are there simply to assist and advise, which in my experience they do very well. In this instance, for them to be incorporated in a supporting quote by the Minister seemed to me to be a bit rude, to say the least.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: One would assume that they were involved in the preparation, but not in the consultation as to whether or not it was appropriate to proceed in this direction. That is a decision for the Government. The Minister has taken a crook decision in this instance but, be that as it may, we do not go to that level to seek advice as to whether or not we have breached the principles of industry practice, as is the case in this instance.

The other part that concerns me most is not the fact that it is recorded in these papers that according to the Minister consultation was held with the Metropolitan Milk Board. I have been in touch with the executive of the Metropolitan Milk Board which claims that it was not consulted at all in relation to the preparation of these regulations. Yet again we have another authority that is divorcing itself from the Minister's actions. They are the servants of the State under the canopy of the Metropolitan Milk Supply Act. That is the board that was set up by this Parliament for the purpose of administering the Act. It is an incredible situation. They are backing off like crayfish. Every group, except the group in the South-East that will receive these significant funds, do not want to know about it. One can go from one level to the other within the community, within the industry and within the realms of the Milk Board and find that they do not want to know about it, either.

The Minister has some answering to do at public level, because it is too late for this process—he has already dealt with the matter in the Upper House, pretty hastily I will agree. He did not even give notice in that place of his intention to introduce the Bill. He just whacked it in on Thursday, 24 October and down it came, straightaway on the very same day from that place. We picked up the adjournment in this House and we are required to proceed from there in a very short time. This is a very significant industrial change to one of the very important industries of the State.

The farmers on the land, the ones who get up with the sun, go down with the sun and milk their cows accordingly, do not know the details of this. They have only seen snippets in the newspaper and heard the interview on the *Country Hour*. They have had absolutely no access to the details of this legislation. It is unprecedented in this respect. I and many others in the community were very critical of the Minister's predecessor, the Hon. Mr Chatterton, and his efforts to slip in legislation here and there, but I cannot ever recall that he carried on in this fashion. This bloke whom we have now is a little dictator. Fair dinkum! He is absolutely overriding all the principles and the undertakings of the Labor Party to consult and whacking in legislation.

This is unprecedented in regard to rural Australia. It really is unbelievable that his own colleagues can allow this to occur. I know that he has an idea that he will win in Whyalla, but that might or might not occur. It might be occupying his good sense for the moment. I do not want to be critical of the person, because that is not proper in this House: I do not want to reflect on the personality, but his activities as a Minister at industrial level are deplorable, as exemplified in this instance.

In ordinary circumstances a Minister of Agriculture might have sought to consult with the other side of the Parliament on a matter as delicate as this or even with the shadow Minister, old Ted, but not a word—and I passed him in the passage in the past few days. I recognise that he is a very busy bloke. He is holding down a whole heap of portfolios and they tell me that he has moved his officers from the Department of Agriculture to another high rise establishment in the city of Adelaide where he can attend his other portfolios and the poor old agriculture portfolio has gone down the drain.

The Hon. H. Allison: That is the other end of the business.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Yes, but the whole thing is out of gear. On the eve of an election announcement, the extent to which the Minister is exercising his authority is absolutely unreal. We know that the Government has the numbers in this House so that the legislation can go through. I am not sure whether it is all a big bluff, whether or not he is fair dinkum, whether he will proceed and proclaim this legislation sometime during the election campaign period and bring in regulations, but the House can be assured that the Liberal Party has a policy (and I have put it on the record tonight) in relation to what happens in this industry or any other rural industry for that matter. We will not set out to meddle or dictate in their affairs.

If a boundary prevents someone from trading fairly, reasonably and competitively, we will give the industry groups, as we have done in this instance, every opportunity to sort out their differences. We will give them assistance to do so. Failing agreement being reached on that basis, we will take away the barriers. It really is as simple as that.

Mr Whitten interjecting:

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I take it that the interjection by the member for Price—

Mr Whitten: It is out of order.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: The honourable member is out of order, and he admits it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the honourable member will come back to the Bill sooner or later.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I have been right on the knocker all the way through. I appreciate your directions, Sir. If you want me to give it away at this stage, the other matters on which I wish to comment can well be raised in Committee. In deference to your remarks, Sir, and the desire of some of my colleagues to speak, I will conclude my remarks. I must say that I appreciate the fair number of members who have assembled in the House in the past half an hour or so to hear this address. I hope that they take note of the importance of the subject and that the Government, through its Minister, recognises that it is meddling in very deep and very hot water. Introducing a precedent of this kind is invariably dangerous. I understand that the member for Mallee will give a few other examples at industry level where, if this sort of caper is repeated, we will have chaos in the rural industry and possibly even the fishing and other industries.

In this place one just cannot abuse the system, take over and control people's money in the way that the Minister of Agriculture is seeking to do in this instance, especially without consultation with those who are responsible for having an amount deducted from their produce returns, those on the ground floor or, indeed, those who are directed by the Minister by legislation to act as agents for him in the collection and distribution of the moneys.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I propose to support this legislation, and in doing so I will err on the side of consistency. In 1975 the late Murray Duffield, who was Secretary of the South-East Dairymen's Association, contacted me in, I think, July and sought my assistance for the South-East industry in working towards full equalisation for South-East dairy farmers. I undertook to do that for as long as I was the member of Parliament for the South-East and over the past 10 years I believe that I have worked very steadily towards achieving that. A letter which I received in October 1982 from the then Secretary, Mr Cameron, of the SEDA, stated:

Dear Sir,

At a recent meeting of central council members of this association, a report was received from President Lance Clements on

negotiations and discussions with the Minister of Agriculture [Hon. Ted Chapman] relating to the market milk augmentation scheme, and reference was made to your considerable involvement in this matter.

A resolution of the meeting placed on record the appreciation of members for your very worthwhile efforts and assistance, and instructed me to convey this information to you with their sincere thanks. It is believed your active part in discussions and guidance given have helped materially toward resolution of the problem.

Resolution of the problem was, in fact, only one more step along the road towards equalisation. At that meeting in October 1982 we had concluded another stage in the implementation of the augmentation scheme for the South-East dairy farmers and may I say that the augmentation scheme, excellent though it has been in transferring some funds from the metropolitan region to the South-East, has still not fully met the needs and what I believe to be the entitlements of South-East dairy farmers.

May I say that while I claim to be erring on the side of consistency I also have another reason for supporting this legislation. I was elected by the people in the District of Mount Gambier: 281 families in the South-East are dairy-men. There is no-one else in State Parliament specifically to represent the interests of those people. I am here to do that, and that is why I intend to follow up the very erudite address of the shadow Minister of Agriculture by putting some of the facts which the South-East dairy farmers have consistently placed before Governments over the past 10 years and explained why they believe that they should be entitled to a greater share of market milk profits in South Australia.

In the first place, a pamphlet, which was put out in March or April this year by the Chairman of the Metropolitan Milk Board (Mr B.D. Hanniford) and entitled *The Dairy Industry in South Australia*, sets out many facts that were included in my colleague's address this evening. However, one or two of those facts are worth repeating. One concerns the aims of the Metropolitan Milk Board. The final statement under 'Aims' is as follows:

The aim is to ensure that the consumer receives a reasonably priced wholesome product 365 days of the year which can be relied upon as a staple basic food.

There is a serious omission in the Metropolitan Milk Board Act: there is no specific provision to ensure that dairy farmers across the whole of South Australia are guaranteed an adequate living. I find it rather a sad reflection on the state of affairs in any part of Australia when there is no provision in legislation to allow so much as half a cent a litre to be added to the price of milk in order to ensure that producers in an industry can maintain a viable living.

I wrote to the Minister only a few weeks ago suggesting that one way out of the whole dilemma would be to impose a small surcharge (say, half cent a litre) on milk in South Australia. That would not only have provided for the additional amount required by South-East dairy farmers to survive: it would also have provided a small surplus that could have been returned to metropolitan suppliers in order to alleviate their difficulties, if they were experiencing problems. However, the Minister in his wisdom said that that was not the solution. I understand that he may now be directing the Metropolitan Milk Board to collect a levy to be paid to South-East dairy farmers and at the same time be preventing an additional charge from being levied against consumers, one would assume because we are too near an election and that to levy an additional sum (even so little as half cent a litre) would be considered politically unwise even if it was a lack of justice to dairy farmers in the South-East.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: I understand that that is the Minister's direction to the board.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: So, the Minister is well and truly politicising this issue when the member for Mount Gambier was pragmatic enough to suggest that an increase of only one half cent a litre might have settled the whole problem and enabled the South-East dairy farmers to survive. I assure members that there are in the South-East dairy farmers who cannot wait three months or six months for a solution to this problem. They are near bankruptcy, as indeed dairy farmers in other parts of the State may be, too. However, in the South-East, the vast majority of milk supplied is for manufactured milk: that is, for conversion into cheese. Only 5 per cent or 6 per cent of all milk goes into the much more lucrative market as milk in cartons to be delivered to the doorstep of the consumer each morning.

My colleague also highlighted another problem over which neither I nor South-East dairy farmers have any control: the fact that a large milk company in the South-East in effect controls the price that is paid per kilogram butterfat to dairy farmers. I understand that it has been set by the company across Australia at \$2.45 as against the \$3.10 that has been set by metropolitan Adelaide factories. There is a major and serious discrepancy here, but I have no control over that, and my main aim in representing South-East dairy farmers is to ensure one way or another that they have an equitable share in the profits that one derives from the sale of milk to householders on a daily basis in cartons.

The emotional issue of whether or not there should be an increase in the retail price of milk should not be drawn as a red herring across this debate. The real issue is whether or not dairy farmers across South Australia should be given an equal share of the profits in respect of milk sold in the metropolitan area and in country city areas. The single fact that cannot be denied is that the South-East has been treated quite differently since the Metropolitan Milk Supply Act was originally enacted way back in 1946. The South-East has specifically been excluded from selling its milk in the metropolitan area.

As recently as 1982, when the Liberal Party was in government, discussions revealed that at that stage, if the South-East were to guarantee 41 per cent of its milk being sent to Adelaide each year, an equalisation factor of about \$3 million would be paid to the South-East from the metropolitan market. That would also have entailed the South-East paying out, from that \$3 million of its profits, such amounts as would be necessary for transportation, chilling, refrigeration and packaging either in Mount Gambier or in Adelaide, and a whole range of other costs. There would also have been lost to South-East dairy factories the volume of milk that was transferred to Adelaide—at that stage 41 per cent but now nearer 30 per cent. That would have been a loss to local factories and could have had an adverse effect on their viability. These factors have been considered by SEDA and included in its calculations and considerations when putting a final figure which it believed was fair and equitable to SADA as a required share.

I place on record my personal thanks to Lance Clements (President of SEDA) for his long and continued negotiation, along with others, on this matter. I also place on record my thanks to the President of SADA (Mr Kretschmer) and to the Secretary of SADA (Mr David Higbed) for their presence at an important meeting held at Compton Hall, Mount Gambier, when the three people jointly put the case for their associations. It was important that those three association representatives appeared before South-Eastern dairy farmers and explained the rationale behind their differing points of view.

At that meeting it was stated that SADA was prepared to offer \$1.69 million as an increased augmentation and a step towards equalisation. It was also prepared to offer immediate payment of the 1984-85 augmentation money, which

would be over \$900 000. Further, it was prepared to offer a much more rapid turnover, virtually on a monthly basis, of funds collected from then onwards, as well as that the ceiling of 10 per cent should be arrived at immediately instead of the plateau of 7 per cent which had been reached two years before and which did not look like being passed for the next several years. These were major concessions, but SEDA deemed them inadequate because its demand was a little short of \$2.2 million. I have the precise figure in my notes, but it was about that sum.

In other words, there was a difference between the claim of the SEDA and the offer of the SADA of a little less than \$500 000. The Minister of the day (Hon. Frank Blevins), like other Ministers, has repeatedly expressed his reluctance to intrude into industrial matters. He has repeatedly expressed his desire that the associations should resolve the issue by negotiation. He has, partly because of the imminence of an election, partly because Liberal and Labor Parties have committed themselves to an improved form of equalisation for the South-East, and for a number of other reasons, found that the need for legislation has been precipitated so that we now have legislation before us.

The Liberal Party policy of negotiation between the two organisations until the end of 1985, of arbitration by an independent arbitrator until 31 March 1986 and then, in the event of disagreement, of opening up the central region to the South-East Dairy Farmers Association so that they have access to the metropolitan milk market, has had its time scale telescoped by a variety of circumstances. However, the real disagreement of the evening relates to the manner in which the Minister has decided to implement this legislation.

In principle, both Parties are agreed that equalisation of one form or another would be fair to the dairy farmers of the South-East. One has to beg the question as to why at this eleventh hour not only is the Minister being catapulted into legislation but the South Australian Dairymen's Association has decided that it will make the 1984-85 money available more quickly. Normally the South-East has to wait for 15 to 18 months after the production of milk by which time people could have gone bankrupt and many have fallen out of the industry in that period of time.

SADA has made a number of concessions. However, if agreement had been reached some years earlier on a more equitable basis this situation may not have arisen. Those questions are now largely academic because we do have this legislation before us. For a variety of reasons I represent the dairy farmers in the South-East. I have been requesting moves towards equalisation for the past 10 years and have every intention of seeing this matter through to the end and to the stage where South-East dairy farmers get a much better deal than they are currently getting. Whether in fact the various calculations of SADA and SEDA are fair and accurate is not for me to decide.

I am not an expert and I believe that an experienced and independent arbitrator might have arrived at a much more satisfactory conclusion had he been employed some considerable time earlier. The Minister, too, has had to rush matters and it will be interesting to see whether the speculated amount of \$2 060 000 is the figure decided upon by the Minister—a compromise between the SADA and SEDA figures. It will be equally interesting to see how the Minister arrived at that figure of compromise. Whether it is more than enough or, again, inadequate his figures will be interesting for the House to analyse.

The promise of augmentation or of steps towards equalisation has been made by the South Australian Dairymen's Association in order to keep the South-East dairy farmers out of the Adelaide market and to keep things on an even keel. It has been revealed that the ratio of peak production

to trough production for the South-East is 6.5 to 1, which means that the South-East produces a large volume of milk in the peak season and very little for the rest of the year. This compares to 1.8 to 1 for the Adelaide Hills and Murray Swamps, 1.6 to 1 for the Mid North and 1.5 to 1 for the Riverland and Port Lincoln.

Obviously, the South-East would have to stagger its calving, do some extensive feed lotting and change its production procedures if, in fact, it were to compete on the metropolitan market on an all year round basis, and to change that quite marked ratio of 6.5 to 1 to somewhere nearer that being achieved by the other producers. However, that is not really the issue. The real issue is the fact that for the past 30 years the South-East has been, by Statute, prevented from entering the more lucrative metropolitan milk market. It has had in the past all too few years some incentive to keep out.

It has stated that it is quite willing to compete on the Adelaide market and, in fact, letters addressed to the Minister, to the South Australian Dairy Association, to the Labor Party and the Liberal Party by the South-East Dairymen's Association as recently as July asked everyone to express their intentions towards finally moving into full equalisation for South-East dairy farmers. Whether for them full equalisation simply means the transfer of funds, or whether they will ultimately be asked to make the effort and to transfer milk to Adelaide, is a moot question.

Of course, if milk did come into Adelaide and if the Metropolitan Milk Board or the SADA said to them, 'Bring the milk up to Adelaide', that would necessitate the Adelaide metropolitan factories changing their marketing schemes in order to find markets for an additional 30 per cent of milk which they would have to place into manufacture. It would change their pricing and marketing structures, so both the South-East and the metropolitan factories would be faced with some problems, either of viability or change in marketing procedures.

As I have said before, these matters have all been discussed at considerable length by representatives of the metropolitan and South-East industries over the past several years and not simply over the past few months. This is not a new problem. I have a lengthy letter from 1982 which outlines quite precisely the concerns felt in the South-East, concerns which are very much those being expressed by the South-East Dairymen's Association today. This should not come as any great surprise to people within the industry.

What does come as a surprise is that after three years, when the South Australian Labor Government promised in 1982 it would do something, at the eleventh hour plus, it is introducing legislation which at the worst could get the Minister into considerable trouble. I do not believe that he has thought out adequately enough the methodology behind the legislation currently introduced. I say to members of the House that that is the Minister's problem and not mine. I am pleased that this legislation is before the House and hope that it will achieve a fairer share of market milk profits for South-East dairy farmers.

Some of the problems still confronting the Minister if he proclaims this legislation and tables the regulations are as follows: the method of achieving his ends; his lack of consultation, which is quite obvious from letters read into *Hansard* by my colleague the member for Alexandra; lack of consultation with any companies; the question of how much the Minister will be transferring to the South-East; the question as to why other regions are not being involved in his calculations; the question whether or not flavoured milk is being included in the distribution of profits; and a number of other matters which I could quite easily draw to his attention and which certainly have not escaped the attention of the South Australian Dairymen's Association.

These issues may not be answered by the Minister in the House today, although I hope that they are, because I do not believe that the Minister in another place has fully addressed the wide range of issues which I am quite sure will be drawn to his attention within the next few days. As I said at the outset, I have to support the dairy farmers in the South-East. I have interviewed many of them personally over the past 10 years and a number over the past few months. Many have said that it is only by the skin of their teeth that they are hanging on in the hope that some improved augmentation or equalisation scheme can be achieved not the next year, but before the end of this year.

I do not believe that all the figures quoted from factories or the industry in the metropolitan area are reliable nor do I believe that the comparisons drawn between the Hills and the South-East are accurate. Many dairy farmers in the metropolitan area do not fully appreciate that there are very few large dairy farms in the South-East. The majority are small battlers; many are in dire financial straits.

I have had access to audited accounts from a number of them. I asked them to bring in their statements to my office so that I could see whether or not they were presenting a fair case for me to argue. I believe that it is only fair to members of the House that the local member should be fully and accurately informed as to any crisis in his electorate, if indeed he is portraying such a situation before his colleagues.

I assure members that I am extremely concerned for the future well-being of many dairy farmers and their families in the South-East. At a recent conference between the South-East Dairymen's Association and SADA it was revealed that central farmers were paid an average of \$4.60 per kilogram fat for all milk supplied for July 1985 as against \$2.50 for the South-East product. There is a tremendous discrepancy in earning power, even if there is some difference in cost of production, between the Adelaide Hills and the South-East.

When one also considers that the South-East dairy farmers and the rest of the dairy farmers in Australia are being confronted by the federal Kerin plan, one of whose aims is to reduce production of milk in Australia from about 6.1 billion litres per annum down to 5.3 billion litres per annum and that dairy farmers across Australia will probably be given a quota which will take into consideration the productivity of each dairy farm over the past three immediately preceding years, and that many dairy farmers are building up in those second and third years rather than running down because they have had such struggles over the past two or three years simply to exist, one can see that this is only one phase of resolution of problems confronting the dairy industry in South Australia.

It would be absolute folly for South Australia to phase out milk production in the South-East of South Australia if it is an area where milk can be produced with relatively little trouble and to insist that milk be produced in other areas of South Australia with much more difficulty. I am quite sure that honourable members would encourage production in the South-East rather than discouraging it. Therefore, I have pleasure in supporting this legislation as an interim means of assisting dairy farmers in the South-East of South Australia who are experiencing considerable financial difficulties.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education): I move:

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

Motion carried.

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): If this Bill passes I dare the Minister to proclaim it before the next election. I am sure that he would be aware of the same facts that the member for Alexandra has drawn to the attention of the House about the numbers of dairy farmers in South Australia. There are only 288 dairy farmers in the South-East. If all of them are happy with this proposition—and I am not sure of that fact—the remainder of the total of 1 372 are virtually, to a man, unhappy. Whereas a certain percentage of that some 1 100 farmers not in the South-East would have voted Labor in the past I would bet that I could count the number who will vote Labor in the Upper House election when it is called on the fingers of both my hands—and they do not even number 10.

Nor do I believe that the people associated with milk production and with farmers and the rest of the industry will support Labor. I am amazed that the Minister believes that he can either engage in this kind of chicanery for the sake of bargaining for the seat of Mount Gambier or, on the other hand, be so stupid as to imagine he would get away with it. Quite clearly, if the Government and Independent members stick together, this measure will pass this House in its present form.

As there are no amendments proposed to it by the Government it will become an Act of Parliament. It has already passed the other place. As I said at the outset, in those circumstances I dare the Minister to proclaim it before the election. It is not just a blatant exercise in Party politicking, it is also crook. I do not share the view of the member for Mount Gambier that it is just and fair. I will explain that shortly, but I point out, in terms which I am sure members can understand, that this measure provides the South-East dairy farmers with a vacuum cleaner into the bottom line on the profit and loss statement of every other dairy farmer in the central region.

We note in clause 3 of the Bill that a fee is to be calculated as prescribed by regulation—not in this legislation—by reference to the quantity of milk treated by the licence holder (the people who run the factories in the metropolitan area—Southern Farmers and Dairyvale Cooperative) during the relevant antecedent period. In other words, it is retrospective, anyway, and the fee will be determined by regulation. It will not even be debated here. Sure, it has been suggested in the House tonight what the figure will be, but members in this place, farmers elsewhere and, if they have an ounce of conscience, dairy farmers in the South-East ought to recognise that they will have no say in how and when the regulation is changed.

If this Government is returned to office and in four years time it decides that dairy farmers in the South-East are in dire straits and it wants to make another bid to win the seat of Mount Gambier from the Liberal Party, it will simply by regulation increase the amount that has to be paid from the balance sheets and profit and loss statements of the dairy farmers in the central region to the dairy farmers in the South-East.

That makes it possible for me to understand the recent statements made by Mr Higbed, President of the South Australian Dairy Farmers Association. In today's *News* he is reported as saying:

We object to being forced to be involuntary contributors to the ALP campaign in Mount Gambier.

That is what it amounts to, at least on the hustings. The poor dairy farmers in the South-East do not realise that by the mechanism of this legislation, if it is enacted, the processors, particularly that multi-national company (which has no conscience in relation to South Australian dairy farmers),

Kraft, can simply use this legislation to create more profit for themselves.

If they reduce the amount of money that they are willing to pay to dairy farmers not only in Mount Gambier but elsewhere in Australia, it automatically means that the dairy farmers in Mount Gambier and the South-East will want to improve their profitability. If they are paid less by Kraft, they will be less profitable and, on the assumption that the Labor Party is re-elected at the next election four years down the track, they will go to the Minister (and it will not be the Hon. Frank Blevins) and demand an increase through this legislation in the contribution made by other dairy farmers from the central region for their own benefit. That is the effect of the legislation.

Nobody can deny that by this mechanism money will be transferred from efficient and legitimate producers in the central region to other producers in the South-East. If the South-East dairy producers, both the farmers and the cheese factories, were sincere about their problems, surely they would have improved the standard and quality of the milk that they delivered in the first instance to the factories and from there the quality of products marketed from those factories.

Over recent years the Dairyvale Coop at Jervois has substantially modernised its equipment and improved its production technology to the point where it is now without question the premier cheese producing factory in Australia. At the recent Royal Melbourne Show it wiped the board in the cheese categories.

If the Dairyvale Coop can do it, why cannot the cheese factories around Mount Gambier also do it? By that means the Dairyvale Coop is able to sell its products of better prices. It is more competitive than other processors and producers of the same kinds of products. It can keep its milk producers viable. If we look at the production situation in the South-East, we see, as has been pointed out by my colleague the member for Alexandra, that the farmers in Mount Gambier and in the South-East are very seasonal in their production. They are able to sell only 5 or 6 per cent of the milk volume that they produce as liquid milk. As has been pointed out, they have not bothered to go into the flavoured milk market in order to supply local demand—they have left that market to the Victorian suppliers.

If the producers believe that there is a more profitable market in fresh milk production, they ought to have done something about that. On the other hand, if we look at the production in the central region (spread over the hills, the Fleurieu Peninsula, the Lower Murray and the plains around Lake Albert and Lake Alexandrina), we can see that the extent to which the flush of production in spring exceeds production levels at other times during the year is far less than is the case in Mount Gambier. Of course, in the South-East, during their flush period, they produce much more milk than they can produce at other times of the year. They argue that it is not profitable to invest in irrigation and other cultural husbandry techniques that would enable them to spread the peak of production. They also argue, quite invalidly, that they do not have a responsibility to do so.

I believe that if they attempted to do that they would find that not only would the cost of doing it but also the cost of getting the raw milk to a market further afield would be so much greater that it would not be profitable for them to engage in that sort of activity. The scale of production in which they would be involved would not be sufficient to service the capital investment that they would have to make at current interest rates to enable them to operate competitively. I simply mock the statement (and it is a false statement) made by the Minister in this same article in today's *News*, where he said:

If they decided—

that is, the South-East producers—

to start marketing in the metropolitan area, Adelaide consumers would get much cheaper milk and the central region producers would go broke overnight.

That is simply not true and it is piffle. I would like to see the figures on which the Minister based that assertion. I acknowledge that for a few weeks of the year, when they have milk running out of their ears, they could dump milk on any market and expect that they might be able to get a price advantage from doing so.

However, let me say that the South-East dairy farmers ought to have gone to school in the East End market because, if you are a reliable supplier and able to ensure that your customers always have what you are providing on the market, you will be able to sell it. On the other hand, if you are a fly-by-night operator, or attempt to be a long line seller growing, say, cauliflowers when it is apparently cheapest to do so, you will be seen as an unreliable supplier, and the price that you can obtain for your article will be very much less than you would otherwise be able to obtain if you were reliable and able to guarantee some continuity of supply.

The South-East dairy farmers are unable to guarantee a continuity of supply and are unwilling even to attempt to do so. They believe, and argue fallaciously that, because they can produce about as much milk or butterfat per cow as can producers in the central region who are supplying the Adelaide metropolitan milk market, they are therefore entitled to the same consideration.

They do not bother to make the effort that the producers in the areas supplying the Adelaide metropolitan milk market make in ensuring a continuity of supply. So, they could not expect to get the same kind of profitability by entering the market for that short period with the huge volumes of milk that they would have. What is more, of course, if they were to do that they would destabilise the market. Prices would fluctuate in metropolitan Adelaide or otherwise, if the Milk Board simply refused to allow that to happen, under Government direction, there would be all hell to pay. I will not detain the House with the ramifications of what that would entail. I could explain how the supply/demand mechanism over a cycle of years would cause violent fluctuations in the price in the metropolitan area.

Both the previous speakers in the debate have pointed out that the price being paid by the processors in the metropolitan area is \$3.10 a kilogram for butterfat, whereas Kraft and other producers in the South-East and elsewhere in Australia are paying only \$2.45. That is at the nub of the problem of the South-East dairy farmers in attempting to make their enterprise more profitable. Rather than simply looking at prices, as I have mentioned, it is necessary for them to think again about how they can spread production from the spring and early summer peak, which they now have, over the rest of the year. If they are to be taken seriously at all they will have to do that. Indeed, I believe, contrary to what the Minister says, that if the South-East dairy farmers were left to their own devices to decide whether or not to enter the fresh milk market in the metropolitan area in competition with existing producers which supply it, indeed they would go broke overnight.

Why it is that the Minister considers this Bill to be just, has got me puzzled to the point of being unable to understand. Using the criteria used to argue the validity of this measure, it would be equally valid to argue that prawn fishermen in Spencer Gulf ought to pay, through an augmentation mechanism established by the Government, a fee to the prawn fishermen in St Vincent Gulf, to ensure the viability of prawn fishermen in St Vincent Gulf. Equally, since the commodities are somewhat a substitution of one

for the other, cray fishermen in the South-East might be expected to pay, through an augmentation scheme, some kind of subsidy to prawn fishermen in both gulfs.

We could consider another primary product, like grapes: using the same argument used in support of this Bill, why is it that we do not require the producers of grapes in the Barossa Valley, Clare Valley, Coonawarra, the Southern Vales or Langhorne Creek, who get a higher price per tonne fixed for their product as a minimum price set by the Prices Commissioner, to pay (through an augmentation mechanism) supplementary income to grapegrowers in the Riverland? The argument is just as valid. Considering another industry further afield from primary industry: why is it that Ford is not required to pay through an augmentation scheme a sum of money to GMH? I am not sure where Mitsubishi fits into that—whether it would be a net contributor or a net beneficiary.

Clearly, considering the large number of wheat farmers in the marginal areas of the Mallee, why is it that by the same mechanism we do not argue for the transfer of income from wheat farmers, say in the higher yielding parts of the State, in the Mid North and on the peninsulas, to the Mallee wheat farmers, because by some measure they may be in greater crisis than the wheat farmers in the better areas to which I referred? It is stupid to imagine that it is fair and just to transfer money from one farmer to another.

Introducing legislation that compels that course of action to be followed by a third party engaged in handling the product of one farmer to another is just not fair: it is legalised theft, forcing that third party to do the stealing.

We have heard from the member for Alexandra that under this proposition the amount of money that would be transferred from one farmer to another in the event that you had, say, a herd of 130-odd cows, producing 30 000 kilograms of butterfat would be \$5 325.

That would go to a farmer with the same number of cows, producing the same amount of butterfat annually but by no means at the same rate on a weekly, monthly or seasonal basis. That amount of money would go to the farmer who was just sitting back and taking it easy, not bothered by the necessity to attend to irrigation equipment, to conserve fodder to feed out during times of the year when there is insufficient pasture available to sustain an even yield. Under this legislation that farmer would be paid \$18 390. That is because there are fewer farmers in the South-East than there are in the central region: the ratio is about one to three.

Accordingly, I find it amazing that the Government can even countenance such a thing at law. I believe it is okay if dairy farmers in the central region want to be engaged in a scheme of arrangement with other dairy farmers in the South-East. That would be an industry arrangement. In the past it has always been possible for the industry to reach agreement on the matter. Why did not the Minister show a bit more patience? Why did he not assist in arbitration? We may well ask ourselves why it did not suit the Minister to do that. Quite obviously, there is no other reason than that he simply wishes to obtain the support of the South-East dairy farmers in his grab for power for the Party to which he belongs, attempting to wrest a seat from an honourable, competent and hardworking member, the like of which the people in the South-East have never had in living memory.

Certainly, the bloke they had before the Hon. H. Allison was elected as member for Mount Gambier was in no way as intelligent, insightful or willing to be involved in consultation or to take the trouble to understand so many subjects which affect the daily, weekly and indeed total lives, of his constituents as is the current member for Mount Gambier. So, it is a grab for power, to try to pick up a seat,

as the Government knows that it will lose a heap of seats in the metropolitan area. It will not work. It will be seen for what it is, and that is, a cynical exercise.

It is not coincidental that the measure comes before the Parliament at this time, and it is not coincidental that it comes before the Parliament in its present form. When we look closely at the background of the negotiations which have been undertaken over several years, as well as in more recent times, we can see that the dairy farmers themselves had not exhausted the negotiation process between their respective organisations, namely, SADA and SEDA. The Minister had no business to meddle in this. He is meddling simply because he wants to win that seat.

Mr Whitten interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: I want to point out to the House here and now, and to the member for Price, who interjects out of his place, that this proposition is the direct antithesis of the proposition that was before the House just a few months ago, where the Minister was abolishing the South Australian Potato Board, giving exactly the opposite reasons for doing so.

The ultimate solution is the solution that the Liberal Party has proposed, and in Government in a few weeks time that is exactly what we will do: we will give the two industry groups until 31 December to negotiate an appropriate amount of funds to be transferred from the South Australian Dairymen's Association dairy farmer returns to the South-Eastern Dairymen's Association dairy farmer accounts. If an acceptable figure is not agreed by both parties by that time, an independent arbitrator will be nominated to consider all the factors and determine an appropriate amount for the transfer.

Finally, if the independent arbitrator's determination is not accepted by 31 March, we will amend the Metropolitan Milk Supply Act and enable free trade and access to the metropolitan milk market by the SEDA producers and any others who choose to seek that whole milk market from elsewhere in the State. Clearly, there is no way in which the SEDA dairy farmers could possibly afford to enter the metropolitan milk market. If they do their sums, as I said at the outset of my remarks, calculating the amount of capital that they would have to find and service at the current high interest rates, they will discover that the size of their production, its seasonal nature and the cost of getting the milk from where it is produced in the South-East to the metropolitan area will be so great as to make it less profitable than the existing arrangement they have and less profitable than selling it to Kraft or any other processor there and then on the spot.

If that happens, they will have spiked for all time and lost what had been an amicable arrangement between the dairy farmers in the central region and themselves, where they at present derive considerable benefit, without justification, in my opinion, from the milk producers in the central region.

In the time that is left to me, I underline the point that was made very forcefully by the member for Alexandra: that the authority given to the Minister of Agriculture under this Bill is designed, to use his words, by a curious and shabby means to take from one group of dairy farmers and give to another in the same industry. That action in law is unprecedented in the rural industry throughout this nation. I do not know of any other example, and I challenge the Minister at the table to cite one. It sets a very ugly precedent, indeed. By doing so, the Labor Party will live to rue the day that it ever countenanced the Pandora's Box that the Minister is opening by insisting on the passage of the measure and ultimately its proclamation.

This proposition as it stands is not necessary now. It was not necessary before, and for it to pass with such haste (without the consultation that the industry that it affects

deserves) is despicable in the extreme. I share the views expressed by the Secretary of the South Australian Dairy-men's Association, when he has said, not only in today's paper but also as recently as 25 October, that the whole proposition is 'nothing more or less than involuntary contributions to the ALP campaign in Mount Gambier'.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray): I will speak only briefly because my colleagues the members for Alexandra and Mallee have covered all of the aspects of this regrettable situation very well indeed. Right from the outset, I say that I have come over a period, in the representation that I have been able to make in this House for some 10 years, to understand many of the personal situations that dairy farmers now find themselves in and have found themselves in over that period—indeed, the plight that many of those persons who have chosen that responsibility find themselves in.

A number of areas concern me. I am amazed that we could have a Minister who would be prepared to bring in legislation such as that which we are now debating without any form of consultation with industry itself. A few dairy farmers with whom I have had the opportunity to speak since the introduction of this Bill only a week ago have been shocked at the extent of the legislation as they learn about its effects. They are particularly disturbed as a result of the lack of consultation and opportunity provided to them to have their say about what should happen to their future and their industry. As has been pointed out by my colleagues, this legislation will mean a licence fee imposed on processing companies, that the Minister will have the power to enable moneys to be distributed to South-Eastern producers on the basis of what he as a person—

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

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: It shows the extent to which the Government is showing an interest in this legislation in that there was only one person on the Government benches prior to that quorum being called, that person being the Minister responsible on the front bench. It emphasises the point that I was making: that this Government could not care less about the many people who find themselves in the very serious situation that they are in, and the more serious situation that they will find themselves in as a result of this legislation. I do not know whether the Minister at the bench at present has had the opportunity to speak personally with any of these people who will be affected. I doubt that he has: I do not know that he would be interested in doing so, but I would have thought that, with the responsibility that he has in this House in taking this legislation through on behalf of the Government, he would take the opportunity to speak to some of these people and to recognise how serious the current situation is before he was prepared to sit there on behalf of the Government to carry the legislation through this House.

As was said by my colleague before, it is a foregone conclusion, the legislation having passed the Upper House, that this legislation will now become law, and I regret that very much indeed. I was saying before the calling of the quorum that by means of the licence fee imposed on processing companies this Minister will have the power to enable moneys to be distributed to South-Eastern producers on the basis of what he—one person, one Minister, who probably is not in very close contact with what is going on; if he were, he would not introduce this legislation—believes to be equitable. The calculations that have been put before me indicate that the transfer payment to South-Eastern producers, based on returns in 1984-85, will amount to \$2.6 mil-

lion—more than double the amount of distribution currently paid under the mutually agreed terms of SADA and SEDA.

The figures that have been quoted by the member for Alexandra and the member for Mallee I will not go over again. I will be particularly pleased to be able to forward copies of the shadow Minister of Agriculture's contribution in this debate, and that contribution will clarify to a large extent the seriousness of the legislation.

In indicating that the Opposition will oppose the Bill, the shadow Minister of Agriculture has clearly defined our policy, a policy that was brought down some weeks ago when we first heard that there was a likelihood that this type of legislation was going to be round the place, when we understood the pressure that was being put on the dairy industry by the Minister who was obviously expressing political interest in what was likely to happen in the South-East rather than what was going to be good for the dairy industry generally in this State.

At that time the Liberal Party put down its position, and that has been referred to clearly by both the member for Alexandra and the member for Mallee. I can only indicate that I oppose the Bill strongly because I have come to know of the conditions under which many of the dairy farmers in the Lower Murray and hills areas are working under. Many have approached me over a long period to express their concern about their own future and that of the dairy industry in South Australia. They had hoped that this Government, along with any Government, might have accepted the responsibility of trying to assist them. That certainly has not been seen by this Government. In fact, to the contrary: it has done everything it could to get in the way of these people, rather than being able to assist them in any way whatever. I repeat what I said earlier: if the Minister on the front bench took the time to talk to some of these people he would understand just what I mean. I oppose the Bill, and I regret that so many of those people who rely on the dairy industry for their livelihood have not had the opportunity to know first hand of the absolute ramifications that will come out of this legislation in regard to their future. I join with the shadow Minister, my colleague the member for Alexandra, and the member for Mallee in opposing the Bill.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I oppose the Bill. In the 12 or 13 years I have been in Parliament I have never seen such a despicable Bill. I say that in all sincerity. The Bill seeks to manipulate for Party political purposes—that is all one can put it down to. There is no other industry in this State where such a scheme is set up and, more particularly, there is no other area or industry in this State where it has been directed so much for Party political purposes.

I know that the Minister is in today's press saying that they were nasty things to say. However, I refer to his media release of 24 October 1985, the release from the Hon. Frank Blevins in which the third paragraph states:

As a result of that—

referring to the above issues—

and strong representations from ALP candidate for Mount Gambier, Peter Humphries, Mr Blevins says he has decided to legislate to ensure South-East producers receive a more equitable share in the returns from milk market sales.

This sets the precedent for every other industry in the State to be put up for a similar scheme. Just a moment ago the member for Mallee talked about the prawn fishing industry. An identical scheme could be applied to that. We could drag down the efficient producers to prop up the inefficient producers.

I do not know the individual situation of milk producers in the South-East. What I do know is that they are being subsidised by their colleagues in other areas who, through

their good planning, have been able to develop an industry and share in better prices for their commodity. One could say the same about the fat lamb industry. I know what the same Minister, only a short while ago, said about dismantling the meat industry in my area, but there was not one word of consideration, compensation or anything like that to help out the producers being disadvantaged. None at all. It did not suit the purpose.

This time it does suit the purpose and, in the Minister's own words, it is to help the ALP candidate for Mount Gambier. Let us not kid ourselves. This is a Party political Bill designed to interfere in the normal administration of an industry, and it is one that is designed with ulterior motives. Even more than that, it sets a precedent and we could have other industries involved in the same way. As I stated, my knowledge of the milk industry in South Australia is limited: I have only five milk producers in my district, but it concerns me that one section of the industry has been asked to fork out and subsidise \$2.2 million for another. I would like to question whether that other section of the industry pays exactly the same council rates, overheads, including the cost of land and whether other costs are anywhere near the same value.

I see no reference to any equalisation of that aspect—none whatever. This Bill takes the cream from the top (I suppose that is the right expression when talking about a dairy industry Bill). About 10 years ago production quotas for manufacturing were set and the Adelaide area, which is roughly a radius of 80 kilometres around Adelaide, produces about 250 million litres of milk, of which 100 million litres per annum is used for the Adelaide whole milk market. This means that 60 per cent of Adelaide production goes to the manufacturing industry.

In the South-East the roles are quite different: 95 per cent of the milk produced in the South-East goes to the manufacturing industry. In the South-East they have been producing for a different sort of market: they have been producing for a different market ever since they have produced milk. I am not aware whether the percentage of whole milk being produced in the South-East is much different in ratio, but now they have seen colleagues in another part of the State who have had access to a better market and so they have put the pressure on by bartering one way or another putting pressure on Governments and members of Parliament, and so on, so that they can in fact benefit by a better managed and better located industry in another part of the State.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: They've capitalised on the opportunity—

Mr BLACKER: I cannot comment on the actual industry but the shadow Minister, the member for Alexandra, indicates that there are commercial interests in this as well. I understand that the agreement setting up the initial augmentation scheme was undertaken in good faith by honest and credible people who signed an augmentation agreement under the seal of their respective organisations. It was done with every correct legal principle that one could possibly think of, yet the Government has come in and said, 'Bad luck fellows, we are going to do as we please anyway.' Only a day ago we were debating the gas Bill and the breaking of agreements, and here the Government is stepping in again to break another legally binding agreement.

I wonder where the State is going when the Government carries on in this way. When the original agreement was signed I understand that a 10 per cent apportionment was equivalent to about \$1.1 million; at today's prices 10 per cent is equivalent to about \$1.7 million, which I understand is very close to the compromise offered from the South Australian Dairymen's Association. In fact, I believe the latest figure is in the vicinity of \$1.693 million. The Bill

provides that the figure should be \$2.2 million instead of \$1.693 million.

Let us look at that from another point of view. What will all the Adelaide voters—the people who support the Government and Opposition members in the metropolitan area—say about it? The cost of milk will rise by 2.2c a litre under this Bill. It is all very nice to say that that price rise will be absorbed in someone else's costs. Let us face facts. The price set down is based on production costs. We can call it what we like, but it is a production cost to primary industry and to producers. Somewhere along the line someone will have to pay for the increase. The Bill increases the price of milk in this State by 2.2c a litre. Government members cannot get away from that fact, because that is exactly what it does.

The Bill is scrounging out of the consumers of this State an extra \$400 000 to make up the difference that was offered to South-East producers by the South Australian Dairymen's Association. I could go on for some time talking about the inconsistencies of the Bill if we compare it with the agriculture and manufacturing industries. Because of the location of those industries they have access to better markets, so why should we not equalise? In fact in this House not so very long ago the Premier flatly refused fuel equalisation. That is the other side of the question, but why is it not possible? Why should one section of the community be disadvantaged as opposed to another? Why should we not have equalisation in relation to fuel and other commodities? That relates to production costs; on the other side, why should we not have equalisation in relation to wool and livestock? There is always a penalty depending on the location of the industry. If we could equalise those penalties, I would be happier because my district would benefit tremendously.

I refer to a letter from the General Secretary of the South Australian Dairymen's Association, Mr David Higbed, dated 25 October 1985 and addressed to the Hon. Frank Blevins. The letter is headed 'Augmentation Scheme' and it states:

Dear Minister, I have perused the Bill to amend the Metropolitan Milk Supply Act and the second reading speech thereto, and note, with some surprise, your claim that '... this aspect of the augmentation agreement (i.e. the 42 per cent clause) has frustrated South-East producers'. I believe I must reiterate, before debate on the Bill, begins, or, if I may so presume, before many more public statements are made concerning the Bill, some facts relating to the augmentation scheme that may otherwise be in danger of being overlooked.

First, the augmentation scheme was the result of negotiation between the two associations (in the case of SEDA, with the assistance of the managers of their three dairy companies). It was neither unilateral nor made under duress.

Second, the 'letter of intent', which is the fabric of the scheme, is signed by both associations, under their Common Seals.

Third, in the 6 years of the scheme's operation this association has observed the terms of the agreement to the letter. In so far as the 42 per cent clause is concerned, it is part of the 'letter of intent', and this association has no mandate to dispose of the legal property of Central Region dairyfarmers without formal renegotiation of the scheme in respect to this or any other clause.

I believe that to be a fair and reasonable assessment. Of course, the Dairymen's Association cannot dispose of its members' assets, but that is obviously what the Minister intends. The letter continues:

Fourth, the South East Dairymen's Association has not, at any time, informed us either of their desire for a renegotiation of the 42 per cent clause or of the 'frustration' that you ascribe to them, or of any wish to change any other item in the agreement. Certainly, we were, as you are aware, informed of a resolution passed by the ALP State Conference, but we must confess that such is a very odd channel for communication between two organisations that are in frequent contact over industry matters.

Nevertheless, upon becoming acquainted with the ALP Conference resolution, we changed the direction of the discussions that we had already initiated with SEDA in connection with the effect of new federal legislation on the augmentation scheme, toward the now emergent dissatisfaction, and offered to remove

immediately (i.e. for 1985-86) the alleged cause of their frustration, and to change from annual payments to periodical instalments.

Following rejection of this gesture we offered to increase the contribution immediately (i.e. for 1985-86) to 10 per cent. May I presume to emphasise that we are dealing with millions of dollars of other people's money, which we hold in trust, and which we have been disbursing in strict accordance with the terms of a document under the Seals of both parties, concerning which we have received no notification of dissatisfaction?

I believe that the Government should heed those words. The letter concludes:

One does not, in these circumstances, rush to change such arrangements in response to nothing more than sale-yard rumours and second-hand reports or, may we add, decisions of political Parties of either persuasion.

May I also draw your attention to the last paragraph of your letter of 30 May 1984 in which you state "... I wish ... to reiterate my earlier advice that it is not proposed to introduce these amendments unless they are necessary to ensure full implementation of the Augmentation Scheme"?

Is "full Implementation" now in doubt? Yours sincerely, David J. Higbed, General Secretary.

I believe that letter adequately sets out the issues that are at stake in relation to this Bill. I refer to concerns about the equalisation proposal and the calculation of the licence fee. From my brief assessment I understand it is anticipated that something in the vicinity of \$20 000 will be retained out of this scheme for the administration of the collection of funds.

Further reading of the Bill does not disclose anything that limits the amount of money that can be taken out. Effectively, this could well become a taxation measure for this State, because the Government could say—as I have seen occur in the fishing industry and a number of other industries—that \$20 000 does not cover the cost and it would like a bit more. Eventually it is no longer a cost recovery measure but income earning revenue and, in fact, it becomes a resource tax on the industry.

I see this measure as a foot in the door to establish a resource tax on primary industry. The Government has already done that in the fishing industry, although for many years it has denied that it is a resource tax. The Minister has now admitted that fishing licences in fact amount to a resource tax. On the strength of that, where do we go? We are in fact signing an open cheque with this legislation. I believe that the measure should be opposed in every way possible.

I refer to the rather unfortunate position that the member for Mount Gambier finds himself in. He has been placed in a compromise situation not of his choosing but because his colleagues in another place have not been able to exercise their numbers, and we see this time and time again. We are fighting a lost cause in this House, because the Bill has already passed the other place without so much as a division. Therefore, what hope do we have of voicing any opposition to it or amending it? The Opposition should have the numbers in another place to do something about this, but the Opposition in this place is in a position where it can do nothing.

I am not at all interested in what the Democrats did on it, but I do understand and know that the numbers were there and should have been there to enable those members to exercise if they really wanted to do so. I believe that the Minister has been manipulating this industry for Party political purposes. He has demonstrated a cleverness and cunningness to be able to manipulate two areas of the dairying industry in South Australia. He has schemed very effectively and very cleverly and, if one were looking at it from an outside viewpoint and looking to score points on his ability to manipulate the political system, at the current time the Minister would score well. To that end he has been treating the Opposition like puppets, dangling them on a string. I

do not enjoy being dangled on a string, and I do not think many members on this side of the House like it, either.

In today's paper we see yet another report that the Minister is reacting to the dairy claim. It states that Mr Blevins said that he had decided to act only after year long negotiations between central and South-East dairy farmers ended in a deadlock. In documentation that I have read into the record and from what the member for Alexandra, the shadow Minister has put to the House, we know that it is utter rubbish to suggest that. Yet, the Minister goes on claiming quite proudly that he has done that.

He reflected also on Mr Higbed and said that what Mr Higbed stated regarding increased milk prices was absolute nonsense. What is absolute nonsense? Is the 2.2 cents per litre absolute nonsense? Who will pay it? Dairy farmers prices are set on the cost of production, so the price obviously must go up, because the price that they are already receiving is set on cost of production figures. So, the 2.2 cents, which is the difference in the augmentation scheme about which we are talking is an extra \$400 000 on top of the \$1 693 000, and it becomes a cost of production. We can put no other connotation on it.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: I do not know what the Minister did with the Milk Board, but we do know that \$400 000 is coming out of someone's pocket. Is it coming from the producers, the processors or the consumers? As I have indicated, it will come out of the consumer's pocket ultimately. In the short term it will not, as there will not be any great announcement of a 2.2 cents increase in milk prices—certainly not before the election. But, immediately after that the money has to be made up. It cannot be made up out of the producers' share as their price is set by the Milk Board. That price is set on a cost of production basis.

This Bill causes me a great deal of concern. I have not seen nor heard in this House a Bill of such parallel. If one tried to reflect on how this Bill could or would apply in any other industry in this State, one would realise that chaos would occur. I cannot believe that the issue got through the other House without a division. I think I can understand why, but I do not believe that any clear thinking person could accept that there is a logical explanation to that. I hope that in the 20 minutes I have spoken on this issue I have expressed my view as clearly as possible.

I urge this House to oppose the issue in the strongest possible way. I do not believe that for Party political motivating purposes we should impose on consumers in this State an additional 2.2 cents per litre.

It is unfair, unreasonable and should be seen for what it is: a blatant Party political manoeuvre to try to win a seat which the Government of the day believes it might have a chance of winning. I strongly oppose the Bill.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Fisher): I oppose the Bill.

Ms Lenehan interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: I do not want to tell an honourable member who happens to be out of her seat that—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Appleby): I ask the honourable member not to interject out of her seat.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I do not need to add to what has been said, as those who have spoken have dealt with the problems in the Bill. I have a vested interest in that my family has a dairy and are registered producers. I have recognised for years that the South-East producers have never been prepared to produce or attempt to provide milk in reasonable quantities all year round. They are fair weather farmers when it comes to dairy produce, and I say that quite fairly. They will admit that in the main they want to produce in the high production part of the season, when there is plenty of good fodder around. If they had to produce in the tough

times, when there was not much fodder, it would entail a lot of hand feeding with fodder having to be carted some distance and that would make it less economic or even uneconomical.

They had their own cooperative but unfortunately it was not successful. One can blame bad management or whatever. I blame bad management. It failed, and Kraft had to move in and help back it up to get it back on its feet. Kraft then wanted to pay a measly amount for what it wanted to use for the production of cheese and then undersell others through the retail market. That is a benefit to consumers, but only until such time as the company can exploit the consumers, which often happens with some of the bigger operators involved in the manufacture of food throughout this country and with some of the big retail outlets. That is the difficulty that those with my philosophy have in judging what is free enterprise and what is improper free enterprise. That is how exploitation can eventually occur. In the initial stages they exploit the producer and in the long term exploit both the producer and the consumer if that is the best way to operate the business on a large scale.

Why do we take this action? We say that we are trying to equalise. I will not get into the Party political debate on this, as commonsense tells each and every one of us why it is here. Madam Acting Speaker, you would not know much about the dairy industry. At least that comment has one member moving back into her right seat.

Ms Lenehan interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr S.G. EVANS: I am sure that you, Madam Acting Speaker, would know, as would the member for Mawson, that if at some time in the future there has to be an increase in the price of milk because of this legislation, and if that increase in price takes place under a Government of another philosophy, there will be an outcry by every metropolitan member of the opposite viewpoint that milk has gone up and that the Party in office is to blame. However, the blame will lie with this legislation. Each and every one of us who is involved in the political scene knows that if there is an extra cost to the industry and if the price at which one sells the commodity is based on the cost of producing the commodity, the consumer will pay or some of the producers will go insolvent. It is one or the other—commonsense tells us that. There are not many ifs and buts about it.

The future will show the truth of that statement and will show the reactions of individuals at that time depending on whether they are in or out of power; we all know that. I suppose all members know that the seat of Mount Gambier has been a touchy one for a long time. Millicent was in the same position and has been a politically sensitive area. We went through the potato debate and that was a hot potato to handle. We now have a milk debate with a bit of sourness in it; it has gone off a bit.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Fisher is making this speech—no-one else.

Mr S.G. EVANS: In fairness to the honourable member, I will answer him. I have none personally, I do have a third share in a business that is licensed, but I do not work in it, nor do I take any profit or money from it—and I have not done so for some 15 years, because I believe that the members of my family who have worked hard to make a few bob out of it deserve it. I cannot be more forthright. I have a vested interest. I hope that that enlightens the member for Unley as to my interest in that field. That would not alter my attitude.

Over the years I have probably represented more of the Hills milk producers than has any other member, but I have lost a lot of them. There are only two milk producers in the area which I am fighting for now. I am worried about

the consumers in that area. My interests have changed. All I know from this Bill is that the consumers of Davenport will have to pay extra for their milk. I oppose the legislation. I believe that the Government has made this move from Cabinet and that most of the Government's backbenchers do not know what effect it will have on either the producers or the consumers. Only the future will tell. I know that the vote cannot be won on this side, and I could talk for a full half hour, but nothing would be gained by that. It is already decided. The Government has the numbers and this Bill will pass once it goes through the Upper House. That is where it lies. I merely register my concern and objections. The fate of the Bill is already decided, but I oppose it.

Mr MATHWIN (Gleneig): I oppose the Bill. It is a bad Bill, one that was brought in specifically in an attempt to buy back the seat of Mount Gambier. Indeed, this Bill seeks authority at law to enable the Minister to take large sums of money from certain farmers' returns without their authority. That is what it is all about. In fact, I understand that it will take out \$2 060 000. That is the sum that we are talking about in relation to this Bill.

The Bill, which gives the Minister of Agriculture authority, has been designed by a curious and shabby method to take from one group of dairy farmers and give to another group in the same industry. That is its basis. This action is unprecedented in the rural industry and is Party politically loaded. Without any shadow of doubt, the reason for its introduction is that the Government wished to attempt to buy back the seat of Mount Gambier, having failed to do so on many previous occasions.

There is no doubt that, like all things and all Bills and actions of this nature, it means that someone has to pay, and it will be the city consumers who will pay—you and I and our friends and relations, and all the people who live in the metropolitan area, will pay this extra money to the tune of between 2c and 3c a litre. I note that the Minister of Agriculture commented in today's *News* in reply to Mr David Higbed, who claimed that the move would cause a jump in milk prices and that it was only a political move designed to buy back votes in Mount Gambier. The report stated:

We object to being forced to being involuntary contributors to the Australian Labor Party campaign in Mount Gambier, Mr Higbed said.

In reply, the Minister of Agriculture said, in part:

What Mr Higbed says about increased milk prices is absolute nonsense. The price is set by the Metropolitan Milk Board.

What a thing for a Minister, a learned man, to say! That is ridiculous. He knows darn well, the same as all other members in this House know, that someone has to pay, and it must be the consumers, the little people of this State, those who have to buy more milk. That is usually the bigger families. I recall that when I had a large family at home—five children—we got through gallons of milk, but now that I live by myself I am going to drink a pint in two or three days. It is the little people, those who can ill afford it, who will have to foot the Bill and pay extra for this bit of socialist legislation. That is what it is—it is socialism in its rawest form. Let us consider—

The Hon. Ted Chapman: It is \$2 060 000 every year.

Mr. MATHWIN: As my friend from Alexandra has just prompted, it is \$2 060 000—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Alexandra is not supposed to be prompting, and I can hear too much noise coming from the Government side of the House.

Mr MATHWIN: Thank you, Madam Acting Speaker. I ask honourable members to take note of that. There is too much noise on the other side.

The **ACTING SPEAKER**: Order! The member for Glenelg will heed the Chair and continue with his speech.

Mr Oswald interjecting:

The **ACTING SPEAKER**: And the member for Morphett is interjecting out of his seat.

Ms Lenehan interjecting:

The **ACTING SPEAKER**: I do not need the assistance of the member for Mawson.

Mr **MATHWIN**: Thank you, Madam Acting Speaker. I think we should all have a drink of milk to calm ourselves down. The sum involved is \$2 060 000 a year. It is not just a one-off payment. It will occur annually. That is the situation. Let us consider the figures in relation to milk production. South Australian milk production reached a peak of 483 million litres in 1969-70. Production has since declined to 382 million litres in 1983-84. South Australian butter production has declined dramatically since the 1940s. Of course, we all know that people suggested that we would get ill if we ate too much butter and that therefore we should eat margarine. Now we learn that margarine has plenty of fat in it, so a lot of people are going back to butter because it tastes much nicer.

Cheese production has increased from about 10 000 tonnes in the 1940s and 1950s to 25 000 tonnes in 1983-84. Of course, therein lies a story, because I believe that Australian cheese has developed so well over the period I have been here that we are in a situation (and we probably have been for the past five or six years from my gleaning as a layman) where we export cheese to some countries that pride themselves on making very good cheese, one being Holland.

We cover the widest range of cheese in Australia. We produce fetta cheese, which of course is made from goats milk—so that is not really covered in this Bill, and I should not have mentioned it. We also produce gruyere cheese, a Swiss cheese that we imitate. That, of course, is the basis for the excellent fondue dish. Bread placed on long forks is dipped in schnapps, then it is dipped into hot cheese, stirred around and eaten.

The rule in Switzerland is that if you drop the bread in the cheese you pay for the wine, which is a good system if you can hold your bread. Another cheese for which we are renowned in Australia as producing very well is Cheshire cheese, and Cheshire is close to where I was living in the United Kingdom. Cheddar cheese, which is a redder and a mild cheese, is also produced successfully here. Our mature cheese, particularly that from the Victor Harbor area, is second to none in taste. There is nothing finer than a good cheese.

Cheese production increased to 25 000 tonnes in 1983-84. This augurs well for the industry. The Bill deals with milk, which is used to produce cheese. When I was in Switzerland, I saw gruyere cheese being produced and shared in the pleasures of eating it in a fondue. My main fear as a metropolitan member, and a layman who enjoys his cheese, is the cost of this legislation to ordinary people of this State who buy cheese. They will be stunned, as the member for Fisher said earlier. Unfortunately, by the time the wheels of this plot turn the Government will have changed hands. We will be in government and will be criticised for increasing the cost of milk, if this Bill passes, which no doubt it will because the Government has the numbers and we will get rolled on this Bill. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT AND EMPLOYMENT BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it insisted on its amendments to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the House of Assembly insist on its disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments.

Motion carried.

A message was sent to the Legislative Council requesting a conference at which the House of Assembly would be represented by Messrs Baker, Bannon, Eastick, Ferguson, and Ms Lenehan.

PARLIAMENT (JOINT SERVICES) BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it insisted on its amendments to which the House of Assembly had disagreed. Consideration in Committee.

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

That the House of Assembly insist on its disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments.

Motion carried.

A message was sent to the Legislative Council requesting a conference at which the House of Assembly would be represented by Messrs Eastick, M.J. Evans, Gunn, Keneally, and Trainer.

METROPOLITAN MILK SUPPLY ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).
(Continued from page 1895.)

Mr **MATHWIN**: When I was speaking previously I had reached the stage where I was going to comment on the horrible effects that this Bill will have on the industry. New section 30aa (2) states:

(b) a fee calculated, as prescribed by regulation, by reference to the quantity of milk treated by the licence holder during the relevant antecedent period.

This paragraph means that the area referred to will be controlled by regulation. I think that governing by regulation is a most dangerous practice. When the Minister replies to the second reading debate, I would like him to indicate what the regulation will be. What does a Government have in mind in relation to this part of the Bill. New section 30ab (1) provides:

(b) the board may, by written notice served personally or by post on the licence holder, suspend the licence until the fee is paid.

Members will recognise that the Minister has considerable power under this Bill and can direct the board. New section 30ab provides:

(4) where a milk treatment licence has been under suspension for 3 months or more, the Minister may, by notice in writing to the holder of the licence, cancel the licence.

This provision gives the board and the Minister power to finish any person in the industry if they so desire, with a stroke of the pen. New section 30ac (2) states:

(a) declare that an equalisation scheme, in the terms stated in the notice, shall come into force as from the date stated in the notice;

In good socialist terms, I suppose that 'equalisation' means social justice. New section 30ac (4) provides:

In this section—'equalisation scheme' means a scheme providing for the payment of amounts from the fund to, or for the benefit of, licenced producers of milk or any specified class of such producers.

That provision plainly indicates that 'equalisation' is similar to socialisation. Perhaps it is social justice to some people. This Bill is not a good Bill. To put it into plain Australian,

it is a crook Bill. I do not support it because it means that metropolitan consumers will pay more for milk. These consumers in the metropolitan area are people, in the main, who have young families, and need large supplies of milk. They can ill afford to pay an extra two or three cents a litre for their milk. Irrespective of what the Minister said in the *News* and in his statement today, consumers will pay. The Minister and the Government knows that the little people—those with young families—will pay. I oppose the Bill.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Much has been canvassed in this debate and at 11.26 p.m. I do not intend to repeat the information that has been given. The member for Alexandra's speech will go down in history as epitomising an explanation in clear, full detail of what the Bill sets out to do and where the dairy industry currently is, as well as analysing future thoughts and guidelines on this matter. That speech may be referred to in future years as the Chapman report. I urge members to consider seriously what has been put forward by the member for Alexandra. This Bill, to me, seems to be an underhand method of endeavouring to redistribute wealth. It is a desperate measure to buy votes. Lately we have seen many measures—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Too much sound is coming from the righthand side of the Chamber. I ask that that noise desist.

Mr MEIER: It is a pity that members are not paying more attention to this important Bill. Many examples of late show how vote catching is going on. The classic example is the \$3 million given to people with building society loans. We here see the Minister of Agriculture's deciding what is best for the dairy industry. It is interesting to note that this idea seems to have come from a motion of the ALP candidate for Mount Gambier, which stated:

The conference recognises that the South Australian dairy industry is a Statewide industry and that producers in the South-East should be granted a more equitable share of the market milk premium.

There is nothing wrong in a person moving such a motion. What is wrong is for the Minister to take action without proper, or possibly any, real consultation with the two main groups involved. It seems that the Minister is determined to go his own way and does not care less what the average person in the industry thinks. That is to be very strongly condemned. This Bill provides that, by means of a licence fee imposed on processing companies, the Minister will have power to enable moneys to be distributed to South-East producers on what he believes to be an equitable basis.

The amount of money is not insignificant: we are looking at something like \$2.06 million. It is clear that the Government is coming to the end of a disastrous three years in office. It realises that the people of South Australia have given it up. However, it is determined to try at any cost to hang on to power. If it can buy votes in this way it will do so, as it is doing with this Bill. I strongly oppose it and hope that it means that this Government's end is coming very soon, because if this sort of legislation were introduced into other areas of rural industry, or industry generally, we would be completely and utterly on the wrong track. I oppose the Bill.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education): Many words have been spoken about this matter during 3½ hours of speeches: some contained words of wisdom; others were rather frivolous and some were quite irrational. I am intrigued to note that the analysis of the Bill given by some members is quite at odds, as was pointed out by the member for Flinders, with attitudes expressed in another place.

The member for Flinders is quite correct in saying that the measure went through that place without a division.

The views there were different from the Opposition views in this place. The Hon. Mr Lucas indicated that he would support the Bill. It is fair to interpret his support as similar to that of the member for Mount Gambier as an interim and short term measure, which was the gist of the Hon. Mr Lucas's support as well. The Hon. Mr Dunn indicated that he did not support the Bill. In this place we have heard varying opinions such as those—

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I read the Hon. Martin Cameron's speech, but I failed to find his coming up with a view at all, although in the last line he said he believed it was necessary to have more discussion on this matter. That is the best I could get out of his speech as to where he stood in relation to this matter: maybe I did not read it closely enough.

He said a number of things that indicated that there might be some merit in the proposition, as I recall from my reading of it. Many people have raised the issue of the precipitate way in which this matter came about. I draw attention to the words of my colleague the Minister of Agriculture in another place when he spoke on 30 October during the second reading stage of the Bill, as follows:

On the first occasion I went to Mount Gambier as Minister of Agriculture the first person I saw was a representative of the South-East Dairymen's Association.

They came to see me and asked, 'Were you elected on a platform of legislating for a more equitable share of the market if the present system does not deliver?' I said, 'That is correct.' They asked, 'Will you legislate?' and I said, 'At the moment, no. I have no interest in legislating. If you sort out the problems yourselves, as you appear to be doing, I will not legislate, but if it is necessary I will legislate.'

That is really the genesis of where we are with respect to this legislation. It is important for honourable members to pay attention to that and not try to put the suggestion that 24 October was the first time that this matter became part of the public province.

It goes back before that time in terms of activities of my colleague the Minister of Agriculture and clearly goes back further than that in terms of a general issue for public discussion. I was interested to spend time this evening, while listening to honourable members, reading details of the Webb committee of inquiry which, in one sense, is another starting point for some of the issues we have here tonight. It is not as though this issue is a Johnny-come-lately; it is not. It has been around for quite some time.

The Minister of Agriculture said that he did not propose to legislate at that point, some time ago, because he believed that industry could work it out for itself, but if it could not he would consider legislation. In that context discussions took place. Perhaps it is fair to say that they did not work out totally to the acceptance of both sides. As I understand it, that resulted in the 1984-85 payment not being paid between—

The Hon. Ted Chapman: That's not true.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The member for Alexandra says, 'That's not true'. I am prepared to accept—

The Hon. H. Allison: It's always paid late.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I take the point made. On 8 October the South-East Dairymen's Association wrote to the Minister of Agriculture—not the ALP candidate for Mount Gambier—and said:

On Monday, 7 October a meeting of South-East dairy farmers was held to hear the proposals from the SEDA and SADA respectively on sharing the State's market milk pool. After Mr Lance Clements of the SEDA and Mr Aub Kreschmer of the SADA had outlined their proposals the meeting was asked to determine whether the SADA proposal should be accepted. The meeting then decided that the SADA offer was inadequate, and the offer was rejected.

At this point, the executives of the SEDA and SADA formally agreed that negotiations between the two bodies had broken down and nothing could be achieved in further meetings between the two bodies on the market milk share issue. The meeting then passed a motion that you be formally asked to intervene on behalf of the SEDA, to determine the South-East's equitable share of the market milk pool, and to introduce in the current sitting of Parliament the necessary legislation to ensure that this equitable share is paid to South-East dairy farmers on a prompt and regular basis.

As both our association and the SADA believe that further negotiations would be fruitless, we now request that you honour the undertaking given in the Parliament, that you would intervene once it became apparent that negotiations between the SEDA and the SADA had broken down. In view of assurances given by yourself and the local ALP candidate Mr Humphries, on your behalf, we are confident that we can rely upon you to take prompt decisive actions on this matter. Our President, Mr Lance Clements, and the committee of the SEDA would be pleased to provide any information and assistance you may require in determining what constitutes the South-East's fair share of the market milk pool.

At about the time that that letter was received by my colleague, Mr David Higbed, General Secretary of the South Australian Dairy Farmers Association, also wrote to the Minister a very detailed letter putting forward aspects of the SEDA and SADA propositions. I am certain that that information is well known to members in this place, so I will not read it all, but I will quote certain parts of the letter. He wrote on the same day (7 October) immediately after the meeting on Monday night, as follows:

We report that the dairy farmers in the South-East region, at a general meeting held at the Compton Hall on the night of Monday, 7 October 1985, rejected the offer made by this association for a revised augmentation scheme, supporting, instead, a request for ministerial intervention. As we recall, the text of the resolution passed by the meeting did not contain overt support for the counter-proposal of the South-East Dairyfarmers' Association, but it is assumed that the counter-proposal was seen, by those present, as providing a parameter for your guidance.

As I read from that letter, it was not only a parameter for guidance; it was clearly a request for legislation. It should also be noted, and I know my colleague and all members in the House are aware of this, that the SADA has its own views on the matter. In fairness, I will quote from the letter:

As you are aware, we would be most reluctant to see the industry subjected to further legislation. We are proud of our tradition of self-regulation, and believe that it has contributed much to the stability that has hitherto been the hallmark of the dairy industry in this State. We cannot, however, overturn the decision made by our colleagues in the South-East, nor can we distance ourselves from the political intrigue that has, regrettably, clouded our negotiations during the past four months.

The point is acknowledged that this is a decision made in the South-East which needed a reaction. It was in that context that my colleague the Minister of Agriculture in another place decided to pursue the matter further: he took it to Cabinet and into Parliament. Members should also note that on 8 October there was an awareness both in the SEDA and SADA that this was a matter that had come before the Minister's attention for his concern.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: The doubt had been cast back at the June conference—you know that.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I return to the speech made by my colleague in another place all that time ago. On his first visit to Mount Gambier, and shortly after he became Minister of Agriculture, he made the point that if discussions did not take place and result in a conclusion, he would introduce this legislation.

It is important to raise one other point on this matter which relates to a point raised by the member for Mallee, who in the hyperbole of his speech issued a challenge to the Minister to proclaim the legislation before the election. I will quote what my colleague in another place said, because it is quite clear that this is part of a process that could possibly lead to further discussions:

When this legislation passes I will approach the parties again and say, 'I now have the authority to do something about it. I

did not have the authority previously. I can make suggestions as I have done for 2½ years, but I have not been successful with the various propositions so now I have the authority to do something. Parliament has given me that authority.'

That was in anticipation of the passage of the Bill through this place. He further said:

However, I still do not want to use that authority and if you come to an agreement the legislation will not be proclaimed.

That is clearly following on from the request made by SEDA, which was quite appropriate, and which indicates that nevertheless it does not close the door to further negotiations on this matter. It is hoped that those negotiations will in fact take place and that some acceptable agreement will be arrived at.

By contrast I note that the Liberal Party stance on this matter is a different one and, of course, has been quoted tonight in the House. It wants further negotiations, so to that extent I suppose there is a similarity. It then wants to appoint an independent arbitrator and says that, if the independent arbitrator's determination is not accepted, the Metropolitan Milk Supply Act should be amended to enable free trade and access to the metropolitan marketplace by SEDA producers.

The member for Mallee, who supported that proposition, then went on to say that they would all go broke, so I would like to know exactly where his concern for the South-East producers actually lies. There are a number of other points that I need to raise. First, I make those points because, in the hyperbole of the debate that has gone before, there was a suggestion that the Minister in another place has attempted to superimpose his authority and that 'he has jumped into and has abused the system.'

I do not believe that any of that quite correctly reflects the situation that is before us on this occasion. However, there are some other points that have been raised by members which I need to address and which I shall come to one at a time. The question has been raised: what about other areas of the State? I can advise that it is intended that only South-East producers will be involved. The principal reason for that is that the advice I have is that the producers in other areas such as Port Lincoln, the Mid North, the Riverland or the electorate of Glenelg do not want to be involved in an equalisation scheme. The specified class on page 3, clause 4, can mean anyone, but in this instance will mean producers who are members of the South-East market milk equalisation scheme. The reason that others do not want to be part of it is that they will be financially disadvantaged, because they are involved more in the production of market milk.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Alexandra had his opportunity to discuss this Bill and the Minister is now responding, not the member for Alexandra.

Mr Becker: He's not responding very well.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Nor the member for Hanson.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The advice that I have is that the producers in other areas do not want to be involved because they perceive that they may be financially disadvantaged by such a scheme. That is the advice that I have on the matter and all that I can say on it. As on previous occasions with answers I have given on agricultural Bills, I will have the matter checked by my staff and my colleague and any appropriate insertions will be made in *Hansard* if adjustments need to be made.

One of the points that I want to make is that a number of members in this place have indicated the gross financial impost, as they wish to interpret it, that will be imposed on producers in the metropolitan region and indeed the likely impact that will have upon consumers. I think what should

be noted is that there have already been significant sums of money paid over recent years as part of the voluntary equalisation scheme—something of the order of \$800 000 or \$900 000 per annum. As I understand it, in the current negotiations Metro Supplies has offered \$1.7 million and the South-East producers are pursuing a figure of \$2.2 million, so we are talking about a figure that has already been agreed within that range. In fact, \$1.7 million has already been offered and that certainly means that that is the baseline figure—it would not be a lesser figure than that.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: That's the top line.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: It is rather an odd top line if you enter negotiations and say, 'My top line is \$1.65 million or \$1.7 million and from this point I will come down to a lower figure in the discussions.' I fail to understand that kind of negotiating, or to see that that would be a positive way to enter any negotiations.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: They cut up the \$1.98 million, so what are you talking about?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I am talking about the position in relation to SEDA and SADA. They seem to range between about \$1.7 million for SADA and \$2.2 million for SEDA. The other matter of some concern to South-East dairymen is that various what might be interpreted as ruses, in their opinion, have prevented full implementation of the equalisation scheme entered into some years ago, and this has stopped the scheme reaching a level of payment that the dairymen might have anticipated. I guess that that is a matter for argument and conjecture between the various parties involved. Some will argue that the 42 per cent rule has not been unfairly used, while others will argue that it has been. The basic outcome of all that is that discussions did not result in a concurrence of view on that matter.

Another point that has been raised by a number of people—indeed it was referred to in the Webb Committee of Inquiry—concerns the role of Kraft. It is true that Kraft is a company that has a relatively low base manufacturing price, but I have been advised that, notwithstanding, that does not constitute the full picture. I am advised that the Kraft company pays a bonus at the end of the year, which usually increases by some 60c. So, in fact, it is almost equal to the amount applying in the metropolitan area. I believe that members were rather free and easy in some of their criticisms of the Kraft company, and I would be interested to know whether or not they accept as being correct the adjustment being made later in each financial year.

The amount transferred will be based on what the Government determines as an equitable share of the market milk premium to be made available to the South-East. Of course, that matter will depend on certain factors, and that is why it is proposed to include that arrangement in the regulations.

The other point raised by the member for Alexandra as shadow Minister of Agriculture was that the Metropolitan Milk Board did not know any of the details of the regulations. I am advised that it does know precisely the details of the regulations and has been advised of that accordingly. Indeed, the regulations have already been introduced, I understand, and are available to the Milk Board.

As to the number of suppliers, the member for Mallee referred to the fact that apparently there are 1 300 metropolitan producers. Information that I have indicates that there are 940 metropolitan producers, 268 South-East producers and 122 producers in other parts of the State, making a total of 1 330.

Then the matter of who will end up paying for this measure was referred to—whether it will be the consumer or whether the cost will be borne by the producers. Of course, the situation is that, to date, it has been borne by the producer, and it is proposed that that situation will

continue. The advice that I have indicates that section 41 of the principal Act empowers the Milk Board to fix prices paid to producers, to factories, and by the public to retailers.

The board can vary these prices. Therefore, the board will reduce the amount to be paid to producers by the amount that equates to the sum paid by way of licence fees. The cost paid by the public to retailers will remain at 69c. The honourable member queried that, and that is the advice I have on this matter.

Various members raised the point about the numbers here in the House, indicating that obviously the Bill will get through. However, the Bill got through the Upper House, where the Government does not have a majority. Many of the other comments on this Bill made by members came down, as I said before, to a level of hyperbole that was quite bizarre. The member for Mallee claimed the Bill is crook, the member for Flinders claimed it is the back door resource tax being imposed, etc. I note that the member for Mount Gambier saw through all that and realised that the Bill was trying to meet the needs of dairy farmers in the South-East, and he did not allow himself to get carried away to quite the same degree of verbal extravaganza. Another matter was raised by the member for Murray, who indicated his opposition to the Bill and asked whether I had spoken to the people involved. It is more appropriate that the Minister of Agriculture is the person who speaks with people in this area: I am just the Minister in this House representing my colleague from another place.

It would be an unusual legislative procedure if the Ministers in both Houses, one the Minister primarily responsible and the other representing him, both sought to carry on separate consultations with respect to people involved in the industry. I find that a very quaint way of doing business, because I believe it would be a misuse of ministerial time and a misuse of the lobbying group's time in being involved in two lots of discussions rather than one. I can advise the member for Murray that I have not been involved in those discussions, as I believe it quite proper for my colleague to be handling the carriage of the issue in the full.

The member for Glenelg then came in, and I wondered to what extent this matter had great interest for him. He gave us a mouthwatering tour through the Swiss Alps—gruyere cheese, fondue and all the other issues. I realise here the relevance of the television advertisement where the farmer goes to the city on holiday and sends postcards back to his cows—Daisy Bell and all the others. Of course, he probably goes to Glenelg on holidays, which explains the Glenelg connection.

The honourable member then talked about the consumer having to pay after he finished his culinary delights going through the various cheeses. I have already given an answer with respect to who will be paying. He went on to say, in another part of the verbal extravaganza we had this evening, that what is proposed is socialism in its rawest form. I found that a quaint statement. I do not think it bears reality to what has been going on here for some years nor to what has been requested. Nor does it reflect adequately what the member for Mount Gambier or the Hon. Mr Lucas in another place are necessarily supporting.

Members have spent some time going through the Bill. I think they have spent rather more time speaking on it than the substance of their speeches has actually generated in terms of real issues. I have briefly attempted to answer some of the points raised, but clearly I will have to refer the text of the *Hansard* report to my colleague for his more detailed analysis and response. I give that undertaking, as I have done on previous occasions, that the response will be incorporated in *Hansard* and forwarded to members as appropriate. With those comments, I ask members to sup-

port not only the second reading but also the third reading of the Bill.

The House divided on the second reading:

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

Noes (16)—Messrs P.B. Arnold, Baker, Becker, Blacker, Chapman (teller), Eastick, S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Ingerson, Lewis, Mathwin, Meier, Oswald, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pair—Aye—Mr Wright. No—Mr Olsen.

Majority of 7 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT AND EMPLOYMENT BILL

A message was received from the Legislative Council agreeing to a conference, to be held in the Legislative Council conference room at 10.30 a.m. on Thursday 7 November.

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the conference with the Legislative Council to be held during the adjournment of the House and the managers to report the result thereof forthwith at the next sitting of the House.

Motion carried.

PARLIAMENT (JOINT SERVICES) BILL

A message was received from the Legislative Council agreeing to a conference, to be held in the Legislative Council conference room at 12 noon on Thursday 7 November.

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the conference with the Legislative Council to be held during the adjournment of the House and the managers to report the result thereof forthwith at the next sitting of the House.

Motion carried.

METROPOLITAN MILK SUPPLY ACT AMENDMENT BILL (NO. 2)

Adjourned debate in Committee (resumed on motion).
(Continued from page 1899.)

Clause 2—'Commencement'.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Earlier the Minister talked about the need or otherwise for proclamation in view of the Minister of Agriculture's undertaking to the industry that he will use the Bill as a dangling threat while negotiations continue. Does the Minister intend to proclaim the Bill before he commences those negotiations after the Bill's passage through Parliament? If so, when is it anticipated that the Bill will be proclaimed?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I can only quote what my colleague the Minister of Agriculture said in another place on 30 October:

When this legislation passes, I will approach the parties again... Yes. I will then say to the parties, 'However, I still do

not want to use the authority and, if you come to an agreement, the legislation will not be proclaimed.'

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Not proclaimed in the meantime.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: That is right. That is the advice that I have before me. He then went on to say, I must add in fairness:

Unfortunately, I believe the parties will come back and say, 'No, we cannot come to an agreement', so the legislation will be proclaimed.

So, that is the situation—if agreement cannot be achieved, the legislation will be proclaimed. There will be an interregnum when there will be opportunity for further discussion to take place.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I thank the Minister for his explanation. It would appear, from the information with which he has been provided and on which he has reported to this House, that indeed the parties are to be subjects of discussion and negotiation with the Minister before the Bill is proclaimed. I appreciate that matter being reaffirmed and on the record, because I know that the parties are very anxious to discuss with the Minister the basis on which any regulated amount might be determined and, more especially, the formula that might be used for that purpose.

It would seem, from what the Minister has reported, that there is little chance in the immediate future of this matter being resolved, but the right thing is being done by the Minister, it would appear, in respect to having, albeit at this late stage, proper negotiations and discussions with the parties directly involved. I think that those who are earmarked to pay the large sums that have been forecast—that is, SADA and its members—will be very pleased indeed to read about that reference.

My next question relates to the regulations, should they ever come into effect. It seems that the likelihood of that might now be a little more remote than previously considered. Should they come into effect, this question comes to mind: who will actually determine the regulations for the purposes of determining the figure that might be involved? We must bear in mind that it is a totally new ball game under the legislation in comparison with that which prevailed under the previous voluntary scheme which we have had for six or seven years and currently have in place, albeit tenuously, and which was based on payments made by central region farmers from the returns of country sales of produce. Under the legislation, that all goes out the window.

The fund from which subsidies are proposed to be paid to the South-East comprises amounts derived from dairy farmers' returns following sales only in the metropolitan area. This puts a totally different complexion on the original sourcing of the fund and, indeed, as was pointed out by the Minister in response to a number of members on this side of the House, a totally different complexion on who may therefore ultimately be paying the Bill, because for metropolitan sales quite clearly the current Metropolitan Milk Supply Act, and that part not subject to amendment at the moment, states that the Metropolitan Milk Board shall fix the retail price of market milk based on the production costs, such costs being the outgoings of those involved in the producing side of the industry. Whether it is for a bale of hay or twine or any other costs such as rates, taxes, contributions, licence fees or whatever that may be drawn from their gross income, they are costs of production. The sum of \$2 060 000 that has been bandied around as being the figure (indeed, it happens to be in the draft regulations, a copy of which I have been given in recent hours) is a cost.

If the board complies with the Act (and it claims that it will comply with the Act in this exercise) ultimately there will be a cost to the consumer, despite what the Minister has said. Is it still the Minister's view in the light of those

facts that the customer will not ultimately pay the moneys that are to be transmitted to the South-East dairy farmers?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I want to make two points. First, I pick up the first comments of the honourable member with respect to the possibility for negotiation and agreement. It is probably appropriate that I read into *Hansard* the telegram that the Minister of Agriculture in another place sent last week (following the passage of this legislation through the Legislative Council) to both the SEDA and the SADA, as follows:

I wish to advise you that enabling legislation to allow the Government to provide a more equitable share of the market milk premium to producers in the South-East has now been passed by the Legislative Council. I would anticipate that this legislation will pass through the House of Assembly early next week and be ready for proclamation by the end of the week. If in the meantime agreement was reached between your organisation—

and the other organisation—

on an appropriate premium transfer between two regions, I would not need to proceed with proclamation of the legislation. Your urgent response is requested. Frank Blevins, Minister of Agriculture.

That has already gone, and now I am advised that the Minister will send another telegram as a result of what may happen in this place tonight to further pursue the matter with both the SADA and the SEDA. I am confirming what the honourable member is hoping is taking place, and that is that the Minister is making contact with the organisations to see that these matters are further discussed.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The telegram states 'and be ready for proclamation'. All the paperwork has been done. It does not say that it will be proclaimed by the end of the week. That applies to many other Bills, and the member for Mount Gambier will recall the SSABSA legislation was ready for proclamation one day but was not proclaimed for about four months.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: What do you think is a reasonable period for this negotiation?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: That which is reasonable to any reasonable person.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Alexandra has interjected four times during the debate on this clause.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: As to what is a reasonable period, I am not able to give a definitive answer. I expect that the Minister would expect some concurrence on this matter to be achieved within the next week or so. I would not think that a longer period than that was anticipated. I would have to ascertain further advice from the Minister: I do not know what is in his mind on this matter. However, I can reasonably say that, if the Bill passes in this place in the near future, the reasonable period for discussions after the receipt of the telegram will not be 5 o'clock on Thursday afternoon. That would be an unreasonable period. I think that that is what the honourable member fears—that, in fact, it will not only be ready by the end of the week but also it will be done by the end of the week, but that is not what the telegram says. It says that it will be ready by the end of the week. The Government—the department—will draft the regulations, but they need to be approved by the Milk Board. That is my advice in regard to the regulations.

Mr LEWIS: Frankly, I do not think that the Government has the guts to proclaim this legislation, and I challenge the Minister to say whether or not he intends to proclaim it before the election. I believe that the Government will simply use this legislation to put two different stories about. On the one hand is the story released to the South-East dairy farmers, and it will be different in that it will say, 'Now that we have the legislation we can force these blokes

in the central region to do our bidding and give you what you want.' On the other hand the Government will tell dairy farmers in the central region, 'Well, you have no need to worry. Just continue negotiations and settle the matter as quickly as possible. The Government does not really want to use this waddy to belt you around the head.'

We want you simply to accept the fact that you are going to get screwed, anyway, so you might as well do it yourself rather than be compelled to do it'. I do not believe, in the context of an election environment, that the Government will have the guts to proclaim the legislation. I challenge the Minister to indicate whether it will be proclaimed before there is an election.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I reckon that is a reasonably puerile attitude to take to this matter. The legislation is not about challenges and schoolyard antics of cross this line or that line, or whatever. It is supposed to be a much more substantial way to approach things than that. Nevertheless, I can give this answer to the honourable member's question. It would be my understanding of the Minister's position—and it is his position that I must reflect—that this legislation will be proclaimed, and the operative words are 'will be proclaimed' before the election if concurrence is not achieved between the Parties. That is quite an unequivocal answer to the matter.

Clause passed.

Clause 3—'Insertion of new sections 30aa to 30ad.'

Mr LEWIS: Will the Minister say what fee he believes will be calculated and prescribed by regulation in the first instance under clause 3 (2) (b), and will he give an assurance that, in the unlikely event that the Government is re-elected in the next election, he will not increase that fee during the course of the next Parliament?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: It says 'as prescribed by regulation', and that is something that will need to come out of the further investigation of this matter. The total amount of money that needs to be generated is somewhere between \$1.7 million and \$2.2 million. That is really the effective target area that we are talking about, and therefore the fee would be relevant to that and to the production in terms of determining the amount per litre.

As to the matter of future issues, which I think must relate to the imputation by the honourable member for Flinders that this is a potential resource tax kind of issue, I want to argue the position that that would not be the case. It is not the Government's intention to see this used as a resource tax or as a taxing revenue. It will be based on what production levels apply. As production varies, the level may have to vary, and that also applies in many other industries. That is the advice that I have on this matter. If there are increases, it is because there may be production variations that necessitate that in terms of generating the amount of money that is required by the equalisation scheme.

Mr LEWIS: I take that statement to mean that if the number of farmers who become cow cockies in the South-East increases as a consequence of this legislation passing, the Government, in the unlikely event that it is re-elected at the next election, will simply increase the fee that is calculated so that the level of income to each of those farmers obtained by this devious and unjust means does not decrease. So, it would pay people to go to Mount Gambier, given the kind of arguments that we have heard from the Government side and from others who support this measure, knowing that they would be subsidised at the rate at which the Government decided and that the subsidies would be paid by the dairy farmers in the central region.

The other regions are left out, even though they also have access to fresh milk markets. I do not know why they have been left out. The simple fact is that they have been left

out and do not have to pay. The central region is the only region that is paying. It is not as if it will cost South-East dairy farmers any more or less, or that the markets elsewhere will be any more or less lucrative on a per unit volume basis. That is one injustice. The other injustice is that if there are more dairy farmers in the South-East there will have to be a higher fee to maintain the rate of subsidy to each of them. There is no other way in which it will be possible to comply with their greedy, unreasonable demands.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I am advised that that will not be a problem as speculated on by the member for Mallee, the reason being that the amount of money that is paid, I am advised, is dependent on the amount of production that goes into market milk from the South-East. That figure is of the order of 5 per cent to 6 per cent. In other words, it is a very small portion of the total production. In order for the number of farmers to vary that volume significantly, since it is such a small percentage of their total production, one would need an enormous increase in the number of farmers to vary that, and that enormous increase would not be sustainable by the land that is available in the South-East.

That is my advice on the matter. If the situation varies, I will certainly get back to the honourable member. My belief is that it would be a different situation and that there might be a more realistic problem if, in fact, 90 per cent of the milk produced in the South-East was market milk. Of course, then one would not need a major variation in the number of farmers producing and the total amount of their production to have a significant effect. However, where only a small percentage of their production is going into market milk, it would involve an inordinate increase, which is just not possible.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (4 and 5) and title passed.

While the Clerk was reading the Bill a third time:

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Divide!

Bill read a third time and passed.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Divide!

The CHAIRMAN: I will not uphold that. I certainly never heard 'divide' called and, if 'divide' was called, it was called well past the time when the Bill was passed. As I have pointed out on numerous occasions, it is not up to the Chair to be responsible for a member's failure to make himself or herself known or to recognise that a mistake has been made.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I rise on a point of order. I am not too sure what you, Mr Chairman, have been asked to uphold. I called 'divide'. I did not stand up and do so but, in fact, I called 'divide' on three separate occasions, one after the other. Obviously, the first time it was not heard by the Clerk because he rose to his feet. I do not know whether, Mr Deputy Speaker, you heard it or not the second time. I am sure you did the third time, because you looked in my direction. As I said, the first time the Clerk rose to his feet. I accept that he undoubtedly did not hear me say it, but I did. And I repeated it the second and again the third time. I request that you accept what I say, because that was the position.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I point out again that I will not uphold the point of order. The question was put and the Bill was passed long before the Chair ever heard the word 'Divide'. If the word 'Divide' was given on more than one occasion I can only say that the Chair certainly did not hear the word 'Divide' prior to the Bill's being put and carried. I point out that it is neither the Clerk's nor the Chair's responsibility to provide for a division. It is the responsibility of the person who calls it. On that basis I have no intention of upholding the point of order.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I rise on a point of order. You just said, Sir, that the Bill was put and passed. There was no way I could, nor do Standing Orders provide for me to call 'Divide' before it was put. When it was put and the Ayes were called and the Noes were called on this side of the House we said 'No'. It was not until we said 'No' that I was able to or indeed did call 'Divide'. That is the ordinary procedure. I could not say 'Divide' before the Noes were called for. Indeed, when the Noes were called for we said 'No'. It was immediately after that that I called 'divide' for the first time.

I called the second time, in view of the Clerk's rising in his place to read the passage of the Bill, and the third time whilst he was still on his feet. The record was taken and I will guarantee that *Hansard* will say precisely what I say.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will not allow the honourable member to carry on in that vein. I will not get up again and tell the honourable member that I do not uphold the point of order.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: You have obviously made up your mind: like it or lump it, Chapman; that is what it amounts to.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I assure the honourable member for Alexandra that if he wishes to take on the Chair, the Chair will accommodate him. The Chair has made a decision and it will not allow the member for Alexandra to continue to raise points of order.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I am not going to raise points of order. I am off. I am not going to put up with that sort of thing.

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 29 August. Page 727.)

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): The principal Act refers to the Commonwealth Crown Solicitor as a person who has a right of audience before the courts in this State. The Commonwealth has changed that office to that of Australian Government Solicitor and the Bill before us is designed to accommodate that change. We support the legislation.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare): I thank the Opposition for its support of this measure. Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

JURIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 29 August. Page 727.)

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): We support this legislation. An Act to amend the Juries Act was passed in the last session but it was found to have technical problems. Among other things, this Bill deals with persons who are not eligible to be considered for jury service, particularly those persons employed in a department of the Government concerned with administration of justice or punishment of offenders. This apparently is causing difficulty.

The main problem is that forensic science officers are employed in the Department of Services and Supply and the present prescription would apply to all public servants within that department. There does not appear to be any

reason why officers other than forensic science officers should be precluded from jury service.

The second reading explanation identifies officers in other departments involved in investigation of offences, including the Fisheries Department, Highways Department, and Consumer Affairs Department. The legislation seems to make those officers also ineligible for jury service. We support the legislation.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare): I thank the Opposition for its support of this minor amendment to the Juries Act. As the honourable member says, it ensures that the broadest category of persons possible in the community are available for jury service. In that way it strengthens the important function that the jury plays in the criminal justice system.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

ANZ EXECUTORS & TRUSTEE COMPANY (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) LIMITED ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 17 September. Page 976.)

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): We support this legislation, which contains a technical agreement that seeks to give the ANZ Executors & Trustee Company a power that is already available to other trustee companies under their respective Acts of Parliament. This power allows the ANZ Executors & Trustee Company to act as administrator with the consent of the person entitled to a grant

of probate or letters of administration and with the approval of the Supreme Court.

While this practice is not prevalent, it occasionally arises that a person who is named as an executor in a will or who is entitled to take a grant of letters of administration prefers that this be done by one of the trustee companies. As I said earlier, since other companies already have this power, it seems appropriate that the ANZ Executors & Trustee Company should be treated in the same way and have this power by statute. We support the legislation.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Min of Community Welfare): Once again I thank the Opposition for its support on this matter.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

VETERINARY SURGEONS BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading
(Continued from 31 October. Page 1714.)

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): The Opposition supports the Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

ADJOURNMENT

At 12.37 a.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 7 November at 2 p.m.