

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 12 February 1986

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.P. Trainer)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

### STATUTES AMENDMENT (VICTIMS OF CRIME) BILL

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

### CRIMES (CONFISCATION OF PROFITS) BILL

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

### WORKERS REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION BILL

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

### TRAVEL AGENTS BILL

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

### PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE REPORTS

**Mr KLUNDER** brought up the 41st report, covering the proceedings of the national conference of Public Accounts Committees conducted in Adelaide in 1985, and the 42nd report, being the Public Accounts Committee's annual report for 1985.

Ordered that report be printed.

**Mr KLUNDER (Todd):** I take this opportunity to place on record my appreciation of the cooperative efforts of the members of the fifth committee.

### QUESTION TIME

#### WORKERS COMPENSATION

**Mr OLSEN:** Will the Minister of Labour guarantee that debate on the workers compensation legislation will not begin in this House until the Auditor-General's report on the costings of the scheme is made available to the Parliament? This afternoon, the Government will introduce legislation that will have a very significant effect in its implications on the State's economic future. The proposals for workers compensation reform have been the subject of considerable debate in recent months, during which major differences of opinion have been expressed about costs.

As a result, the Auditor-General was asked last week to undertake an investigation. He approached me for the Opposition's concurrence in making that investigation and, whilst I certainly concurred with that request, I also indicated the Opposition's view that information on which the costings had been assessed so far was somewhat limited. I suggested that, as the insurance industry had declared a willingness to open its books for examination by the Auditor-General, that opportunity should be taken up to ensure that the Auditor-General and the Parliament have as much information as possible.

As it is likely that any proper and thorough investigation along these lines will take some time, will the Minister guarantee that debate will not begin until that investigation is completed and the results made available, even if that means that the legislation cannot proceed during the present four-week sitting of the Parliament? Any failure by the Minister to give such a guarantee will suggest that the Government is interested only in forcing the legislation through Parliament because of specific union demands, no matter what the cost is—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader of the Opposition is quite clearly commenting.

**Mr OLSEN:**—to the State's economy.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I can certainly give a guarantee, but it is contrary to the one that the Leader is looking for. I can guarantee that the legislation will be debated in this Chamber, maybe before the report of the Auditor-General is given to me.

**Mr Olsen:** So it will be debated without the facts.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** No, members opposite will have the facts.

**Mr Olsen:** When?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** They will have the facts at the second reading stage. If members opposite talk to their colleagues in another place, they will find that they have had the facts for many months. I gave the Government's costings to the Opposition in the other place months ago. If the Opposition had anything going for it at all, it would have had those costings subjected to scrutiny.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Any responsible Opposition, of course, would have done that. However, I doubt very much whether this Opposition has done that, because it would have taken a little bit of time and a little bit of initiative, and of course that is something that has been sadly lacking in this Opposition for a long time. The costings were undertaken by Dr Trevor Mules from the economics faculty of the University of Adelaide.

**The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:** Not on the new package.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Yes, on the new package. If members of the Opposition are saying that there is something wrong with those figures, then they are casting a slur on the economics faculty of the University of Adelaide. It may well be that they know the university better than I do—in fact, they probably do—but, even with my limited knowledge of the university, I do not think that members of the faculty would damage their reputations by falsifying figures at the request of the Government.

The Hon. Mr Gilfillan in another place requested that the Auditor-General look at the figures, and I have no objection to that—I say certainly—but those costings have been around for two years. Anybody who has wanted to have a look at them has had the opportunity to do so.

**The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:** Don't be stupid.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** The Deputy Leader says, 'Don't be stupid'—a very, very high standard of interjection—but yes, the additional benefits over and above the

package that was costed were put to Trevor Mules and the additional costings have been done. Again, if members opposite do not believe them—and they have had the opportunity—

**Mr Lewis:** No, we don't believe you. We know your reputation.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** If the Opposition does not trust them, I suggest that they make a telephone call to Trevor Mules and talk to him at the university. Again, that does not seem to me to be particularly arduous. However, Mr President—sorry, Mr Speaker (it will take time and I do not know whether it is flattering you or not), the Bill will be debated. It has been debated in the community for about eight years but the community have not been able to sort out the problem and I think it is time that Parliament had a go.

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the next honourable member, I will just say that the Speaker may not necessarily respond to flattery, but I do respond warmly to good decorum on the part of members, a sense of decorum that was not observed fully on that occasion. I would expect a barrage of interjections like that not to be repeated, and I also anticipate that the Minister would not encourage interjections by responding to them.

#### LAND TITLE LEGISLATION

**Mr FERGUSON:** Can the Minister of Lands inform the House whether he is aware of planned new legislation by the New South Wales Government to provide for a new type of land title? An article in the *Australian* of 24 January states:

The aim of the NSW legislation would be to facilitate the development of small suburban clusters of detached houses, large housing developments with a range of density and architecture, mixed developments including office, retail and residential components, theme developments such as retirement villages and resorts and rural developments such as communes.

It is understood that the legislation would provide greater flexibility where some facilities are used by some of the title holders and schemes where there would be no common property. Flexible management arrangements would allow a range of levies between different titleholders and staged development schemes would be allowed.

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** Yes, I am aware of the plans by the New South Wales Government to introduce legislation to provide for what have become commonly known as cluster schemes. I read the article to which the member referred and as a consequence I made inquiries of the department to ascertain the situation in South Australia.

Legislation does exist in Victoria, but it is a very hotchpotch scheme of several Acts which works in the long term, but I understand it is very difficult to administer. My officers have advised me that New South Wales is already well advanced with preliminary work on what they call 'community title' legislation. The introduction of this legislation is about one year off, but I understand that tremendous pressure is being exerted on the Government to push it through Parliament.

A successful cluster venture has been established in Western Australia, and a South Australian developer, who has seen the Western Australian model, is keen to do something here and already that developer has a project in mind. Cluster development works in America, especially in Texas where the concept is growing in popularity.

At present there is no legislation in South Australia which specifically provides for cluster development, which differs from strata titles in that the purchaser becomes the owner of an allotment upon which he is at liberty to erect a home

or business to his own specifications. At the same time, cluster schemes allow the purchaser to enjoy the privileges similar to those of a strata unit owner by having membership in a corporate body formed for the purpose of maintaining common property ground.

The Lands Titles Office has had inquiries as to the possibility of developing cluster schemes, which may be possible under existing land provisions of the 1982 Planning Act and the Real Property Act Amendment Act of 1982. I believe that this concept is worthy of further investigation as to its effect in South Australia.

#### WORKERS COMPENSATION

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** Will the Minister of Labour say why misleading statements about workers compensation legislation were made in the statement opening the Parliament yesterday? Yesterday's speech included two statements which plainly were misleading. In saying that, I obviously make no criticism of His Excellency, because the statements were made on the advice of the Government.

First, it was stated that the people had endorsed the Government's proposed changes to the workers compensation system, when in fact the proposals that the Government is about to put before the Parliament are significantly different from those before the public at the time of the last election. Secondly, the speech referred to consultation with employer and employee groups when in fact the statutory provisions for consultation with the Industrial Relations Advisory Council have not been complied with.

Section 11 of the IRAC Act requires the Government to refer any legislative proposal of industrial significance (and I presume that this is of industrial significance) to IRAC at least two months before a Bill is introduced. That is laid down in the legislation. However, I have been advised that the first draft of the Bill to be introduced this afternoon was not referred to IRAC until 20 December, less than two months ago, and, of course, the intervening holiday period has further affected the opportunity for effective consultation.

It has also been reported to me that Mr T. Mules of Adelaide University, who costed the Government's original work cover scheme, announced last year, has not been provided with a copy of the draft Bill—despite what the Minister said just a while ago. A statement by Mr Mules in the *News* of 24 January defending estimates of savings in the Government's scheme was based on the original scheme, not the one now proposed. Further, I am informed that the information forthcoming from the insurance industry, excluding the SGIC, as background for the Mules-Fedorovitch report, related to claims payments, and not premium disbursal.

Thus, Mules and Fedorovitch would have found it difficult, perhaps impossible, to form an accurate opinion as to the other costs including administration, legal fees, brokerage and profit (if any). I understand that the report by the Insurance Council reveals a loss ratio on premiums of 132 per cent, 114 per cent and 118 per cent respectively for the past three years—figures that are at extreme variance with the 9 per cent profit quoted by Mules and Fedorovitch.

The information that I have put before the House clearly demonstrates that the suggestion that the Government is trying to make about public support for workers compensation legislation, based on widespread consultation, is completely misleading.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** What was the question? Mr Speaker, I did not hear a question.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I do not think that it was anything to do with anyone being asleep; it was more to do with the microphones. If the honourable member wishes a reply to the question, he will have to ask it again.

**The SPEAKER:** I think that what has happened is a misunderstanding that may have arisen from the formal practice of having the question preceding the explanation. I ask the member for Mitcham to repeat his question.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** Why were misleading statements about workers compensation legislation made in the speech at the opening of Parliament yesterday?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** There was no misunderstanding about Standing Orders. It was simply that the microphones were not working. No misleading statements were made by His Excellency yesterday. That is the short answer to the question. However, I am sure that the member for Mitcham would be disappointed if I left it at the short answer.

To enlarge on the answer, very extensive consultation has taken place over the past eight years principally between the two parties that have the main interest in workers compensation and the only two parties that I would argue have rights in workers compensation, namely, the employers and employees. That debate and consultation has gone on extensively, one could almost say to exhaustion. Of course, other parties have been involved. Anyone with an interest in the field would remember the new directions conference that was held not long after this Government returned to power in 1982.

*The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:*

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I am getting around to that. I am giving a full and detailed answer to the honourable member.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** We will get around to IRAC in a moment. The question was so important that it requires this detailed reply. To suggest that there has not been total consultation is nonsense. The honourable member suggested that something contrary to the IRAC Act has occurred. Of course, what the member for Mitcham failed to state—I would not go as far to say that he was misleading the House, but he certainly was not telling all the truth—is that the IRAC Bill contains a clause which says that the Minister can or cannot, in effect, put a Bill before IRAC. I would assume—in fact, I know—that the member for Mitcham was in the House when the Bill went through. Is his memory faulty? Was he not paying attention or was he not telling the entire truth to the Parliament? I do not know; I have no idea. Certainly, IRAC was kept fully informed of what was occurring and of the dates when the Bill was before the House. I certainly have had no complaints from any of the members of IRAC. If the honourable member has had any complaints he should tell me or ask those involved to abuse me.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Members will be wasting a lot of time over the next four years because the acoustics here are so bad that I cannot make out a word that they are saying.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** The member for Alexandra said something about my accent, did he?

*The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** If we scratch the member for Alexandra, what do we find—the new unbridled Ted Chapman? He kept it down when he was a shadow Minister—he hid it from us. We had the experience before with his making all kinds of remarks about Victoria Square and some of its inhabitants. Over the last three years he has been very quiet, but now we get it back. There was no

misleading of the House by either the Governor or anybody else. As I have stated previously, after eight years of consultation the time for the Parliament to look at workers compensation is long overdue.

### **FALIE**

**The SPEAKER:** I call the member for Price.

**Mr De LAINE:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I would appreciate consideration being given to a new member.

**Mr De LAINE:** Will the Premier say what is the intended future use of the historic refurbished vessel, the *Falie*, after its initial 52 day grain re-enactment voyage?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I thank the honourable member for his question. His interest obviously is keen as the *Falie's* home port is Port Adelaide. In fact, it will be, or perhaps already is, a key feature of the Maritime Museum that is being developed at Port Adelaide. It is an exciting project and as that project develops it will make a major impact on our tourist and other facilities in this State. The *Falie* is a Jubilee 150 project. It has been an expensive project, but I am pleased to report that it is living up to expectations. The honourable member referred to the carrying out of the grain trade re-enactment which has gone very well indeed in the few days that the vessel has been at sea, and it will be calling in at the appropriate ports.

It is an asset to the State that will go well beyond that event. I understand that a number of things will happen during the rest of this year after May, when a whole survey will be undertaken to ensure that the ketch is in good order and has stood up to the voyages it will have undertaken. It will be available for day trips on the Port River, and I understand that a number of bookings have already been made for that. A charter trip has been organised to Port Augusta via Cowell. In June the vessel will be chartered to the Australian/American Association and will visit American River on Kangaroo Island. We can see what a tourist asset it will be. It will be available for charter by groups who may wish to make special journeys. In July the *Falie* will be involved in a Reeves Point landing re-enactment on Kangaroo Island to mark the arrival of a group of settlers who went there first. In September a similar re-enactment of the landing by Colonel Light at Rapid Bay will be undertaken along with a couple of other activities of that kind. It will also be involved in sail training for young South Australians towards the end of this year.

Considerable interest has been shown by sporting groups, conference organisers and private firms to use the *Falie* for day trips and other voyages. We are certainly keen to encourage that. There will be some use of it during the America's Cup.

*Mr Lewis interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I am not sure of the rates that are being offered, but they can be obtained for the honourable member if he knows of anyone interested in it. Possibly, some use can be made of the *Falie* during the America's Cup in 1987, and also the bicentennial year should provide a good opportunity to use it. So, all in all, we will get plenty of work out of the *Falie*, and I hope that the vessel performs up to expectations. Having seen a large investment of public money in the purchase and restoration of the vessel, I believe that the more use that can be made of it and the more it can be made accessible to the public the better.

## IRAC

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** My question is directed to the Minister of Labour, the second most junior Minister, who only managed to head off the Minister of Housing and Construction for second to bottom spot.

**An honourable member:** Get on with it.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The honourable member who interjects has been relegated close to the push off seat. The honourable member has been demoted by his Party. In a most unimpressive debut in this House, the Minister of Labour made a statement that I would like him to clarify. He said that he had the prerogative of waiving the requirement to refer matters to IRAC. Will the Minister correct his statement that he can waive the requirement to consult with IRAC on legislation? I have had the opportunity to peruse the IRAC Bill again, having handled it when it was before the House. Part III, dealing with the functions of the council, the clause that the Minister is obviously confusing gives the council, not the Minister, the ability to waive compliance with the relevant subsection or to reduce the period of two months referred to. In no place does the Bill give the Minister the right that he has arrogated to himself this afternoon. Will the Minister retract the false statement he has made to the House this afternoon and correct the record?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** The honourable member has the advantage of me because he has the legislation with him.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I will look at the legislation, but I assure the honourable member that the effect is exactly the same.

## YOUTH EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING

**Mr KLUNDER:** In the light of recent media attention that has been focused on the slow start of the Federal Government's youth employment initiatives, will the Minister of Employment and Further Education say what progress has been achieved by the State Government's youth employment and training schemes?

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I thank the honourable member for his question and am happy to supply information to the House on the employment programs that were announced by the Government before the recent election, namely, the YES scheme. I have a statistical table which I seek to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it, so as to keep my answer shorter.

Leave granted.

## LABOUR MARKET PROGRAMS—SUMMARY

Program	Target Increase	Anticipated Outcome
<b>A. Trade Training Support/Traineeships</b>		
1. Pre-Vocational .....	182	264
2. Group Apprenticeship Schemes:		
(i) Private Sector .....	90	125
(ii) Trainees .....	—	—
	(incl in 4)	
3. Apprenticeship Numbers .....	610	670
4. Traineeships .....	1 600	1 000
		by end of 1986
<b>5. Supplementary Measures</b>		
(i) Training Centres .....	75	75
(ii) Required Training Effort .....	35	—
(iii) Reforms to Formal Training .....	50	50
6. New Opportunities for Women (TAFE) .....	56	175
<b>B. Commonwealth Assistance</b>		
7. Skills in Demand .....	395	470
8. Experimental Training Program .....	200	Abolished by Commonwealth
9. National Employment Strategy for Aboriginals .....	45	45
10. Special Trade Training Program .....	15	30
11. Steel Regions Assistance Scheme .....	110	110
12. Community Youth Special Projects .....	100	100
<b>C. Special Employment Initiatives</b>		
13. Self Employment Ventures Scheme .....	140	40
14. Disabled Persons Training Scheme .....	20	20
15. Local Employment Development Program .....	5	5
<b>D. Other Youth Employment Initiatives</b>		
16. TAFE Equity .....	570	570
17. CITY High Schools .....	200	200
18. CITY Rural .....	400	400
19. Bridging the Gap .....	850	400
20. Jubilee Youth Employment Program .....	152	270
	(270 Full Year)	
<b>E. Publicity and Promotion</b>		
	—	—
Aggregate Total .....	5 900	5 019
	(6 018 with No. 20 in Full Year Terms)	

## LABOUR MARKET PROGRAMS—SUMMARY

Program	Target Increase	Anticipated Outcome
NOTES:		
1. The anticipated outcome with respect to target increases is in some cases expressed in full year terms, i.e. 'by the end of 1986'. In the case of 20. 'Jubilee Youth Employment Program', target and outcome have been expressed in full year terms and target grand total adjusted accordingly. The reasons for these adjustments include delays with program commencements and/or changes in Commonwealth Programs.		
2. The 1986 anticipated outcome figure is some 1 000 below the target. Delays with the Australian Traineeship System implementation (—600); a reduced Bridging the Gap target (—450) and the abolition of Experimental Training Program by the Commonwealth (—200) have clearly contributed to this, meanwhile other targets should be exceeded.		
3. Further to 2. above—some apparent 'losses' should in fact be no more than postponements and targets should again be reviewed and the position reassessed in March.		

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** In summary, the table reveals that there are 22 elements of the YES scheme program of employment initiatives undertaken by this Government: some are entirely funded by State money; some are funded jointly by the Commonwealth and State; and some are Commonwealth funded programs. Of those 22 elements, 10 are running on schedule in terms of the anticipated number of employment or training positions that they will provide; seven of them are providing more employment or training positions at this stage than we expected they would provide; but five of them are providing fewer training or employment positions than we expected. Those supplying fewer positions include the traineeship component, which has been canvassed in the public arena and on which I have commented publicly.

Lengthy delays in relation to the traineeship program at the Commonwealth level have not enabled the State Government to get the number of traineeships in place that we would have liked. That is entirely beyond the control of the State Government. We have been pushing very strongly in this matter, but it is more a national than a State issue. Other programs which have not yet achieved their target, or which are not likely to do so by 30 June, include the Required Training Effort (Supplementary Measures), under Trade Training Support/Traineeships. That area requires further discussion. The Experimental Training Program, originally included in the tabulation for the YES scheme and other employment initiatives, with some 200 positions, has in fact since been abolished by the Commonwealth Government.

That was a Commonwealth funded component of the program. We had anticipated that 140 people would be involved in the Self Employment Ventures Scheme this financial year, but it is now anticipated that only 40 will be involved. That is because of a delay in organising publicity for that scheme but also quite significantly because of a concern about the quality of the applications received in the earlier stages. There were not enough quality applications to justify increasing the number to 140. That is more of a postponement or a deferment, because we anticipate that in the second half of the year we will well and truly reach the target. The Bridging the Gap program is also running behind schedule with an anticipated outcome of only 400 instead of 850.

However, considering alongside these figures, those on the other side of the coin—those that are up—I believe it is quite an impressive picture in relation to what has been achieved under the YES scheme. The number of apprenticeships has increased. We had anticipated that there would be an increase of 610 apprenticeships, but it is up to 670. There has been an increase also in Group Apprenticeship Schemes (from 90 to 125), as well as in Skills in Demand, the Special Trade Training Program, New Opportunities for Women program (which has shown a significant increase—

from 56 to 175) and the Jubilee Youth Employment program, the first successful applications for which I will announce tomorrow and in which there is a significant increase from 152 to 270.

While there have been some reductions, and while the traineeship component (which is such a big element) is expected to reach only 1 000 instead of 1 600, therefore having a major numbers effect, it is undoubtedly the case that the YES scheme is running well and truly to schedule in the vast majority of its elements and is indeed ahead of schedule in a number of significant programs. Once the traineeship program is up and running successfully, the numbers will be well in excess of what had originally been planned.

## INTEREST RATES

**Mr BECKER:** In view of the increasing hardships which young couples and single supporting parents in particular are facing because of rising building society interest rates, will the Minister of Housing and Construction urge the Premier to make representations to Canberra regarding Federal Government economic policies? Since the Government's approval last Friday of a further increase in building society interest rates, I am being made aware of an increasing number of cases of hardship. For example, I have been contacted by a single supporting mother who has just been advised that her monthly mortgage repayment will increase by \$59. With two sons attending high school, she will have no alternative but to reduce spending on her sons' clothing and meals if she is to keep her house.

In other cases, I know of cars having to be sold to help reduce household expenditure, and a number of young couples in my electorate are holding regular garage sales to obtain finance by selling off goods they would normally keep stored. It is becoming increasingly apparent that there are many home-owners who cannot qualify for current Government assistance and who are facing increasing hardship as a result of the interest rate spiral.

When the question of Federal Government policies which are keeping the pressure on interest rates was raised with the Premier yesterday, he refused to criticise those policies. As the Minister is more likely than the Premier to be aware of the increasing hardship which high interest rates are causing, will he urge the Premier to make representations to Canberra to reverse those policies which have resulted in Australia's highest interest rates in well over 50 years?

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I would be very interested in obtaining the information that the honourable member has referred to regarding those people who have contacted his office about personal hardship. When the honourable member talks about a single mother with two children who go to high school, I point out that that instance would quite

easily fall into the safety net that was part of the package announced by the Government on Friday. If the honourable member will give me that information, I will certainly act on it.

Some of the statements just made by the member for Hanson and also the comments contained in the *Advertiser* show, first, that he fails to acknowledge the necessity of the increase and, secondly, that he completely ignores and does not understand the safety net which we have negotiated with the building societies and which protects those people in real need.

I think it is fairly obvious that the honourable member's Federal Leader has been advocating deregulation and his own State Leader advocated deregulation until he found, towards the latter part of the election campaign, that the community supported the view of the Bannon Government, namely, that the ceiling should be maintained. What I am saying is that this package picked up those people; there was a relief mechanism which was far more generous than the normal mortgage relief scheme, and I am sure that those people whom the member for Hanson quoted will be picked up.

Let us return to the question as to whether or not I can exert pressure on my Premier or my federal counterpart to ask the Federal Government to change its monetary policy regarding deregulation. I understand that, when the argument surrounding deregulation was taking place during the election campaign, and also prior to that, the member for Hanson was just a backbencher and was not responsible for housing, so I will excuse his ignorance in relation to what was going on, but I can assure him that the previous spokesman was given all the assistance possible to explain why this State Government has urged the Federal Government not to deregulate housing interest rates and to keep the ceiling at 13.5 per cent.

The member for Hanson may recall that time and time again I stood in this House and said that we had convinced the Federal Government that it should set up a working party to look at the effects of deregulation on low income people. Prior to the election campaign, and despite the scare tactics that were promoted by the member for Hanson's Leader in the election campaign, the Federal Government stood firm and said that it would not contemplate deregulation until that working party had considered the effects of deregulation on lower income people, and that is one of the reasons that I, as Minister of Housing and Construction, charged with providing mechanisms and recommendations to my Cabinet colleagues, held up any approval of an increase until we could provide the relief mechanism within our own situation, such as with the building societies. We have insisted that, until that working party delivers its report—

**Mr LEWIS:** I rise on a point of order, Sir. I understood that Standing Orders required questions and the answers to them to be addressed to the Chair rather than across the Chamber in the provocative fashion in which the Minister is engaging.

**The SPEAKER:** A certain amount of latitude is granted in these matters, but I direct the Minister to address his remarks to the Chair.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** When I am giving a rather in-depth answer, I know that you, Sir, can understand it without my looking at you, but I have to direct my gaze at the member for Murray Mallee so that it sinks in a little better.

**The SPEAKER:** I call upon the Minister to continue his answer.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** We have insisted that the Federal Government make no move to deregulate until the report of the working party is delivered. I understand that the working party has delivered an interim report and I am

quite encouraged, because again that working party is made up of independent people and its initial recommendation is that there should be no tampering with deregulation as far as home loan interest rates are concerned, so that is the answer to the member for Hanson's question. He can be assured that this Government will not only provide means for people to get into housing, but we will also provide a mechanism to keep in housing those people who face difficulties because of rising interest rates, or encourage people who seek to go into housing, because the building industry depends on it. We are well aware of it and I am sure the member for Hanson is also aware of it.

### KMC SERVICES

**Mr GREGORY:** My question is addressed to the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs in another place. Will the Minister of Consumer Affairs investigate an organisation known as KMC Services? I have been approached by a constituent who responded to an advertisement that appeared in the *News* of Thursday 16 January 1986. Two advertisements were placed purportedly by the company, the first of which stated:

Home workers wanted to fill addressed, pre-stamped envelopes for K9.90 a thousand, free details with self-addressed stamped envelope to KMC Services.

A further advertisement stated:

Make extra money filling envelopes, free details, write your name and address to KMC Services.

That advertisement has appeared on numerous occasions since then. The constituent to whom I referred responded to that advertisement by letter and received two letters from KMC Services. One contained the following paragraph:

How much money you make is up to you. We do not require that you stuff and mail a certain number of envelopes each week. Work as much as you want to achieve the extra monthly income you desire, and we offer, if you follow our instructions, that you will earn \$140 for each 100 envelopes that you stuff and mail for us. You can easily mail 300 a week by working one or two hours daily. The best thing about this kind of home work is that it's so easy to get started.

It states further in that letter:

The fee for processing your application and for our complete set-up kit is only \$40. Register right now and get started. The very same day that you receive the materials. Why not invest \$40 in your future today?

Then there is a letter from a person who holds himself out to be a president of something or other which tells how easy and pleasant such work is. My constituent did go to the address of KMC Services and questioned a woman there who said that for her \$40 she would get a supply of the two letters she had received in response to her inquiry, and a marketing manual (which was a photocopied file). She was not allowed to examine the file, but was shown certain pages as the woman flicked through it. She was told that she would have to advertise in the paper, using her name and address on a special invitation form, which she had received in reply to her inquiry. But of the \$40 that she had paid to KMC Services, that company had kept \$25 and \$15 was given to Walter Todd, the President.

According to the woman concerned, the companies that were listed appeared to be American. The lady at the premises also said that the company was getting about 200 inquiries a day. It is my view that this organisation ought to be investigated because it appears from what this woman said to me that people in the circumstance of not having enough money due to being unable to get work are parting with \$40 in seeking to get gainful employment.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFT:** I thank the honourable member for his question and I will most certainly refer the

information that he has provided to the Minister of Consumer Affairs and have this matter investigated.

### HOME BUYER ASSISTANCE

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Will the Minister of Housing and Construction clear up confusion over the Government's assistance to home buyers? In a statement made last Friday the Deputy Premier said that the Government's subsidy to building society borrowers, due to end in March, would continue. However, this was completely contradicted in this House yesterday by the Premier, who would say only that the subsidy scheme was under review. The conflict between the Premier and his Deputy obviously has arisen because of the Government rushing out its announcement last Friday in the hope that it would be lost in the coverage of the Lindy Chamberlain affair. I ask the Minister now to state specifically who was right—the Deputy Premier when he said that the subsidy scheme would continue after the end of March or the Premier, who has said that it is still under review.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** The member for Light has stood on his dignity many times and accused members on this side of the Chamber of doing things to confuse the issue. The honourable member, who has set himself up as a stalwart of parliamentary democracy and gone into this *ad nauseam*, has the effrontery to say that we released that statement when the Azaria Chamberlain case was hitting the front page. That is an insult not only to my colleague the Deputy Premier, to my other colleagues on this side of the Chamber and to me, in particular, but also to the Chamberlain family and to all those people who are associated with it.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I will answer the question. Pompous statements like that from people who think that they can get away with it because they are seen as being above it all—above the sewer—need an answer. That is the lowest remark I have ever heard in this House. I hope that the member for Light will give a personal explanation and apologise to this House.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I have known the member for too long. I have shot one home, and he does not like it.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I have 15 minutes, Sir. Friday's news release by the Hon. Dr Hopgood said:

To minimise the impact on high rates on new and existing borrowers the Government and the societies have negotiated a package of housing initiatives. These are—

and this is the one in question—

continuing the Government's .75 per cent subsidy to building society borrowers already receiving it.

That subsidy was in place and is due to end shortly. When that statement was made it was the view of Cabinet—and the Premier reiterated that comment—that the subsidy would continue until that time. If it is felt by the Government that the subsidy needs to continue it will do so.

There was no conflict in what the Deputy Premier said, there was no conflict in what the Treasurer said yesterday, and there is no conflict in this press release. It is just that the Opposition is out for a beat-up: it failed miserably, as I have just proved.

### HOME LOANS

**Ms LENEHAN:** Will the Minister of Housing and Construction investigate complaints that the minimum income level required by the State Bank for eligibility for a home loan precludes the applicant from eligibility for the \$7 000 grant under the Federal Government's First Home Owners Scheme?

I have recently been approached by several of my constituents, the details regarding one of whom I will briefly outline. My constituent was told by the State Bank that he needed to earn \$15 000 per annum to become eligible to apply for a loan from the bank. He was then told that, as his income was more than that amount, which in his case included overtime, he exceeded the limit for the First Home Owners Scheme grant. My office, on contacting the Federal Department of Housing and Construction, was told that, in order to receive this grant, a sole applicant could earn a maximum of \$13 950 gross in the financial year prior to or in which the contract was signed. Will the Minister investigate what appears to be a most anomalous situation? Following the Minister's reply to a question asked by another member, I will be pleased to provide the name and details of my constituent.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I am certainly concerned that someone who could be eligible for a First Home Owners Scheme grant was given information that was contrary to the regulations. The honourable member is well aware that when the Federal Government introduced its First Home Owners Scheme we introduced our own State Home Ownership Made Easier scheme so that the two could complement each other. The idea was that, if a person could not be picked up under our own Home Ownership Made Easier scheme, they would be picked up under the Federal Government's First Home Owners Scheme. Those two schemes worked in tandem successfully and, when one considers the result of the election, they were obviously well received generally by the community. I will take the information given by the honourable member, along with personal details, and raise the matter with the relevant bank so that, if her constituent is entitled to that grant, they will certainly receive it.

### PENSIONER EARNINGS

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** Will the Premier inform the House what representations, if any, the Government has made to the Federal Government regarding a recent policy change by the Department of Social Security to discontinue the practice of allowing pensioners to average earnings over the whole year? In fruit growing areas in South Australia, where seasonal work is the only form of part time work available and where organisations such as fruit packers and canners are dependent on seasonal labour, it has been possible in the past for pensioners to work four or five weeks during the harvest period earning the maximum amount permitted throughout the year without loss of pension benefits.

The department's change in policy has resulted in considerable hardship for many of these people who are unable to obtain work on a constant basis of, say, one day per week. This has significantly disadvantaged pensioners and created problems for canners, packers and growers alike. It is a retrograde step which has significantly disadvantaged certain pensioners and the industry.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I thank the honourable member for drawing the matter to my attention. I cannot recall having been made aware of the details that he has just put before the House. I will certainly consult with my colleague

the Minister for Community Welfare and see what has occurred in this matter.

### PARLIAMENTARY VIDEOTAPING

**Mrs APPLEBY:** My question is to you, Mr Speaker. In view of earlier press reports on this matter, could you, Sir, inform the House of any arrangements made for videotaping yesterday's opening of Parliament, particularly for educational purposes?

**The SPEAKER:** I thank the honourable member for her question on a subject that is of some interest to me as a former teacher. The national and commercial channels broadcast in yesterday's news programs a 30 second segment of whatever it was that they considered newsworthy. Members would, however, be aware of my clearly expressed view that the parliamentary system needs to be brought closer to the electors by every means possible. The limited capacity of our galleries precludes all but a tiny minority of the electorate being able to observe proceedings other than via those 30 second news segments. A somewhat more comprehensive 10 or 20 minute coverage videotaped and replayed in the evening would have made more of the public aware of our Parliament's traditions and could have been recorded by schools for teaching purposes.

Acting as an individual member, with the concurrence of the previous Speaker, I contacted the Australian Broadcasting Corporation several weeks ago and informally suggested that the Parliamentary Clerks be approached by the ABC. At the time the ABC seemed quite eager, but nothing eventuated. I was then approached by the *Advertiser* last week on this matter and informed that the ABC was no longer interested. I was then asked for my views on whether one of the commercial television channels might be interested. My reaction was one of scepticism, but the journalist contacted all three commercial channels before eliciting the negative response that I had previously anticipated.

I am pleased to advise members, however, that the Educational Technology Centre of the South Australian Education Department, which has on a previous occasion executed some excellent photographs of Parliament for school use, were on this occasion also able to videotape the opening of Parliament. After editing, selected sections will be distributed by the videotape duplication services of the Homestead Video Project that operates for children in isolated outback areas and who are outside the range of normal television broadcasting. I am hopeful at this stage that a more comprehensive videotape can be assembled. A copy can then be deposited in the Parliamentary Library for use with school groups visiting Parliament House, when we eventually acquire a suitable videotape recorder. In addition, all members have schools in their electorates and they might be pleased to learn that it would be a simple routine matter for the Educational Technology Centre to duplicate copies for school use.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, will the editing be done in a bipartisan fashion?

**The SPEAKER:** In so far as I have any control over that matter, I assure the honourable member that that will be done.

### PETROL PRICES

**Mr GUNN:** In view of the serious effects of high fuel costs on rural producers of this State, what action have the Minister of Agriculture and the Government taken to request the Commonwealth Government to take immediate action to pass on the reductions in oil prices to producers in this

State and the nation as a whole? As the Minister of Agriculture is supposed to be the spokesman in this State for agriculture, I point out that, in 1984, the gross value of rural production was over \$1 800 million. As agriculture, which laid the foundation for our development in South Australia, is still the most important part of our economy, will the Minister act to protect this vital segment of our economy?

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I thank the honourable member for his first question to me, although I note that the former shadow spokesman (he is also a former Minister of Agriculture) was the first off the rank with a question to me concerning agriculture. On Monday, I was fortunate enough to attend a conference, in Hobart, of Ministers of Agriculture at which the matter of fuel prices was raised. The Federal Minister gave the Ministers from all States a fairly comprehensive run down on the Federal Government's position on fuel pricing and said that the matter was being considered by the Federal Cabinet. I raised the matter with him and put the point of view of South Australia on fuel pricing. I shall be happy to talk to the Premier about further discussions that may be held with my federal counterpart, as well as possible discussions between the Premier and his federal counterpart, on this matter.

### LOAN SERVICE FEE

**Ms GAYLER:** Can the Minister for Housing and Construction say whether the Government will ensure that building societies honour the arrangement to abolish the so-called loan service fee? Today's *Advertiser* reports that the newspaper received a series of telephone calls yesterday from irate customers of a certain building society who were most concerned about the society's proposal to retain the service fee and, in fact, to increase it by 50 per cent in breach of the agreement that the fee would be dropped. Only yesterday in this House in my first speech I welcomed the abolition of that fee, which, it has been put to me, is simply a backdoor means of ripping off home purchasers. The Co-operative Building Society's letter to borrowers talks of this fee as a monthly fee, but it has been put to me that this arrangement is a double jeopardy. An increase in the interest rate is bad enough: doubling the fee is unacceptable. I believe that the Government should insist that the fee should be abolished as part of the package of measures arranged.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I thank the honourable member for her question. Obviously, in this term of Government we are again to hear from people on our side who are concerned about those in the community who suffer hardship, whereas from the other side we will get the usual flippant comments. I know that, as a result of my actions this morning, the stop press of the *News* reports on action that this Government has taken to remedy this matter. I believe that that is an indication that this Government—when it sees something happening or where, as in this case, a building society has misread negotiations—will do something about it. The member for Mitcham seems to think that, just because something appears in the stop press, the member for Newland should not ask her question. However, the member for Newland is more interested in what is going on here in Question Time, and she listens, unlike the member for Mitcham, who spends all his time reading the paper.

This is the first time in modern history, with the building societies under the control of the Minister of Corporate Affairs and thereby under the control of the State Government, that there has been any form of negotiation. I recall that, when the Tonkin Government was in power, the building societies were hauled down to the Premier's office and



told to reduce interest rates by about half a per cent, and they did not like it. When this Government was requested permission to increase interest rates and we looked at the figures and convinced ourselves that an increase was needed, we negotiated a package which afforded relief to those people who needed it. That is important.

The reason why some people received a letter, as reported in the *Advertiser*, was that a building society increased the service charge to cover increased administrative costs. After negotiations had taken place, that building society misunderstood the terms of the package and, in sending out its letter concerning the 1.5 per cent increase, informed borrowers of an annual administration fee of \$48, to be paid in monthly instalments. As soon as some of those borrowers contacted my office (they contacted not only the *Advertiser* or certain of my colleagues here), I immediately contacted that building society and told it that such an arrangement was outside the agreed package and that, as was stated in the Deputy Premier's press release, all service fees would cease on 1 July. I am happy to inform the member for Newland and other members, especially the member for Mitcham, that those fees will be abolished from 1 July. Anyone who has paid the fee for the whole year will receive a six month refund.

#### SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council intimated its appointment of sessional committees.

#### JOINT HOUSE COMMITTEE

The Legislative Council notified its appointment of members to the committee.

#### JOINT COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION

The Legislative Council notified its appointment of members to the committee.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION: IRAC

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Labour):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** One or two members opposite suggested that I in some way misled the House in my explanation about IRAC. As I stated, the Act gives the Minister discretion as to which material he puts before IRAC or for how long this should apply. Clearly, had the members who complained taken the trouble to read the Act, they would see embodied in it, under part III 'Functions of the council':

Subject to subsection (3), any legislative proposal of industrial significance should be referred to the council.

It does not say 'shall be referred to the council'. That is what makes it entirely discretionary, and from time to time the Minister of Labour has invoked that provision. Things have (or have not) been put to IRAC and for varying lengths of time, and once again I point out that a Bill similar to the Bill that will be introduced shortly was offered to the members of IRAC in either late October or early November,

well before the State election, but the members of IRAC declined to take the Bill. It was their decision, but I offered it.

**Mr S.J. Baker:** In an election climate.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** No, it was not in an election climate. In effect, the Bill has been before IRAC for many months. However, as I stated, it is entirely discretionary on the Minister as to whether or not it is made available and for how long. That has always been the case.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION: INTEREST RATES

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**Mr BECKER:** I refer to the reply by the Minister of Housing and Construction to my question concerning hardship caused to some people because of the current interest rate increase in building society loans and the instances I referred to, in particular the example of the single supporting parent. In that case the person is outside the current guidelines of the system that was implemented by the Government. I am unable to provide the Minister with the name and address of that person, because it would be a fruitless exercise. In addition, that person would want to retain the confidentiality between herself and the society.

#### NOTICE OF MOTION: OTHER BUSINESS, No. 1

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** Mr Speaker, I am required by Standing Orders to transfer this motion to another day, and I seek your instruction. Can you advise the House, Sir, whether private members' time will be allocated, or will it be denied parliamentary democracy to debate this issue?

**The SPEAKER:** That last remark was completely out of order. The member for Hanson may only move to postpone the item. Only procedural matters can be dealt with until the Address in Reply has been adopted in full.

**Mr BECKER:** Under protest, I therefore move:

That Notice of Motion: Other Business, No. 1 be made a Notice of Motion: Other Business for Wednesday 26 February.

Motion carried.

#### SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That Standing Orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable Government business to be considered as required and to have precedence over other business except questions before the Address in Reply is adopted.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I oppose the motion, and I do so for a number of what I think are very cogent and valid reasons, the first being that it is becoming more the habit than the exception for the Address in Reply to be postponed so that the Government, for reasons known only to itself, can go about the business of its legislation. You, Sir, have been keen to inform the public of the ceremonies that surround the opening of Parliament, and the fact is, of course, that part of the ceremony and tradition associated with Parliament is the first debate that occurs in a new Parliament that is the Address in Reply debate.

A whole section of the Standing Orders is given over to the opening of the session. For the edification of members, particularly newer members, I inform the House that section 3 of the Standing Orders is given over to the form and

ceremony surrounding the opening of Parliament about which you, Mr Speaker (and I), are rather keen to inform the public. Standing Order 44, which is part of that section of the Standing Orders, provides quite unequivocally:

No business beyond what is of a formal character shall be entered upon before the Address in Reply to the Governor's opening speech has been adopted.

That is provided in the Standing Orders, and that should be the norm. It is part of the traditions of the opening of Parliament, part of those traditions that you, Mr Speaker, have indicated you will be keen to preserve, although you wish to see some changes made. If we do not like that Standing Order and if we are to suspend Standing Orders every time there is a new Parliament, let us get rid of that provision. I do not want to get rid of it, but, if that is what the Government wants, let it be done by the democratic decision of this Parliament to change the Standing Orders. But do not let us down-grade the Address in Reply debate, which this Government has systematically done and which it seeks to do for quite specious reasons.

The forms and ceremonies of the opening of Parliament are there for a reason, and part of those forms, ceremonies and traditions is the Address in Reply to the Governor's speech, which is delivered to the Parliament by the Queen's representative. I believe it is a slight to the Governor to push aside this debate as the Government has done. Other members may not see it in that light because they do not value the debate. Perhaps it does not titillate the appetite of the media, but so what! This place exists for the benefit of the public of this State and their representatives, and among those the most important people may just happen to be the backbenchers. One of the unfortunate moves of modern day parliamentary systems is to down-grade the role of backbenchers and upgrade the role of the Executive—and to hell with all other forms and practices that allow backbenchers to have some place in the sun in this Parliament!

In my time, I have seen changes to the Standing Orders in the name of efficiency and to reduce the Question Time and the opportunity for members who are not in the Executive to make a contribution in this Parliament. This is another move in that direction. I deplore the continual suspension of this Standing Order so that the Government—on this occasion for a particularly specious reason—can get around it. If this is to be the habit, let the Government change the Standing Order, although I may say that I will resist that. The Address in Reply debate is one of those rare, unbridled opportunities for backbenchers to be introduced to the Parliament and for the public to be introduced to them. Members have an opportunity to say something that they think is worth saying, although we might not agree with them.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I am debating a fairly important principle, I suggest to members opposite who may not see much point in this Standing Order. Yesterday we had the interesting exercise of the new member for Briggs, in a fairly pompous and at times spiteful way, saying what he wanted to say. He even got some press reporting. However, this is one of the opportunities for the backbenchers in question to make their maiden speech, and the Address in Reply to the Governor's speech should take precedence over all other business of the House. Why does the Government wish to put it aside on this occasion? There are two reasons.

*Mr Lewis interjecting:*

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** That is one. We have just had the member for Hanson ask when private members' business will come on. That occasion gives backbenchers and members of the Opposition particularly an opportunity

to mount in this place resolutions of interest to them, their constituents and maybe the public at large. That is to be delayed indefinitely, at the whim of the Government, because it will delay the Address in Reply debate. Private members' business cannot come on until the Address in Reply debate is dispatched and that will not happen until, if we pass this resolution, the Government at its whim deals with any legislation which it might want to pass in a hurry.

What is the pressing legislation which we hear about and which must be pushed forward now to take precedence of this Address in Reply debate? The big issue is the question of workers compensation. That is the issue which the Government has said we are going to get through before we adjourn. The Minister has not even met the requirements of the Act under which he is operating, namely, the IRAC Act. He does not even know the requirements of two months consideration at IRAC. Here is the Government not even meeting the statutory requirements and seeking to put that before the House while deferring this debate. What an inauspicious introduction to this House from the would-be Deputy Premier of this State, the junior Minister of Labour. Part of the deal was that he would be Deputy Premier, to con him to transfer to Whyalla to shore up their stocks there—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the Deputy Leader to return to the matter before the Chair.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Suffice to say that the Minister does not even know the Act under which he is operating. Lord help his chance of promotion in the Labor Party! The statutory requirements for the introduction of this legislation have not been met, let alone any proof of necessity to push aside this traditional debate to consider the matter.

Of course, the other reason is that, for some reason, the Government wants to sit for only four weeks, so to hell with the forms and procedures of the House. The Government wants to sit for four weeks and then close the Parliament down for six months. That shows scant regard for what this Parliament should be all about. I would say that this would be the least propitious occasion on which the Government should seek to delay the Address in Reply debate, keep the Governor and private members and the like waiting, while the Government fiddles around with any legislation that it might think is convenient for it to put through, and the Address in Reply can wander along at the Government's convenience.

As I said when I opened my remarks, those are not the priorities which are set in the Standing Orders and which I think should exist. They are certainly not the priorities that the sentiments which you have expressed publicly, Mr Speaker, would seem to me to dictate in terms of the formality, the dignity and the propriety of the opening of Parliament. For those reasons I oppose this motion.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The member who muttered the interjection, now from the back seat and getting perilously close to the push off seat, I might observe—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I did not quite manage to get it all out last time, so now is my chance. The honourable member whose interjections we have become used to—

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

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (27)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon, Blevins, Crafter, De Laine, Duigan, M.J. Evans, and Ferguson, Ms Gayler, Messrs Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood (teller), Keneally, and

Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Mayes, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Rann, Robertson, Slater, and Tyler.

Noes (17)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker, Becker, Blacker, Chapman, Eastick, Goldsworthy (teller), Gunn, Ingerson, Lewis, Meier, Olsen, Oswald, and Wotton.

Majority of 10 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

### MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Transport)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Motor Vehicles Act 1959. Read a first time.

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

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

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

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Bill

The main purpose of these amendments to the Motor Vehicles Act is to improve services to the public and also the efficiency of the Motor Registration Division by—

(a) removing the limitation of 14 days currently placed on permits issued by the police to owners who have paid the required registration fees and compulsory third party premiums for their vehicles but because they live in remote areas are not able to be issued immediately with registration labels and plates. Because of limited postal services in the outer areas of the State these transactions invariably cannot be completed within a period of 14 days and therefore it is proposed that in consultation with the Police Commissioner the Registrar may fix by administrative action a longer period than 14 days for the operation of these special permits;

(b) by reducing the period for the completion of the transfer of the registration of vehicles from one owner to another from 14 days to seven days.

Considerable difficulty and embarrassment are being caused to registered owners especially where parking fines are involved when the transfer of vehicles is not effected as soon as practicable. It is proposed that one document be used for the transfer of vehicles with the onus being placed specifically on the purchaser to ensure that a vehicle is registered in his or her name within a seven day period of the sale and to impose a late fee penalty if that requirement is not met;

(c) changing the registration period for traders plates from a March expiry date to a calendar year to obviate the reissue of plates and allowing a self destructive label to be used on these plates. This proposal has the support of the industry;

(d) providing for a five year period of operation for drivers licences instead of three years. This action will reduce the number of transactions which the public have with the Motor Registration Division which in turn will affect some economies within the Division also. It is also proposed by administrative action that licences will be issued to expire on a driver's birthday in multiple of five years commencing at 20 years and renewed every five years thereafter;

(e) provide for a driving instructor's licence to operate over the same period as the instructors ordinary driver's licence. This will allow the ordinary licence of a driver's instructor to include the additional classification of driving instructor licence. It also provides for driving instructor's licence to operate over a five year period instead of three.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 makes an amendment to section 16 of the principal Act which provides for permits to drive pending registration. Provision is made for the determination of the period of a permit by the Registrar after consultation with the Commissioner of Police.

Clause 3 amends section 56 of the principal Act which sets out the duty of the transfer or of a vehicle on transferring the vehicle to another person. The period within which the obligations imposed under the section is reduced from 14 to seven days.

Clause 4 amends section 57 of the principal Act which sets out the duty of the transferee of a vehicle on the transfer to him of the vehicle. The period prescribed in this section for the performance of obligations under the section is reduced from 14 to seven days. Further provision is made in new subsection (1a) under which where the transferee fails to apply for transfer within seven days of transfer and then applies to register the vehicle, or applies late to transfer the vehicle, the Registrar may charge a late payment fee.

Clause 5 provides for the repeal of section 65 of the principal Act and the substitution of new section 65 which provides that traders plates are issued for a period expiring on the thirty-first day of December following the date of issue and may be reissued for further 12 monthly periods.

Clause 6 provides for the amendment of section 79 of the principal Act which prescribes a theory examination to be undertaken by applicants for licences or learners permits. Applicants must undertake and pass an examination in the rules to be observed by drivers of motor vehicles unless they held a licence in the five years preceeding the application or they satisfy the Registrar that within the five years preceeding the application, they held a licence to drive a vehicle under the law of a State or Territory other than South Australia.

Clause 7 amends section 79a of the principal Act which deals with the requirement for persons to undertake practical driving tests. The amendment brings the section into conformity with section 79 as amended by clause 6 of the measure.

Clause 8 amends section 84 of the principal Act which deals with the duration of driver's licenses. The present period of a licence (3 years) is extended to a period not exceeding five years. The effect of the amendment is to enable the introduction of a system under which licences expire on those birth dates of a driver that are divisible by 5. The Registrar is enabled to extend the five year period for a period not exceeding 12 months. The purpose of the extension is to enable a licence expiring, for example, after five years and three months in the case of a person who renews his licence three months prior to a birthday divisible by five.

Clause 9 amends section 98a of the principal Act which deals with driving instructor's licences. Provision is made for the Registrar to attach conditions to licences. The duration of the licenses is extended to conform with the amendments to section 84 of the Act.

Clause 10 makes an amendment to section 145 of the principal Act which is the regulation making power. Provision is made to enable the promulgation of regulations which confer exemptions from the provisions of the Act in favour of persons, classes of persons, vehicles or classes of vehicles.

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

## MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Motor Vehicles Act 1959. Read a first time.

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

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

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

Leave granted.

### Explanation of Bill

This Bill seeks to amend section 133 of the Motor Vehicles Act 1959 to limit expressly its operation to contracts which attempt to avoid compulsory third party bodily insurance. Section 133 of the Motor Vehicles Act provides:

Any contract (whether under seal or not) by virtue of which a person contracts in advance out of any right to claim damages or any other remedy for the negligence of any other person in driving a motor vehicle shall to that extent be void.

This section falls within Part IV of the Act, entitled Third Party Insurance. Since its enactment in 1938, transport operators have regarded its provisions as applicable only to contracts seeking to avoid liability for death and bodily injury, but not applicable to contracts related to damages for loss of, or damage to, property. This view is supported by *Hansard* reports of that time.

It has been common practice throughout Australia for carriers to specify in cartage contracts that goods being transported are carried at the risk of the owner of the goods. In such cases, the carrier has not insured the load and has proceeded on the basis that, if the load is lost, neither the carrier nor the driver can be sued for damages because of the provisions of the cartage contract.

In a decision handed down by the High Court in August, 1985, in the matter of *Lake City Freighters Pty. Ltd. v. Gordon and Gotch Pty. Ltd.*, 60 A.L.R. 509, the Court ruled that the provisions of section 133 applied to third party claims for property damage as well as to those for death and bodily injury. The effect of this decision is that in South Australia the owner of the goods has a right of action against the carrier and/or the driver for damage to those goods, notwithstanding that the provisions of the cartage contract may be to the contrary. Carriers in South Australia are therefore financially disadvantaged in relation to carriers in the Eastern States (where legislation governing compulsory third party insurance is only applicable to death and bodily injury) because they will need to arrange insurance cover in the event of loss of, or damage to, goods carried.

Representatives from the Australian Road Transport Federation, the Transport Workers Union, the South Australian Road Transport Association and the National Freight Forwarder Association have requested that section 133 be amended, to limit its operation to contracts seeking to avoid liability for death and bodily injury, operative retrospectively. This request is supported by the Department of State Development, on the grounds that road transport companies operating wholly within South Australia are financially disadvantaged relative to road transport companies operating in Victoria and other States (except in Western Australia). It also disadvantages road transport companies relative to rail transport.

However, it would be improper for the retrospective operation of the proposed amendment to affect any action commenced before the presentation of this Bill on the basis of the High Court's interpretation of section 133 and the Bill does not seek to do so.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure, proposing that the amending Act be deemed to have come into operation at the time that the principal Act came into operation. Clause 3 limits the operation of section 133 of the Motor Vehicles Act 1959, and any corresponding previous enactment, to contractual provisions by which a person contracts in advance out of any right to claim damages for the negligence of any other person in driving a motor vehicle, where such negligence has resulted in death or bodily injury. (Section 133 renders such provisions void.) However, the rights of parties to actions commenced before 11 February 1986 are not to be affected.

Mr INGERSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

## WORKERS REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION BILL

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Labour) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the rehabilitation and compensation of workers in respect of disabilities arising from their employment; to repeal the Workers Compensation Act 1971; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move:

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

Whenever the subject of workers compensation is discussed there is one thing that has the agreement of all parties, and that is the need for reform. Over the four years between 1980 and 1984 workers compensation premiums in Australia increased by approximately 160 per cent. To make matters worse, these increases occurred when industry could least afford it. Since then, premium levels have remained reasonably constant, but it is clear from the last report of the federal Insurance Commissioner that further significant increases are inevitable.

The Commissioner's report reveals that many insurance companies have continued to make massive underwriting losses on their workers compensation business. The recent departure of Royal Insurance from the workers compensation field is a good example of the current pressures that exist within the insurance industry. Because of the need of insurance companies to recoup their underwriting losses, employers in this State are facing further crippling increases in premiums.

A similar situation arose in the late 1970s, when insurance companies entered into a discount war that resulted in heavy underwriting losses. The massive escalation in premiums that followed in the years 1980 to 1983 was a direct result of this destructive discount war. The insurance industry has a reputation for being the most volatile of the financial sectors and appears to operate on a regular five year cycle of boom and bust. Once again this economically destabilising pattern is in danger of repeating itself, and it is patently clear that a further round of premium hikes lies just around the corner unless decisive action is taken to reform the system.

There are, of course, other pressing reasons, both social and economic, for undertaking these much needed reforms. Victoria has recently introduced its 'Work care' scheme that has reduced premiums in that State by \$600 million per annum. The new Victorian Accident Compensation Commission has estimated that the reforms have cut the premiums in Victoria from an average of 4.81 per cent of gross earnings to 2.26 per cent; a drop of over 50 per cent. If we do not take similar action in this State our competitive position will be severely eroded.

This Bill addresses the critical problems that South Australian industry now faces. It seeks to provide for significant reductions in current premium levels and to introduce greater stability in the setting of future premiums. The Bill also proposes a major revision of the benefits paid to injured workers. It seeks to overcome the current inequitable system where adequate compensation depends on a worker having to prove negligence under the common law. The prime emphasis under this Bill is to compensate injured workers according to their needs and not on a basis of having to prove fault.

This Bill is the culmination of a process of reform that commenced as far back as 1978, when the then Minister of Labour, Jack Wright, established a tripartite committee under the chairmanship of Des Byrne to examine and report on a more effective means of rehabilitating and compensating persons injured at work. The Byrne Committee, as it was called, presented its report in 1980 and made recommendations which were of a far reaching nature. The members of the committee argued for a complete transformation of the workers compensation system and recommended the establishment of a sole insurer to replace the multi-insurer system.

When the Byrne report was released the pressures on premiums were only just emerging, but between the years 1979-80 and 1982-83, average premiums in South Australia doubled. Despite these dramatic increases, the then Tonkin Liberal Government lacked the willpower to implement the major recommendations of the Byrne report and made only cosmetic changes to the existing system. On Labor's return to office in late 1982 one of the first actions taken by Jack Wright was to revive the Byrne Committee report and call for fresh submissions.

As a result, it became immediately clear that the issue of workers compensation reform was very much alive. To enable a full airing of the views for and against reform, the 'New Directions' conference was organised in June. That conference, which included speakers of international repute, such as Professor Terry Ison of Canada, and Justice Owen Woodhouse of New Zealand, was important in bringing into focus the complex issues involved.

In its review of this matter the Government recognised early in the piece that there were basically only two major parties involved—the employers who were paying escalating premiums and incurring the losses, and the workers who were being injured at work and receiving inadequate compensation. A conscious decision was therefore made to closely involve representatives of both these major parties in the formulation of detailed proposals for reform.

Following the 'New Directions' conference work was commenced on the preparation of those detailed proposals having regard to the Byrne Committee recommendations, overseas precedents in Canada and New Zealand, and the single insurer system that has been successfully operating in Queensland since 1916. In August 1985 the Government released a white paper which outlined the Government's proposals for workers compensation reform.

The release of the white paper generated a substantial number of submissions from a wide range of groups. As a result of those submissions it became obvious that a number of refinements needed to be made to the white paper proposals and these have been incorporated in this Bill. In the final result it has not been possible to reach agreement on every item contained in this Bill. Given the complexity of the subject matter and the differing interests involved, that should hardly be surprising. Nonetheless, it is important to note that there are major areas of agreement. In particular, there is general support for:

—Greater emphasis to be given to the rehabilitation of injured workers.

—A sole authority to be established and controlled on a tripartite basis.

—The retention of self insurance.

—The payment of the first week's wages to be by the employer.

—The new scheme to be run on a funded basis.

—And an administrative system of settling disputes to replace the legal adversary system.

The need for improvements in the area of rehabilitation is one of the major concerns of this Bill. Under the current system workers who have previously received compensation find it difficult to get new employment because of insurance industry practices of loading the premiums of employers who take on such workers. These practices and other disincentives to rehabilitation, such as the lengthy delays in the settlement of disputed claims, will be tackled under the provisions of this Bill. The spreading of the costs of so-called secondary disabilities will eliminate the disincentive to employ previously injured workers. The ability of the corporation to reduce the premiums of employers who assist in the rehabilitation of injured workers and who provide alternative duties will also act as a positive incentive.

In addition, the Bill provides for a mechanism whereby the benefits payable to injured workers can be suspended or reduced where the worker unreasonably fails to cooperate in rehabilitation programs. It is believed that the combination of all these measures, together with the much reduced role of the court system and the common law, will assist in the early return to work of injured workers.

Whilst it has not been possible to cost the savings that will flow from the effects of these rehabilitation measures, the Government believes that they will be substantial. The creation of the sole authority to operate along corporate lines on a non-profit basis is central to the reforms and to the achievement of real cost savings.

The corporation is to have an 11 person board with four representatives from the unions and four members representing employers. To ensure that the different employer interests have a voice, it is proposed that, of the four employer representatives on the board, one will represent the interests of small business and another will represent self insurers. The concept of self insurance is to be retained under the new legislation but exemption will be subject to greater scrutiny.

The general support that exists for the establishment of a sole authority is of great significance. The insurance industry has been given every opportunity to set its house in order and to put forward viable alternative proposals. It is clear, however, that the insurance industry's uncostered proposals would not lead to significant savings and would, if anything, further concentrate the control of the industry in the hands of the top five insurance companies.

The Government believes that there are no credible alternatives to the course it has chosen. The only alternative would be to leave the system to drift along in its present form. The Government believes that such a situation would be disastrous to the State's economy.

In 1985, when the Government released its white paper, a number of major employer organisations, including the Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the Metal Industries Association, indicated support for the general thrust of the Government's reforms. It is therefore important to recognise that this Bill largely mirrors what was contained in the white paper. The only changes made of a significant nature and contained in this Bill relate to the improvements made in the proposed levels of benefit. I refer, in particular, to changes in the lump sums for non-economic loss and the proposal to retain the residual common law right for non-economic loss. The Government has had these changes

costed and estimates the extra cost to be no more than approximately 3 per cent to 5 per cent of premiums.

Whilst employer concerns about these departures from the white paper are understandable, it is important to put the changes in their proper perspective. The Government believes that on the basis of independent costings the improved benefits for workers are affordable and that significant savings in premiums will be achievable.

The revised levels of benefits are on broadly comparable terms to those under the Victorian 'Work care' scheme where the average cut in premiums exceeds 50 per cent. The Government's proposals to improve the compensation package for injured workers are in any case long overdue. The maximum levels of benefit payable under the current Act have been seriously eroded by inflation and are quite arbitrary and callous in their cut off effects on injured workers.

Under the current Act, for example, it is possible for a worker just out of school who has been rendered totally and permanently incapacitated as a result of a work related injury to be on weekly benefits for a few months and then limited to a maximum pay-out of \$50 000 for a lifetime's loss of earnings and complete loss of bodily function. No fair-minded person could possibly support the continuation of such a scandalous system.

It has long been recognised that the current system seriously undercompensates some and, in some cases, overcompensates others. The Government's proposals are therefore geared to removing these inequities by providing a fair level of long-term income security to injured workers. The system of benefits will be determined primarily on a no fault basis.

The retention of the residual right to sue for non-economic loss represents approximately 25 per cent of current common law settlements. Under this Bill any statutory lump sum paid for non-economic loss must be deducted from any residual common law settlement. Because of this off-setting of the two amounts, it is believed that very few such common law actions will be taken. Only in extreme cases of pain or suffering, or major loss of social amenity, would extra sums be achievable through the retention of this residual common law right.

It is recognised that no system can be designed that will ever fully compensate injured workers because many losses such as the loss of promotional opportunities are simply not quantifiable. The Government recognises that a balance should be struck between the legitimate rights of workers to fair levels of compensation and the economic ability of industry to pay the cost of that compensation.

Because of the need to strike this balance the Government recognises that the question of costs is central to the proposals, and detailed costings have been undertaken using private industry insurance data. The Government's independent costing study was undertaken by Dr Trevor Mules of the faculty of economics, Adelaide University, and Mr Ted Fedorovitch of the Department of Labour.

Their costing study reveals that the estimated real net savings that will accrue to South Australian industry will be in excess of 30 per cent. This figure includes removal of the 8 per cent stamp duty which is tied to the introduction of these reforms. If account is also taken of the first week's liability being transferred to employers the actual cut in premiums is estimated to exceed 40 per cent.

On the latest year's figures available the total premiums collected by insurance companies in South Australia amounted to approximately \$170 million per annum. On the basis of these figures the estimated real savings of the Government reforms can be expected to exceed \$50 million per annum.

Accordingly, if this legislation is delayed or obstructed the yearly cost to employers can be measured in terms of tens of millions of dollars. Also at stake is the investment in this State of the enormous funds that will be generated as surplus to current requirements.

The investment of these funds over the years has been a source of considerable income to insurance companies and is the reason, notwithstanding the current losses being made by some companies, why the insurance industry is fighting to hold on to the business. It is estimated that over a period of five years these surplus funds will build up to a pool of approximately \$300 million. In the past, most of these surplus funds have been invested outside the State on the basis of decisions made interstate and overseas.

This Bill provides that preference in the investment of these surplus funds is to be given to investment in this State unless higher rates of return can be achieved elsewhere. This will ensure that worthwhile South Australian projects are not overlooked and that the workers compensation system can become a major generator of jobs within the State.

The Government accepts that the validity of the independent costings is a matter of central importance. The South Australian Employers Federation has commissioned its own independent costing using insurance industry data that has produced figures which are different to the costings commissioned by the Government.

A comparison of the two sets of costings shows that most of the figures of estimated savings are, in fact, very close. The major difference appears to be over the level of profit made by insurance companies. The Government's costings estimated that insurance companies were making on average a 9 per cent profit.

The Employers Federation costings, on the other hand, estimate that insurance companies are making a 20 per cent loss. The Government believes the 9 per cent figure to be a more realistic figure of the average long-term profitability of insurance companies and therefore the long-term savings to be made under the new system. The Employers Federation costings, on the other hand, are based on a somewhat unrealistic short-term view.

Because of the importance attached to the costings, the Government has agreed to requests that the Auditor-General examine the two costings to determine to what degree the two sets of results differ and, if so, whether the differences are of such a material nature as to put in doubt the reliability of the Government's costing study.

It may be that the differences between the two costings studies can be explained or reconciled, in which case the Auditor-General has been requested to comment on this as well. It is not clear at this stage when that report will be available but the Auditor-General has informed me that he recognises the urgency of the matter and that he will make his report to the Government as soon as possible.

Before ending this speech it is fitting to record Jack Wright's great contribution to the development of these reforms. Without Jack's unrelenting belief, spanning many years, these essential reforms would not have been conceived nor seen the light of day. This Bill represents a major economic and social reform. It proposes changes that will lead to significant improvements in the rehabilitation of injured workers to a fairer and more financially secure system of compensation benefits, and will also pave the way for substantial cuts in the premiums to employers and improve the competitive position of South Australian industry. I commend the Bill to the House and seek leave to insert into *Hansard* the Parliamentary Counsel's detailed explanation of the clauses without my reading it.

Leave granted.

### Explanation of Clauses

The provisions of the Bill are as follows:  
Preliminary:

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure. Clause 3 sets out the definitions required for the purposes of the Bill. A 'worker' is to be defined as a person engaged to work under a contract of service, a person who performs specified public functions (such as a member of Parliament, a judicial or other officer of the Crown, a member of a Government instrumentality or a prescribed volunteer) or a self-employed person to whom the protection of the Act has been extended by arrangement with the corporation. A 'contract of service' includes an employment agreement, an agreement under which a person works for another in prescribed work or work of a prescribed class, an apprenticeship and an arrangement for on the job training where the trainee receives remuneration. Several definitions are similar to those appearing in the current Act, although 'spouse' is now to be defined to include a *de facto* spouse if the spouse has been living with the worker for a period of three years or if the spouse and the worker have had a child.

Clause 4 is concerned with defining the concept of 'average weekly earnings'. The basic definition is that average weekly earnings are the average amount that a disabled worker could reasonably be expected to have earned had the worker not been disabled. In calculating average weekly earnings, earnings from all forms of employment must be taken into account and earnings over the preceding period of 12 months are to be considered. The average weekly earnings of a contractor are to be determined as if the contractor was performing particular work as an employee, the average weekly earnings of a permanently incapacitated worker under 21 are to be determined as if the worker was 21 and the average weekly earnings of a permanently incapacitated apprentice are to be determined as if the apprenticeship had been completed. The earnings of a disabled worker whose earnings capacity has been affected by the disability are to reflect fairly the earnings that could have been earned but for the disability and the earnings of a worker who, although out of work, was predominantly in work for the preceding 18 months are to be determined as if the worker had been in full-time work. Furthermore, average weekly earnings may not be less than any award rate applying to the work and not less than a prescribed minimum amount (which will be of particular relevance to unemployed 'volunteers' under the Act and workers in part-time employment) and may not exceed 2.5 times the State average weekly earnings. Average weekly earnings are not to include certain prescribed allowances including overtime (other than regular overtime) and site allowances.

Clause 5 provides that the Act will bind the Crown. Clause 6 prescribes the territorial operation of the Act. The Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Corporation:

Clause 7 constitutes the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Corporation. Clause 8 provides that the corporation is to be managed by a board of 11 members. The presiding member is to be a person nominated by the Minister. Four members are to be appointed after consultation with the United Trades and Labor Council, three after consultation with employer associations and one after consultation with the Employer-managed Compensation Association Incorporated. One member is to be appointed on account of expertise in the field of rehabilitation and the General Manager will *ex officio* be a member.

Clause 9 sets out the terms and conditions of office. An appointment to the board may be for a term of up to 5 years; deputy members may be appointed; members may

be removed from office in appropriate circumstances. Clause 10 provides that members of the board may be entitled to fees, allowances and expenses (paid from the Compensation Fund). Clause 11 relates to proceedings before the board. At least one meeting must be held in every month.

Clause 12 provides for the validity of acts of the board and the personal immunity of its members. Clause 13 requires a member of the board to disclose a personal interest in any contract or other matter before the board. Clause 14 sets out the proposed functions of the corporation. The corporation is to undertake, subject to the direction of the Minister, the enforcement and administration of the Act, manage funds derived under the Act, keep the operation of the Act under review and make appropriate recommendations for reform, collect data and undertake research and perform other prescribed functions. The corporation will be able to operate accounts and invest money, deal with property and establish offices.

Clause 15 requires the corporation to have due regard to differences in the ethnic background of workers. Clause 16 is a delegation power. Clause 17 requires the corporation to keep proper accounts. The corporation is required to ensure the proper collection of moneys payable under the Act, ensure the authorisation of liabilities and expenditure, ensure efficiency and economy in its operations and develop proper budgeting, accounting and audit systems.

Clause 18 provides for an annual audit by the Auditor-General. Clause 19 requires the corporation to provide an annual report. Clause 20 relates to the office of General Manager and Deputy General Manager. The General Manager is to be the chief executive officer of the corporation and responsible to it for the efficient management of its business and staff.

Clause 21 provides for the staff of the corporation. Clause 22 ensures continuity of service where staff are from the Public Service, SGIC and other prescribed employment. Clause 23 allows the corporation to enter into arrangements with the Superannuation Board. Clause 24 provides that the Government Management and Employment Act is not to apply in relation to the officers of the corporation. Clause 25 provides for the use of public facilities.

Rehabilitation:

Clause 26 is the leading provision on rehabilitation. The corporation is to be required to establish or approve rehabilitation programs so that disabled workers may achieve the highest possible level of physical and mental recovery, where possible be restored to the workforce and participate in the social life of the community. Rehabilitation programs are to provide for a comprehensive range of matters including worker assessments, advisory services, help in obtaining or retaining employment, assistance in training or retraining, accommodation and travel assistance, special equipment or care, rehabilitation research and the support of other organisations that assist disabled workers.

Clause 27 allows the corporation to arrange for the provision of rehabilitation facilities and services and, with the approval of the Minister, to establish clinics and facilities. Clause 28 provides for the appointment and functions of rehabilitation advisers. Clause 29 allows the corporation to assist employers to establish programs designed to prevent or reduce the incidence of compensable disabilities.

Compensation:

Clause 30 is one of the more significant provisions of the Bill as it defines the concept of compensable disability. By virtue of this section, a disability is generally compensable if it arises out of or in the course of employment. The employment of a worker may include various journeys, attendances and breaks associated with work; journeys between home and work are to encompass travel from or up to land appurtenant to the home unless the corporation

determines that in the circumstances of a particular case it is fair that some other point within the land be used.

Clause 31 is an evidentiary provision to the effect that if a worker who works in scheduled employment suffers a scheduled disability it shall be presumed, in the absence of proof to the contrary, that the disability arose out of or in the course of employment. Clause 32 provides for compensation for costs reasonably incurred by a worker in consequence of having suffered a compensable disability. Clause 33 requires an employer to transport a worker who has been injured to a hospital or medical expert for initial treatment.

Clause 34 provides for compensation for damage to personal property that occurs contemporaneously with the occurrence of a compensable disability. Clause 35 provides for weekly payments of compensation to a worker who is incapacitated for work. A worker who is totally incapacitated for work will receive an amount equal to his notional weekly earnings and a worker who is partially incapacitated for work will receive the difference between his notional weekly earnings and that amount that the worker is earning or could earn in suitable employment. A worker's 'notional weekly earnings' are his average earnings or, if an adjustment has been made on a review under the Act, the average weekly earnings as adjusted. A partial incapacity may be deemed to be a total incapacity unless it is established that suitable employment for which the worker is fit is reasonably available. However, if an incapacity endures for more than three years, the partial/deemed total provision ceases to apply and a pension is reduced to the difference between what the worker can earn in suitable employment (taking into account certain prescribed factors) and 85 per cent of notional weekly earnings. Weekly payments cease in any event once the worker is eligible to receive an age pension from the Commonwealth Government or reaches normal retiring age (whichever is later).

Clause 36 regulates the discontinuance or reduction of weekly payments. The corporation must give a worker 21 days notice of a decision to discontinue or reduce payment on the basis that a worker's incapacity for work has ceased or lessened or that the worker has been unreasonable in failing to undergo a medical examination.

Clause 37 allows the corporation to suspend weekly payments to a disabled worker where it considers that the worker has failed or refused to submit to proper treatment or to participate in a rehabilitation program. Clause 38 relates to the review of weekly payments. A worker or employer may request a review at six monthly intervals and the corporation is to carry out an annual review in any event. On a review the corporation may make adjustments to take into account changes in the worker's incapacity for work.

Clause 39 provides for the economic adjustment of pensions by the corporation. An adjustment will occur annually and in the first three years of benefits, account is to be taken of changes in the rates of remuneration payable to workers generally or to workers in the kind of employment from which the disability arose. Thereafter adjustment will be made in line with CPI changes. Clause 40 ensures that weekly payments are not affected by annual leave or long service leave entitlements and equally that periods of incapacity do not affect a worker's entitlement to such leave. However, a worker who is incapacitated for 52 weeks or more shall be deemed, subject to receiving any leave loading, to have received annual leave. Provision is also made for workers whose annual leave entitlements are governed by another law.

Clause 41 regulates a worker's entitlement to weekly payments if the worker is absent from Australia. The corporation's prime concerns are to ensure that a worker's rehabilitation is not impaired and to be able to ascertain

the worker's whereabouts, medical progress and on-going earning capacity. Clause 42 allows in certain circumstances a commutation of the liability to make weekly payments to a disabled worker. However, only a liability to make payments for a permanent incapacity is commutable. Furthermore, the worker must have already received compensation for non-economic loss and in any event a worker cannot receive more than a prescribed maximum.

Clause 43 prescribes the compensation payable in respect of a permanent disability on account of non-economic loss suffered by a worker. The amount of compensation is to be determined by reference to a scheduled table. The corporation is to make an appropriate determination if the particular disability does not appear in the schedule. The maximum amount payable under this section in respect of an entitlement is \$60 000 (indexed to the CPI).

Clause 44 prescribes the compensation payable on the death of a worker to a spouse and dependants. A spouse who was cohabiting with the worker is entitled to a lump sum payment and a dependent spouse is entitled to a pension of up to 50 per cent of the notional weekly earnings of the worker. A dependent child who is orphaned may receive up to 25 per cent of notional weekly earnings and other dependent children up to 12½ per cent. The amount payable to other dependent relatives will be determined by reference to the extent of the dependency, the relative's earning capacity and means, and the other benefits that have been provided under the Act in respect of the worker's death. Compensation may also be paid to a spouse or child who, although not a dependant at the time of the worker's death, suffers a change in circumstances that may, if the worker had survived, have resulted in the spouse or child becoming dependent on the worker. Payments cannot be made under this section beyond the date that, assuming the worker had survived but been permanently incapacitated, the worker would have ceased to have been entitled to compensation under the Act. Payments made under this section in any event cannot exceed in total what would have been the worker's entitlement to a weekly pension had the worker survived.

Clause 45 provides for the review of weekly payments being made to a dependant of a deceased worker. A review will take into account changes in the person's income or earnings capacity; annual reviews will take into account changes in the CPI. Clause 46 determines liability under the Act. Of particular note is that an employer is to be primarily liable for the compensation payable for the first week of incapacity. An employer who is liable to make a payment pursuant to this provision shall make the payment within 14 days of the claim or, in case of a dispute, immediately upon the dispute being determined.

Clause 47 provides for the imposition of interest at a prescribed rate on amounts in arrears. Clause 48 allows the corporation to make a payment if an employer fails to do so. In the event of the corporation making such a payment, it may recover from the employer as a debt the amount of the payment, an administrative fee and a penalty.

Clause 49 allows the corporation, at the request of an employer, to assume a liability of the employer. One application of this provision will be to allow the corporation to take over long-term liabilities of exempt employers to permanently incapacitated workers. Clause 50 makes the corporation the insurer of last resort. In the event of an exempt employer becoming insolvent an amount equal to the liabilities of the corporation by virtue of this provision will be able to be claimed in a winding up of the exempt employer.

Clause 51 requires the giving of appropriate notice on the occurrence of a compensable disability. Clause 52 sets out the procedure for making a claim under the Act. Clause 53



sets out the procedures to be followed by the corporation on the making of a claim. The corporation may require a worker to undergo a medical examination. The corporation is to be required to determine claims as expeditiously as reasonably as is practicable and to endeavour to determine the claim within 10 business days. Notice of the corporation's decision on a claim must be given to the claimant and any interested employer.

Clause 54 places restrictions on the actions that may be taken against employers on account of disabilities suffered by their workers. In particular, an employer will only be liable to pay damages for non-economic loss or on account of an action for solatium. Any award of a court in an action that is taken independently of the Act must take into account the person's entitlement to a lump sum payment in respect of non-economic loss under the Act. In addition, if the worker has a right of action against a third party then any person who has paid the worker compensation under this Act is subrogated to the right of action to the extent of the payment.

Clause 55 prevents recovery of compensation under both this Act and the law of the Commonwealth or of another State or country. Clause 56 provides that a disability suffered on account of misconduct on the part of the worker is generally compensable. Clause 57 provides that the Merchant Shipping Act 1894, of the United Kingdom cannot limit the amount of compensation payable to a worker on a ship. Clause 58 makes special provision for sportsmen in a manner that is similar to Section 89a of the present Act.

Funding of the Statutory Scheme:

Clause 59 requires employers to register with the corporation (subject to certain exceptions). Clause 60 allows certain employers to apply to the corporation for registration as exempt employers. An employer may apply under this provision if it is a body corporate and it employs more than a prescribed number of workers, or is a member of a group of related corporations or local government corporations. In determining whether to grant exempt status to an employer, the corporation must take into account various matters including the ability of the employer to meet its liabilities, its resources for determining claims, its safety record, its rehabilitation record and the views of any registered association that has an interest in the matter. The corporation is empowered to grant registration subject to such terms and conditions as it may determine or as may be prescribed by regulation. Such conditions may require, for example, the lodgment of security. Registration may only have effect for a period of three years and the corporation may revoke a registration if a term or condition of registration is broken or ignored.

Clause 61 provides that the Crown and agencies and instrumentalities of the Crown are to be deemed to be exempt employers, subject to exemptions made by proclamation. Clause 62 prescribes the procedure to be followed in applying for registration as an employer, exempt employer or group of exempt employers. Clause 63 is a delegation provision to enable exempt employers to exercise appropriate powers, functions and discretions under the Act in relation to their workers. The section effectively divests the corporation of certain functions and transfers them to the exempt employer. Provision is made for the preservation of a worker's rights to review and appeal. The corporation will not be able to overrule or interfere with a decision made under the delegation.

Clause 64 provides for the constitution of a compensation fund. The fund will be comprised of all moneys received under the Act. It is to be applied towards paying compensation for which the corporation is liable under the Act and all other costs of the corporation. Moneys standing to the credit of the fund may be invested and the returns credited

to the fund. Investments should be made so as to promote the economy of the State. Until there are sufficient funds in the fund for the purposes of the Act, the Treasurer may make loans to the corporation on terms and conditions determined by the Treasurer. Clause 65 empowers the corporation to impose levies on employers. Levies are to be applied on a class by class basis and made against payrolls.

Clause 66 enjoins the corporation in fixing levies to have as the paramount purpose the need to establish and maintain sufficient funds in order to be able to meet its liabilities over the particular assessment period, to establish reserves and to make up previous insufficiencies in the compensation fund. Supplementary levies can also be imposed in exceptional circumstances.

Clause 67 relates to the spreading of certain costs by providing that (a) all administrative expenditure and (b) all costs associated with unrepresentative disabilities and secondary disabilities are to be spread across all payrolls on a uniform basis.

Clause 68 allows the corporation to adjust the amount payable by a particular employer. A remission of levy may be made if the employer has taken exceptional measures to reduce the incidence of work related traumas, has a good safety record or provides approved rehabilitation services. A supplementary levy may be imposed if the employer has failed to take adequate measures to reduce the incidence of work related traumas or has a poor safety record.

Clause 69 provides for the imposition of a special levy on exempt employers. The levy is to be fixed with a view to raising a fair contribution towards the administrative expenses of the corporation, the costs of rehabilitation and the amount required to meet the liabilities of insolvent exempt employers. A remission may occur if the exempt employer provides approved rehabilitation services. Clause 70 relates to the provision of returns by employers. A return must include an estimate of the remuneration that the employer will pay to workers during the relevant assessment period and be accompanied by any amount underpaid from the previous period.

Clause 71 provides that on the receipt of a return the corporation may assess the amount of levy payable by the employer and issue an assessment notice. The corporation may make its own estimate of a payroll if it has reasonable grounds to believe that the employer's estimate was erroneous. Clause 72 provides for the recovery of levies and fines. The corporation will be able to make its own estimate against an employer if the employer fails to furnish a return. Furthermore, a fine of up to three times the amount assessed will be payable.

Clause 73 provides penalties for late payments of levies. Clause 74 requires the corporation to keep individual experience accounts for each employer. Clause 75 requires an employer to keep proper records in order that returns may be completed in accordance with the Act. Clause 76 requires a registered employer to notify the corporation if the employer is ceasing to employ workers. Clause 77 provides for proof of registration.

Reviews and Appeals:

Clause 78 provides for the appointment of review officers. Clause 79 establishes a Workers Compensation Appeal Tribunal. Clause 80 provides for the membership of the tribunal, being a President, Deputy President and ordinary members. Presidential members are to be nominated after consultation with the UTLC and employer associations and must be legal practitioners of at least 7 years standing. Ordinary members are to be nominated after consultation with the UTLC or employer associations.

Clause 81 provides that for the purpose of any proceedings the tribunal is to be constituted by the President or a Deputy President, one member selected from one group and

one member selected from the other. Clause 82 provides for the personal immunity of members. Clause 83 provides for the making of rules relating to the practice and procedure of the tribunal. Clause 84 provides for the appointment of medical review panels.

Clause 85 enacts that a panel shall be constituted in relation to particular proceedings, or proceedings of a particular class, by the Minister. Panels are to be established as specialized panels in particular classes of disabilities. The panels are to be constituted after consultation with the UTLC and employer associations. Clause 86 provides for the procedures of panels. Clause 87 provides for the personal immunity of members of panels.

Clause 88 provides for the appointment of a Registrar as chief executive of the tribunal and the medical review panels, and for the appointment of associated staff. Clause 89 directs review authorities in proceedings to act according to equity, good conscience and the substantial merits of the particular case. Review authorities will not be bound by the rules of evidence. Clause 90 requires reasonable notice to be given to the parties to proceedings before a review authority of the time and place of any hearing and requires that each party be given a reasonable opportunity to call or give evidence, examine and cross-examine witnesses and make submissions.

Clause 91 sets out the various powers of a review authority, including the power to issue a summons and to compel a witness to answer questions. A medical review panel may require a worker to undergo a medical examination by the panel, a member of the panel or another medical specialist. Clause 92 provides for the payment of witness fees. Clause 93 allows a party to be represented in proceedings before a review authority. Costs may be awarded in certain cases where a party is represented by counsel or an officer of a registered association. Special provision is made for costs if proceedings are brought frivolously or vexatiously.

Clause 94 requires a review authority at the conclusion of a review to furnish the parties to proceedings with a statement containing prescribed matters. Clause 95 protects the confidentiality of proceedings before a medical review panel. Clause 96 sets out the rights of review under the Act. In particular, a person who is directly affected by a decision made on a claim for compensation, made in relation to the provision of a rehabilitation program, made for the variation, suspension or discontinuance of weekly payments, made on the imposition of a levy or assessment, or made on an application for extension of time under the clause, may apply for a review. The corporation is, at first instance, to attempt to resolve an application for review by agreement. Unresolved matters are to be referred to review officers.

Clause 97 sets out the functions of a review officer. A review officer must make a fresh determination of the matter and may refer a medical question to a medical review panel. The decision of a review officer takes effect in substitution for that of the corporation. Clause 98 provides that the corporation or a dissatisfied party may appeal to the tribunal or on a medical question, to a medical review panel, against a decision of a review officer. The appeal is to be conducted as a rehearing. The tribunal may in turn refer a medical question to a medical review panel. Clause 99 provides that the decision of a medical review panel (on a medical question) is final unless the tribunal, by leave where special reasons are shown, grants an appeal.

Clause 100 allows the tribunal to state a case on a question of law to the Supreme Court. Clause 101 allows appeals to the Supreme Court, by leave, on questions of law. Clause 102 allows the Minister to intervene in proceedings before the tribunal or Supreme Court where it is thought that intervention is desirable in the public interest. Clause 103

allows a review officer to resolve delays in the determination of claims. Clause 104 provides that a liability to pay a levy is not suspended pending a review or appeal in relation to the assessment.

#### Miscellaneous:

Clause 105 allows self-employed persons to apply to the corporation for the protection of the Act. The Corporation may set various conditions and limitations to the granting of an application. Clause 106 makes special provision for certain workers who work on or about ships that are covered by special international insurance arrangements. Clause 107 makes the corporation the insurer of employers in respect of any liabilities that arise for non-economic loss or solatium on account of workers suffering compensable disabilities.

Clause 108 provides for the making of interim payments of compensation. Clause 109 entitles a worker's employer to request a report on the medical progress being made by a worker and on the extent of any incapacity. Clause 110 entitles the employer of a disabled worker to require the corporation to have the worker undergo a medical examination by a medical expert nominated by the corporation.

Clause 111 ensures that a worker is provided with a copy of all medical reports. Clause 112 sets out the various powers of inspectors under the Act. Clause 113 empowers a rehabilitation adviser to inspect any place of employment of a disabled worker. Clause 114 is intended to ensure that reasonable confidentiality is maintained in respect of the physical or mental condition of a worker, the personal circumstances of any person and the information furnished by employers in returns.

Clause 115 relates to diseases and disabilities that develop gradually. Clause 116 provides that compensation payments are not to be affected by *ex gratia* payments, accident insurance or other prescribed payments or benefits. Clause 117 makes it unlawful for an employer to deduct from the wages of a worker any sum that the employer may be liable for under the Act. A worker must not in any other way be adversely affected by virtue of the fact that an employer may be liable to pay any sum under the Act. Clause 118 deals with the situation where a worker has been committed to prison.

Clauses 119 and 120 provide for the serviced notices and other documents. Clause 121 forbids the making of an agreement that purports to exclude, modify or restrict the operation of the Act and renders such an agreement void. A purported waiver of a right conferred by the Act is to be void. Clause 122 renders unlawful any fraudulent attempt to obtain a benefit under the Act.

Clause 123 makes special provision for the protection of the name 'work cover'. Clause 124 deals with offences under the Act, which are to be disposed of summarily. Clause 125 exempts the corporation from the operation of certain provisions of the Stamp Duties Act 1923 relating to annual licences. Clause 126 is the regulation making power. Clause 127 provides for the repeal of the Workers Compensation Act 1971.

The first schedule sets out the various transitional provisions required on the commencement of the Act. Special provision is made for the dismantling of the Silicosis Fund and the Statutory Reserve Fund. The second schedule is relevant to the operation of clause 31. The third schedule prescribes various permanent disabilities in respect of which prescribed amounts are payable on account of non-economic loss.

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

**DAIRY INDUSTRY ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Agriculture)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Dairy Industry Act 1928. Read a first time.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I move:

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

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

Leave granted.

**Explanation of Bill**

The Australian dairy industry has experienced two years of declining returns, due to overproduction and depressed export prices. Current marketing arrangements do not provide for production control at a national level.

Dairy farms in South Australia are licenced under two Acts: those supplying the metropolitan area are licensed by the Metropolitan Milk Board under the Metropolitan Milk Supply Act (1946) as amended; those outside the metropolitan area, such as the South East or Port Lincoln, are licensed by the Department of Agriculture under the Dairy Industry Act (1928) as amended.

Dairy industry organisations are concerned that continuing increased milk production in Australia will further depress industry returns and have requested the Minister of Agriculture to restrict the issue of new dairy farm licences under the Dairy Industry Act, on industry economic grounds.

At present the Minister can refuse to issue a dairy farm licence under the Dairy Industry Act only if the farm is not suitable for use as a dairy farm, or does not meet regulatory requirements in respect of hygiene and construction.

The amendments to the Dairy Industry Act will allow the Minister, on forming the opinion that the issue of further licences would render dairy farming uneconomic, to direct that no new dairy farm licences be issued. This will allow the Government to help reduce milk production in South Australia and improve the viability of existing dairy farms.

The restriction will not apply for renewals of existing licences, the transfer of licences following change of ownership or to a person transferring his licence to a new dairy farm.

In proclaiming this legislation, time is to be allowed to ensure that individuals who have already committed resources to the development of a dairy farm can apply for a licence. In addition the legislation will permit the Minister to revoke a direction previously made.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 7 (2a) of the Act to provide that the issue of a licence for a dairy farm is subject to any direction given by the Minister under section 8 or 8a.

Clause 4 inserts section 8a, which provides that the Minister may direct that no further licences be issued for dairy farms when the Minister is of the opinion that the establishment of further dairy farms would result in lower returns to dairy farmers, rendering dairy farming uneconomic. Subsection (2) of the proposed section provides that such a direction shall not affect an application for renewal of a dairy farm licence, transfer of a licence from one person to another, or an application by a holder of a licence to transfer from one property to another. Subsection (3) of the proposed section provides that the Minister may revoke such a direction.

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

**METROPOLITAN MILK SUPPLY ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Agriculture)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Metropolitan Milk Supply Act 1946. Read a first time.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I move:

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

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

Leave granted.

**Explanation of Bill**

It accompanies the Bill for amending the Dairy Industry Act and is designed to restrict the issue of new milk producer's licences under the Metropolitan Milk Supply Act. The amendments are therefore similar to those proposed for the Dairy Industry Act, thus ensuring uniformity of action under both Acts.

This measure will allow the Metropolitan Milk Board to help reduce milk production and improve the viability of existing milk producers.

The Metropolitan Milk Supply Act and Regulations are also being amended to increase penalties under the Act to \$2 500 and under the regulations to \$1 000. Existing penalties of \$200 and \$100 have not been increased since 1946.

These amendments are therefore proposed to make the penalties more realistic and to increase the effectiveness of the Act.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 29 of the Act to enable the board, on the application of the holder of a milk producer's licence, to amend the licence by deleting the reference to the premises in the licence and substituting a different premises as requested by the holder of the milk producer's licence in the application.

Clause 4 amends section 32 of the Act. Under proposed new subsection (3a), when the Minister forms the opinion that the issue of further milk producer's licences would lower returns to milk producers thus rendering dairy farming uneconomic, the Minister may direct that no further licences be issued. Proposed new subsection (3b) provides that a declaration under proposed new subsection (3a) does not affect an application for renewal of a current licence. Proposed new subsection (3c) permits the Minister to revoke a declaration. Proposed new subsection (3d) requires the board to comply with Ministerial directions under proposed new subsection (3a).

Clause 5 increases from \$200 to \$2 500 the penalty for contravention of any term of an order of the Metropolitan Milk Board admitting a licence holder to a milk prices equalisation scheme in force in respect of milk supplied to the metropolitan area.

Clause 6 increases from \$100 to \$1 000 the maximum penalty that may be imposed under the regulations for a breach of any regulation.

Clause 7 increases the general penalty provided under section 47 of the principal Act from \$200 to \$2 500.

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

**ADDRESS IN REPLY**

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.  
(Continued from 11 February. Page 45.)

**Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide):** I finally rise as a backbencher to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply moved by my colleague the new member for New-

land, and seconded by the first member for Briggs. In so doing, I join other members in extending congratulations to you, Mr Speaker, on your election to the position and wish you well in that position over the life of this Parliament. I am confident that your previous experience in this House and your knowledge of the procedures of the House will enable you to perform the duties of the office with great skill, care and command.

I also offer my congratulations to my fellow Jubilee MPs, the members for Briggs, Bright, Fisher, Newland, Price and Whyalla on this side of the House and the member for Victoria on the other side of the House. No doubt, the tag of 'Jubilee MP' will stay with us for some time and I hope that the members who have been elected for the first time will be here for many years to come and retain the confidence of the electors of their districts. In particular, may I offer my congratulations to the member for Whyalla, who successfully transferred from the Legislative Council and, having read the first speech he gave in that place, I am sure that he is doubly pleased to be here.

Election to this House is a great honour which I believe carries with it an enormous responsibility to represent the hopes and aspirations of the voters of the electorate. So, to the electors of Adelaide, I publicly offer my thanks for the support and trust that has been placed in me, albeit by a slender margin, as their member in this place for the next four years. With due acknowledgement to the first speech of the member for Unley, allow me to say that most political pundits suggested that I could not and should not be in this place to represent the electorate of Adelaide. However, I am here and I am going to stay here. My primary goal will be to represent the people of Adelaide as effectively as I can. My door will always be open to the people of that district, and I look forward to serving them with all the skill that I can muster.

There are many members who are not in this Parliament who were in the last Parliament. A number of them were defeated in the election, others of them retired. George Whitten, the former member for Price; Max Brown, the former member for Whyalla; Jack Wright, the former member for Adelaide; and Alan Rodda, the former member for Victoria worked for many years on behalf of their constituents, on behalf of their Party and on behalf of the people of South Australia. I pay a tribute to their long and meritorious service. In particular, I would like to acknowledge my predecessor as the member for Adelaide, the former Deputy Premier and former Minister of Labour for many years, Mr Jack Wright.

Mr Wright was elected on 3 July 1971 in a by-election following the death of the former member Mr Sam Lawn. Mr Wright came to this Parliament from being a long and hard working member and organiser with the Australian Workers Union. His first speech, on 14 July 1971, dealt with the then recent reforms to the Workers Compensation Act. Over the remaining 15 years Mr Wright worked hard to ensure that the standards of protection that were afforded to workers and the standards of compensation that were afforded to them as a result of industrial accident and industrial injury were maintained and kept in line with changing circumstances, the changing nature of the workforce and the changing nature of industry, machinery, equipment, processes and so on.

It is a standing tribute to him, therefore, I believe, that the Governor has referred in his speech to the fact that one of the most significant pieces of legislation which has now been put before this House by the Minister of Labour is a revamped Workers Compensation Act, following a review begun by Jack Wright and acknowledged by the Minister. Jack Wright's 15-year history in this House has been one of dedicated concern to the standards and conditions of the

working people of South Australia. The contribution that he has made in the industrial and political spheres of the Labor movement earned him the award of a member of the Order of Australia, an award which I think is justly deserved and which is recognised as being deserved by people right across the political spectrum. I am privileged to be able to follow in the footsteps of Mr Jack Wright as member for Adelaide.

The seat of Adelaide is a very different seat now from what it was in the forty-fifth Parliament. It still comprises the square mile of the city of Adelaide but also comprises the remainder of the city of Adelaide and North Adelaide, as well as significant sections of the city of Prospect and the town of Walkerville, much of which was encompassed in the former seat of Torrens. I acknowledge the service given to the electorate of Torrens by its former, and last, member, Michael Wilson. Adelaide now is a very diverse and cosmopolitan area. It has characteristics that very few other electorates have. In particular, it is a finely balanced seat—something which I particularly recognise and which places on me an extra responsibility for representing fairly and equitably the people of the district.

Party politics in South Australia, as elsewhere, is a very public activity. However, there are always people whose occupations prevent them from being acknowledged publicly. Many of those people contributed to my victory and worked hard for the last five or six years to enable me to stand here as the member for Adelaide. So, in this my first speech in this House, may I say that without them I could not have been here.

The electors of South Australia have shown their strong support for this Government and for members of the Australian Labor Party. It puts on the Government and the backbenchers on this side of the House a responsibility for the commitments made, the promises held out and the expectations offered to South Australians during the election campaign. We have a responsibility to ensure that those hopes and aspirations are realised in the coming years. My approach to these responsibilities is one of social reconstruction and social reform; a belief that the process of social reconstruction is never finished; that it is a dynamic process which creates new burdens, new challenges and new opportunities.

The role of Government is to be constantly in touch with the dynamics of change to ensure that people are not left out or left behind by the process of social evolution. One of the great strengths of the Australian Labor Party is the diversity of people who contribute to the development of policy. The diversity of the South Australian community is reflected in the current composition of the Labor Party in this Parliament and is, I believe, another of its great strengths.

One of the most critically important policy areas for any Government is housing. The comprehensive housing policy announced by the Premier during the election campaign provided for assistance to home-buyers, as well as a continued commitment to an expanded public housing program. The Premier committed the Government to a variety of new programs such as low-start loans which will keep repayments down in the early stages of home-buying when family obligations put much pressure on family income.

Home ownership is very important to many people in this country, and with high interest rates at present this scheme will enable working people on average incomes to enter the housing market at a rate which they can afford. Similarly, the Premier indicated that a home guarantee program would be added to the range of schemes which already exist to provide protection to home-buyers who face difficulty in meeting their mortgage repayments.

I take the opportunity of mentioning two other areas of housing policy are so critically important: housing for the

elderly and housing for youth. However, before doing so, I would like the House to know of the consternation that the Liberals' housing policy caused many of the residents of South Australian Housing Trust properties—at least in the electorate of Adelaide. Many of these tenants were genuinely frightened at the prospect of being unable to take up the proposed offer of the Liberal Party had it won government to sell off their residences. I had to visit some groups of units two or three times during the election campaign because of residents' concern. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition suggested that my action in doing so amounted to a dirty tricks campaign, but I assure him that the reason why I had to go so many times and why I took the Minister of Housing and Construction with me was that they would take an assurance from no-one else that they were safe in their houses.

The Liberal housing policy was ill conceived, ill considered and put fear into the hearts of many people, people who were elderly or disabled, most of whom were unable to purchase even if it were a legal scheme. The crisis of accommodation, especially for ageing people, will continue, and the recent reports of the forecasting unit of the Department of Environment and Planning illustrate that the demand for affordable accommodation at the aged end of the market will increase. In the Adelaide statistical division the population over 65 will increase, by 2001, to 14.5 per cent of the population from the current 11 per cent. In the inner and middle ring local government areas, the aged population will grow between 36 per cent and 38 per cent. The report in question states:

Total population numbers in these regions will undergo absolute decline. As a result of these differential trends, the proportion of the population who are aged will continue to rise in their inner local government areas from 18 per cent in 1981 to 21 per cent in 2001 and in the middle local government areas from 13.6 per cent to 20.2 per cent. In the outer local government areas, by

contrast, the aged will increase only marginally as a percentage of total population from 4.5 per cent in 1981 to 7.4 per cent in 2001.

The report notes that obviously all population projections are based on assumptions which can be proved wrong. However, the principal factor causing changes to the number of aged people is ageing-in-place; in other words, all of the people who are going to get old are already there. One of the main policy questions to be addressed, apart from the obvious ones of the very large numbers of elderly people, is how these people can be most effectively housed or re-housed. There are obvious advantages to these people of having easy access to the social, community and recreational facilities of the inner city in order to provide opportunities for their full and active participation in community life; but there is also the advantage of getting maximum usage of those facilities.

The State Government already plays a significant role in the provision of accommodation facilities for the aged, especially independent accommodation. The South Australian Housing Trust provides cottage flats in all metropolitan suburbs in accordance with its policy of providing people with the choice of continuing to live in the area where they lived previously. There has been a significant increase in the demand for cottage flats. In fact, the number of applications has doubled since the beginning of the 1980s. Just over 15 per cent of all rental applications now received by the trust are from elderly people, and they are usually seeking single accommodation.

I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* two tables which are statistical in nature and which are taken from a joint publication of the Australian Bureau of Statistics and the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, entitled 'Accommodation for the Aged'.

Leave granted.

TABLE 4.3—STATE GOVERNMENT AUTHORITIES; OUTLAYS AND RECEIPTS ON ACCOMMODATION AND HOME-BASED CARE FOR THE AGED, SOUTH AUSTRALIA (a) (l)  
(\$ million)

Particulars	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84p
Independent accommodation:					
Expenditure on cottage flats (d) .....	19.8	23.7	32.6	48.5	74.2
Receipts,					
Commonwealth grants-pensioner housing .....	2.9	2.9	3.0	3.1	2.7
Net outlay .....	16.9	20.7	29.5	45.5	71.5
Institutional care:					
Expenditure					
Current .....	4.9	5.4	6.1	6.8	7.1
Capital .....	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.1
Grants to and payments to or for organisations (i) .....	6.1	5.4	6.6	7.8	7.8
Total outlay .....	11.6	11.2	12.9	14.8	15.0
Receipts from					
Residents .....	0.7	0.8	0.9	0.9	1.0
Commonwealth Government .....	1.4	1.5	1.8	1.6	1.8
Total receipts .....	2.2	2.3	2.6	2.5	2.8
Net outlay .....	9.4	8.9	10.3	12.3	12.2
Home-based care:					
Domiciliary care (g);					
Expenditure,					
Current .....	3.0	3.3	3.6	4.2	5.9
Capital .....	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.4	0.5
Total outlay .....	3.1	3.5	4.0	4.6	6.3
Receipts					
Residents .....	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
Commonwealth Government .....	1.4	1.6	1.9	1.9	2.1
Total receipts .....	1.7	1.9	2.2	2.1	2.4

TABLE 4.3—STATE GOVERNMENT AUTHORITIES; OUTLAYS AND RECEIPTS ON ACCOMMODATION AND HOME-BASED CARE FOR THE AGED, SOUTH AUSTRALIA (a) (1)  
(\$ million)

Net outlay	1.4	1.6	1.8	2.4	4.0
Grants					
Home nursing service	1.2	1.3	1.5	1.9	2.2
Net outlay	2.6	2.9	3.3	4.4	6.1
Net outlay on accommodation and home-based care	28.9	32.5	43.2	62.2	89.9

TABLE 4.4—SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HOUSING TRUST: DEMAND AND SUPPLY OF HOUSING FOR THE AGED

Period	Applications for aged accommodation			Cottage Flats	
	Single	Couple	Total	Number completed (a)	Total stock (30 June)
1979-80	665	226	891	292	2 354
1980-81	735	246	981	225	2 517
1981-82	710	231	941	310	2 807
1982-83	1 345	577	1 922	568	3 312
1983-84	1 563	658	2 221	785	4 076

(a) Number completed exceeds increase in stock due to sale and demolition of flats.

Mr DUGAN: One table deals with State Government expenditure and receipts for accommodation and home-based care for the elderly. The other deals with the demand and supply of the South Australian Housing Trust accommodation for the aged. The point of the tables and the earlier statistical information which I have already given the House is to indicate that, while supply already outstrips demand and the State Government is already spending nearly \$100 million, the demand must only increase.

In recognition of this increasing demand, the State Government was the first State Government to sign the Housing Assistance and Community Care Programme (HACC) Agreement with the Commonwealth Government which will ensure that an additional \$7.7 million will be made available over the next two years to expand community based services for the elderly or others who are at risk of institutionalisation but who can and want to remain in their own homes.

As South Australia has established an office of the Commissioner of Aged Care, so too has the Commonwealth Government established an office within the Department of Community Services. That department (again, in recognition of the number of elderly people and the obvious merit in ensuring that people live in community accommodation) is giving support to applications from community groups for what is being called 'group community living', providing for groups of five to 10 people to live in self-contained but integrated units in a residential area.

The Government will also be taking initiatives in the area of protecting those people who choose to move into resident funded retirement villages. A commitment to the protection of such people was given during the recent election campaign. The Government gave the commitment that it would ensure that the people moving into these villages were aware of their security arrangements and were secure in the fact that the money they paid for units would guarantee them permanent accommodation.

There is one other housing initiative for the elderly which I believe deserves public recognition and support. It is one which operates in the inner northern suburbs and provides a service to elderly people in the Adelaide electorate. It is a community based housing cooperative, managed by the board members of the Northern Suburbs Aged Housing Association and backed financially by the South Australian

Housing Trust. The Northern Suburbs Aged Housing Association was established with the objective of working within the districts of Adelaide, Prospect, Walkerville and Enfield as a residential housing co-operative to provide accommodation for elderly people, particularly those in need. The association is a non profit making community organisation that has operated now for five or six years.

The association is effectively increasing the amount of stable, secure and reasonably priced rental accommodation for elderly people. The association is a leader in the housing and co-operative movement, and it is using innovative ways of enabling community groups to utilise private capital for public or community housing purposes, and ensuring that those people who would not otherwise have a roof over their head can be secure in the places provided for them by the board.

The philosophy of the association is that housing should be more than just shelter. The association aims to provide a supportive community where friendship and shared activities can grow for the benefit of all members. It has purchased a total of 30 properties and over the next 12 to 18 months it hopes that that will yield a total of 123 units of accommodation by conversion and construction of new units on large properties. At present the association has 96 tenants, both single people and married couples, and as of 30 June 1985 it had drawn \$2.5 million in mortgages. By the end of its current projected program, the association expects that sum to increase to between \$6 million and \$7 million, which will then provide the 123 units of accommodation.

The association really is an example of what can be achieved in the community by those working for elderly people. It is achieved by hard work and dedication and it ensures that those people who would otherwise miss out are afforded good, solid, stable and secure accommodation. Nonetheless, no matter how much organisations such as that are able to carry on with their fine work in providing the accommodation, accepting the responsibility of collecting income, paying the rates and taxes, organising the maintenance, and keeping the flats in good tenable condition, there will still be a substantial public need and a responsibility on Government to make sure that the increasingly large number of elderly people right across Adelaide, but particularly in the inner parts of Adelaide, have access to

good unit or cottage accommodation at the end of a working life that has spanned the best part of this century.

At the other end of the housing market are young people, who also need affordable rental houses. The biggest shock that I received during the election campaign came during a visit to the Baptist West End Mission, which attempts to provide shelter for homeless boys and youths. The mission has the incredibly difficult job not just of providing shelter to youths who are alone, homeless and often destitute but also of trying to give those youths a belief in themselves and the value of living. That experience and the focus that was placed on youth housing by Tent City during the election campaign has led me to take an interest in the area of youth housing policy.

What did I find? I found a document that had been prepared by the youth housing network claiming that young people between the ages of 15 and 25 years were the most disadvantaged and least provided for sector of South Australia's housing market. It argued that youth homelessness, record levels of demand for youth emergency shelters, squatting and overcrowding in squalid private rental housing were all symptoms of the neglect of youth as a priority in Government housing policy.

It also argued that 5 000 young people were currently on the South Australian Housing Trust waiting list and that the number was increasing faster than for any other section of the population. It further argued that the current high rentals in the private housing market were forcing desperate measures on the young people, measures such as drug dealing and prostitution as being the only options in the face of high rents where people have limited access to public housing and little or no money. It spoke about the large pool of unemployed people who were forced out of the family home, about low levels of benefits and people who had to choose between eating or paying the rent.

The document put out by the youth housing network argued a variety of solutions that had to be addressed by Government so that young people had access to affordable and adequate housing. It argued for rental support and greater support for emergency shelters as well as support for community youth housing cooperatives and associations and information for young people so that they could find appropriate and adequate accommodation. Their claims are not scaremongering; they are not outrageous.

All one has to do is look at the figures. The figures relating to youth shelters show that well over 1 200 young people were admitted to youth shelters during 1984-85, and another 800 could not be assisted. We can look at other statistics, which show that in the last six months of last year 8 000 young people made inquiries for accommodation from 'Whereabouts', the housing advisory service run through the Emergency Housing Office. In 1984-85 nearly 5 500 applications were made by young people to the South Australian Housing Trust regarding participation as tenants in the community tenancy arrangements organised through the trust. In the last half of 1985 nearly 5 000 youths approached the Emergency Housing Office direct for accommodation.

The arguments of the youth housing network are, therefore, fully backed by statistics. The information provided to me and the situation in which the West End Baptist Mission finds itself in catering for homeless young people are without doubt among the most serious problems facing young people today. I am pleased to say that the argument put forward by people involved in trying to provide housing for youth has not gone unheeded. The Minister of Housing and Construction, in a press release issued on 18 November 1985, congratulated the people at Tent City in Victoria Square for the arguments that they had put forward in terms

of highlighting the housing predicament in which many young people found themselves.

The Minister said that community attitudes towards youth homelessness were changing and that many misconceptions existed in relation to young people's housing needs, with many people believing that young people were footloose and fancy free, others believing that they all had happy homes to go to, and still others believing that young people did not deserve housing. Unfortunately, said the Minister on that occasion, much of that argument is just a myth. Young people's needs are genuine, and much more will have to be done as housing and accommodation is now such a scarce commodity.

The arguments put by young people, the youth housing network, social workers and other organisations that deal with youth homelessness have been heard, acknowledged and responded to. In the ALP's housing policy that was issued during the last election campaign the Premier gave a commitment to initiating an inquiry into youth housing. That inquiry will determine the needs of young people and review current programs and the means for improving them as well as making recommendations for new initiatives to ensure that young people can secure affordable housing.

The primary concern of the Government must be about young people who do not have adequate income or parental support and, in particular, about the small but important group of young people between the ages of 12 and 15 years who are on the streets without support or parental guidance and often without money. Young people must have access to adequate and secure accommodation and, while I recognise that support should be provided to families to enable young people to remain in the family home, I believe that many young people either choose to live independently or, in fact, have no choice about whether or not they live at home.

Young people should not be placed in the position, having been forced out of the family home, of having to decide with their low level of income whether they will eat or pay the rent. While South Australia spends more per head of population on public housing than any other State, and while young people in South Australia may have access to some Government programs, the point remains that it is important that the community and the Government recognise that there are some people who do not have accommodation and that there are young people who have nowhere to live. Therefore, it is important and urgent that the inquiry into youth housing begin as soon as possible so that people who have nowhere to turn and no place to live will be afforded some means of protection.

I now refer to a topic that I know is dear to your heart, Mr Speaker—the reform of Parliament. A policy document issued by the Premier during the election campaign concluded that the institution of Parliament must be relevant to the times; it must be efficient and it must be practical. It must be able to respond to the needs of the community as expressed by the constituents, and it must be accountable to the community and be able to scrutinise Government activity. With those particular objectives in mind, a number of courses of action were proposed in respect of the committee system and parliamentary efficiency. In order to put what I have to say into context and so that we can appreciate why such a document, dealing with what might otherwise be seen as the esoteric concerns of the members of Parliament, must be seen in context, it must be remembered that a commitment along similar lines was made during the 1982 election campaign. The commitment that was made prior to the 1982 election was based on the notion that the reputation of politicians was low because people were fed up with the political bickering and the political point scoring that occurred in Parliament.

In that document the belief was expressed that mechanisms ought to be developed to assist in the promotion of agreement and consensus on issues which were not of great political controversy. That document did not suggest that it would at all times be necessary for Parties and others in the Parliament to reach agreement. It allowed for political difference; it allowed for political controversy, but in areas where there was a major community interest and where there was basically an enormous amount of common ground (like, for example, the area of youth homelessness about which I was speaking earlier, as well as other problems such as drug dealing, vandalism and under-age drinking), it was important enough to find a way of dealing with those serious community issues. It was not an attempt to depoliticise things, but rather to provide an opportunity for everyone to make a reasonable and positive contribution towards solving a major problem.

It was because of that sort of approach that in 1983 the Labor Party moved to establish a Joint Committee on the Law, Practice and Procedures of the Parliament. A report was prepared for the select committee which examined reforms that have taken place in the Commonwealth Parliament and the Victorian Parliament, as well as reform work that had been done in Canada, to make the parliamentary process more relevant. That 60 page report was supplemented by a bipartisan paper which concentrated on the time consuming aspects of Standing Orders. However, because of the lack of response to that paper by the Liberal Party in this House, the select committee was unable to complete its work.

The proposition that the operations of the House be made more efficient was therefore put to the community once more during this last election and, while not commanding a great deal of newspaper or media attention, it will influence and have an impact on the operations of this House.

The Premier, in his policy speech in November 1985, laid down a blueprint for the future development of legislation, and the Governor's speech, which heralds in this forty-sixth Parliament, outlines a number of Bills which will be introduced into the House to give effect to those policy commitments. I believe that the State will be better off with a higher standard of facilities, a better standard of living and greater community involvement at the end of this forty-sixth Parliament than it is going into it.

The State is facing a productive period, full of confidence and enthusiasm. There is a great belief in our future and pride in our past which is being celebrated this year with our Jubilee. The Labor Party (and the Labor Government) is a Party of consultation and democracy. It is soundly based on the trade unions and the numerous sub-branches and community organisations with which it deals. It is in touch with the community over a wide range of areas, and I believe that the trust that the people of South Australia have given to the Premier, to the Labor Government and, in particular, that the people of Adelaide have given to me as the Labor Party representative for that district will be well placed.

The actions which will be taken over the next four years will benefit the whole of the South Australian community, without serving any particular sectional interests, and will take into account the views of the various community organisations. I hope that, as a member of the Government Party, I will be able to make a contribution not just to representing the people of Adelaide in this Parliament, but to putting into effect over the next four years the program which was spelt out by the Premier and subsequently now in the Governor's speech.

**Mr TYLER (Fisher):** As the new member for Fisher, I would on its behalf congratulate you, Mr Speaker, on your

election to that honoured position. I also congratulate the Premier on his re-election, and I would like to thank the Premier and his wife Angela for the support and encouragement that they gave Judy and me in the past two years. I congratulate Government Ministers on their election, especially our new Minister, the member for Unley, and I welcome the Minister of Labour and member for Whyalla on his election to the House. I congratulate all new members of the House, especially my colleagues here on the back-bench.

I also express my gratitude to my more experienced colleagues and friends from the south; the Deputy Premier and member for Baudin and the member for Mawson for their support and friendship before I was elected to Parliament and, more recently, since I have been a member has been much appreciated. I trust that during the next four years we will be able to achieve the aims of the Bannon Labor Government, of which the people of South Australia so clearly approved as recently as December last year.

Mr Speaker, I consider it a great honour to have been elected to the House, and for that honour I thank most sincerely the electors of Fisher. I have lived in the southern suburbs for many years and during that time I have been involved in many community groups within the electorate. I am determined that my personal involvement in the area will only be improved now that I am the local member. Therefore, I assure the people of Fisher that, if they have any problems or views on Government matters that they wish to discuss, I am always willing to listen, to try to help and, where necessary, to represent their needs to the Government or raise them in Parliament.

The honour of being elected to this House carries with it certain privileges, and with them, as with all privileges, certain responsibilities. The most important of these privileges is that which offers members freedom from the law of slander. I hope to honour the privileges of my position by bearing up to my responsibilities to the House and, most importantly, to the constituents of Fisher.

I also thank those people who helped and supported me during the 18 months to two years prior to the election: my wife, Judy; my family, especially my mother and father; my campaign director and committee; and other members and supporters of the ALP who contributed a great deal to my success in Fisher. I thank the Australian Labor Party for the confidence it expressed in preselecting me as its candidate for Fisher. The Australian Labor Party has a long and great history in Australia and in this State through its parliamentary and industrial wings, with a long and impressive list of progressive industrial and social reforms to its credit.

As members would be aware, I have worked for the Bannon Government since 1983. I found it a rewarding and fulfilling experience to have contributed to some of the great achievements of that Government. It was especially rewarding to have worked closely with the now Minister of Transport. My experiences in the area of Chief Secretary, tourism, local government and transport have given me a valuable education in Parliamentary life.

I will always be indebted to the Minister for his support, encouragement, and of course, at times, patience. As one would expect, I have gained a great deal from his experience, advice and friendship. Although he has never treated me as anything but an equal, now that we are more formally colleagues I look forward to this relationship continuing. I also trust that during the next four years I will be able to contribute, hopefully with vision, and with a sense of social and economic justice for all South Australians.

Before discussing some of my aims and concerns, particularly the matters that affect the people of my electorate, I would like to introduce myself to the House by giving a brief outline of my background and political development.



I was born in Broken Hill and lived there until moving to South Australia when I was 12 years old. After completing high school I entered an apprenticeship in watchmaking and, for the most part, worked in that trade until joining Gavin Keneally's staff in 1983.

Although always a strong supporter of the Australian Labor Party and the Labor movement in general, I did not actually become a member of the Party until 1975. Since that time I have been actively involved with the Party at all levels. I also have been actively involved in community activities and issues all my life and have seen how closely the aims of the Australian Labor Party, and of course the Bannon Government, tie in with the needs of the Fisher electorate.

I am a proud member of the Australian Labor Party, and my philosophy is based on the principles of equity and social justice: policies which underpin my great Party. During my time in this House I will strongly support the abolition of poverty, and on that note I congratulate the member for Briggs on his excellent suggestion of a bicentennial anti-poverty project, I will work also towards promoting a fairer, more compassionate and understanding society. It is my belief that any economic policy should have as its ultimate aim the well-being of all people.

The electorate of Fisher was named after Sir James Hurtle Fisher, the first resident Commissioner of South Australia. After the commission was terminated and those duties were taken over by the Governor, Sir James remained in South Australia and re-entered the law profession. He was politically active and very much involved in public life, becoming the first Mayor of Adelaide and the first President of the Legislative Council, and his name appears amongst the list of founders of several of South Australia's public and private institutions. The electorate of Fisher was created in the electoral redistribution of 1969, taking areas predominantly from Mitcham and Onkaparinga, with smaller portions from Gumeracha and Edwardstown. When the electorate was formed most of its electors were involved in rural occupations, with few manufacturing, retail or service industries.

In the most recent electoral redistribution much of the rural areas which were part of the Fisher district were transferred to the electorate of Davenport. However, the decline in the proportion of the people involved in rural occupations within the electorate has been most dramatically affected by the population increases in the area. The new electorate of Fisher contains many new and developing suburbs. The population increases by approximately 8 per cent per annum so as one would expect, there is a constant and ever increasing need for the provision and improvement of human services.

Three-quarters of the work force is under 40 years of age, and more than half are employed in the clerical and administrative area or the professions. Many of these people commute daily to Adelaide. Consequently, there is an urgent need to improve transport and local employment opportunities. The two largest population groups comprise people aged 25 to 44 years and those between 15 and 14 years. Further, there is a large proportion of two income households. Accordingly, there is an urgent need for good and accessible child-care. These population groups are also concerned (either as parents or students) about the quality of educational and recreational facilities.

Although only one person in 20 is aged over 60, I consider that an important age group, with a great deal to offer our community. Of course, they do have special needs, which I will work towards. The growth of population has been matched by the growth of housing. New home approvals by the Happy Valley council alone have been between 500 and 600 per annum in recent years. Three-quarters of the

homes in the area are under finance, and although the mortgages are not unusually high there is still concern at the moment amongst constituents about interest rates and other factors relating to their ability to maintain their mortgage repayments and their lifestyle.

The brief statistical run down I have just given is intended to confirm what I have found to be the genuine needs and concerns of the people of Fisher during my many years as a resident in the south, and more especially during the last two years as the candidate for Fisher. Apart from those special needs that we share with each other, we share with other communities concerns in relation to the areas of health, welfare, education, water resources, and the state of the economy. Cooperation between local, State and Federal Government bodies, local community groups and individuals has already achieved much in the way of alleviating problems that exist. However, we must all recognise that there is still much to be done. I hope to promote this cooperative approach and to achieve the best possible physical and social environment for the people of Fisher with particular emphasis on the following goals.

The first is the promotion and provision of safe, convenient and economic transport. The second concerns community protection, and the third concerns the development in areas of health and welfare so as to promote physical and social well-being. Fourthly, we must strive for positive economic growth. The Bannon Government abandoned the 1960s plans for the north-south corridor, which were replaced with a forward looking policy. As a result of that policy a comprehensive southern transport plan was formulated and was placed on public display after consultation with the Southern Region of Councils, the Highways Department, the Department of Transport, the Department of Environment and Planning, the State Transport Authority, and the South Australian Housing Trust.

Stage 1 of that report—the upgrading of the Flagstaff-Marion-South Roads intersection—is nearing completion. In actual fact, I think the opening will be next Monday. These improvements will give people travelling from Happy Valley, Aberfoyle Park and Flagstaff Hill to Adelaide significant time savings. However, this is only a small part of the State Government's plans to improve the road and transport links for the south. The existing bus services have already been improved. Night, weekend and express bus services have been introduced to places such as Happy Valley, Flagstaff Hill, Aberfoyle Park and O'Halloran Hill. I shall try to convince the Minister of Transport that such improvements should also be introduced in relation to Sheidow Park and Trott Park.

Of course, the efficiency of the bus services will be greatly enhanced by improvements to roads in the areas referred to. The construction of Reservoir Drive from Black Road to Chandlers Hill Road, which is expected to cost \$5 million, will be an enormous benefit to the local community. When Reservoir Drive opens it will put significant additional pressure on Flagstaff Road. So, I believe it is vital for the Highways Department and the Happy Valley council to come to some agreement as soon as possible on the future of this very important road. I should add that Flagstaff Road is currently under substantial pressure as a result of the housing boom that I talked about earlier.

Over the next five years the State Government will work to overcome the infamous Darlington bottleneck. This will be achieved by major intersection improvements. I have already referred to one improvement. The next will involve the South Road and Seacombe Road intersection and approaches. The construction of a Darlington by-pass, worth about \$50 million, which will form the beginning of a third arterial road, plus further widening and improvements to the associated roads in the south, will greatly help traffic

flow. It is a pity that the member for Bragg is not in the Chamber, because last night he referred to the Darlington by-pass and claimed that it was Liberal Party policy. Well, indeed it was: they pinched it from the Labor Government. In fact, the Premier would remember that two years ago, on the second floor of this building, he launched a proposal for that road.

Bus and train services will be improved over the next five years, including the upgrading of railway stations and an investigation into the possibility of reopening the disused Hallett Cove to Hackham rail line. As a former ministerial adviser to the Minister of Transport I am well aware of some of the plans and achievements already made, but I am not content to let the matter rest. I feel that the traffic problems can be alleviated only by the development of community facilities and employment opportunities within the electorate.

This would effectively reduce the number of people who need to travel towards the city on a daily basis. Therefore, one of my main priorities as the member for Fisher will be to try to help and encourage the development of community facilities and employment opportunities, as well as developing further transport initiatives.

There is a great need for increasing the number of child-care and preschool positions. All day care centres and family day care givers are operating at full capacity and many families are on waiting lists. The number of families on waiting lists may be slightly misleading as some families are on waiting lists for more than one facility within the electorate and surrounding areas. Nonetheless, the need for increased places is still substantial and, in some cases, urgent, since the availability of good accessible child-care affects the ability of many people, particularly women, to take on employment.

The Government is committed to building a further 19 child-care centres throughout the State during its current term of office. Two such facilities will be built in my electorate at Happy Valley and Aberfoyle Park during 1986. One centre nearing completion at Hallett Cove will service people living at Sheidow Park and Trott Park. Two other centres will be built in surrounding areas before the end of 1986. This will considerably ease the pressure on present child-care services in the southern suburbs.

The centre to be built at The Hub will be unique in that it will provide family health and children's service facilities, incorporate a child-care centre, provide preventive health and welfare counselling and advisory services, including parenting programs, family planning and stop smoking assistance. The centre will also act as a base for visiting specialist services and will link with the Aberfoyle Park Neighbourhood House and other outreach services.

During the Government's previous term of office, a new family day care service was launched and this operates from the Happy Valley Civic Centre. An allocation of approximately 100 care givers was transferred from the Marion office of the Department for Community Welfare. That service provides 120 full-time equivalent places. However, these places have been full for many months and it also has a substantial waiting list. This unsatisfactory situation also exists in surrounding areas.

The State Government is limited in its ability to alleviate the family day care problem as funds for this are provided by the Federal Government. The Bannon Government has taken the initiative by providing \$500 000 to facilitate a further 800 family day-care places. In view of the urgency of the matter it is lobbying the Federal Government for increased funding in this area. I know that the Minister is well aware of the problems that exist in the electorate of Fisher and in southern suburbs in general. I will be doing

my best to ensure that we obtain our fair share of available places.

I now turn to education—a vital issue in any growing area. A feature of many of the preschools in the electorate is the degree of community involvement, which is encouraged by sharing facilities with other community groups such as toy libraries, parent resource centres, play groups, CAFHS, and even keep fit classes. However, the demand on preschools is ever increasing. All preschools have capacity enrolments, some with waiting lists and some unable to provide the optimum four sessions per week for every student in the 12 months prior to enrolment in junior primary school.

Further effort is being made to achieve this situation and to reduce the student/staff ratio. Most schools in the area have increasing enrolments. Several new schools have been built in the area since 1980 and others have received increased facilities and accommodation. As a result, the schoolchildren in my electorate have access to some very modern educational facilities. For instance, the Aberfoyle Park High School has recently been provided with facilities to offer student courses in business education and computer studies. The school is also interested in extending its curriculum to include the study of technology developments and agriculture.

A most important feature of this school is its commitment to community involvement. It shares recreational facilities with the YMCA and the Happy Valley council and has on campus a community performing arts centre. I invite honourable members to visit this performing arts centre. I am sure that they will be very envious indeed. It also has a community school library which includes a toy library. This idea of shared facilities is becoming more and more popular and is a very successful way of ensuring that as many people as possible have access to the community's resources.

Another example of this concept is the Aberfoyle Park Primary School Campus, where four primary schools (two State and two private) share the same campus. Each school is able to maintain its identity and autonomy while cooperating with the others to ensure a cohesive campus. This is just another example of how well private and public enterprise work together.

Some schools in the Reynella area are concerned about their ability to cater for future growth. It is hoped that excess growth in these schools will be avoided by the new schools that are planned for that area. However, many parents and the school itself are concerned that these schools will not be sufficient to overcome crowding. I intend to raise this matter with the Minister in the near future.

Another important project aimed at improving community facilities in the area is the Neighbourhood House soon to be constructed at Aberfoyle Park. The Neighbourhood House has been operating from the campus schools for some time but will be able to increase its activities when it moves to its permanent home. The Neighbourhood House has already coordinated a number of community activities, but will have a much greater scope in the future. In general, it will provide a focus for health, welfare and other family and individual services for people in the local community. It hopes to incorporate support groups such as CAFHS and to provide counselling facilities and community health and education programs, such as STEP (Systematic Training for Effective Parenting). There will also be facilities for child-care with particular emphasis on occasional care, before and after school care and recreational child-care.

The Aberfoyle Park Neighbourhood House has come to life through the persistent hard work of people in the local community and through cooperation between this group of people, State, local government and private enterprise. Pioneer Homes will support the building of the new house,

and it is hoped that other businesses associated with the housing and construction industry will contribute to the building. The land was provided by Happy Valley council. The Bannon Government and the Happy Valley council will provide financial support.

The Happy Valley reservoir, which supplies water to 40 per cent of Adelaide's population, is right in the middle of my electorate. The reservoir does not yet have a filtration plant, and the provision of one was given low priority by the Tonkin Government. This situation has now been redressed and the water filtration program is now under construction.

I am sure that the Minister of Water Resources who lives in the southern suburbs is well aware of the unacceptable quality of water in the southern area, and I know that he will ensure that the construction will proceed on schedule. The plant would then be ready for partial commissioning in 1988 and be fully operational in 1990.

In view of the fact that the southern suburbs, particularly Morphett Vale East, are continuing to expand, a \$12 million plan to upgrade water supplies has recently gone before the Public Works Standing Committee. Three reinforced concrete water supply tanks, a pumping station and about 40 kilometres of distribution mains will be constructed. This will improve the water pressure to many homes in my electorate. The pumping station will be built at Morphett Vale East and is planned to meet present and increased peak consumer demands.

The Bannon Labor Government has done much to improve the relationship between State and Local Government and, as a result, many more local government bodies are playing a much greater role in economic and community development. State and Federal Governments have established generous commercial incentive schemes to encourage local economic development. These include the South Australian Establishment Payments Scheme, the South Australian Housing Trust Industrial Premises Assistance Scheme, Government loans and guarantees, payroll and land tax reimbursements, and the Small Business Consultancy Grants Scheme.

The Happy Valley council is supporting these schemes by the promotion of light industry and therefore employment opportunities within the area. Small areas have been set aside for local retail and commercial activity and neighbourhood centres. No land has been designated for heavy industry, but it is very interested in promoting service industries, warehousing, offices and consulting rooms. To this end it has established a variety of consultative processes such as community forums to bring professional, service people and community representatives together to assess needs and possible solutions. I strongly support this initiative.

This year South Australia jointly celebrates its sesquicentennial with its sister State, Texas. Hundreds of communities and schools in our State have now established firm links with counterparts in one of the United States' fastest growing areas. I am delighted that our Jubilee 150 celebrations include a number of cultural exchanges between Texas and South Australia, but I firmly believe that more can be done to forge business, investment and tourism links. The continued links between Texas and South Australia must be more than merely ceremonial.

I am aware that last year our Premier visited Texas and hosted trade and investment seminars in several Texan cities. Happy Valley is twinned with Sugar Land, a small but growing city close to the large urban centre of Houston. I hope to visit both Houston and Sugar Land later this year in order to encourage business, investment and tourism interest in South Australia, particularly in the southern suburbs. Indeed, I am writing to business leaders and my

political counterparts in the Houston/Sugar Land area suggesting an investment mission and informing them of what South Australia and, more particularly, my area have to offer. Texas is an immensely wealthy State, with a strong financial and high technology base. It is a State with a population greater than that of Australia.

Research and development of local employment opportunities have also occurred with the southern region of councils, which is comprised of Happy Valley, Noarlunga, Brighton, Marion and Willunga councils and is supported by a full-time executive officer. A recent and most promising initiative of the Southern Region of Councils is the development of an industrial attraction project. The first stage of the project is a survey of the opinions and needs of commerce and industry located in the southern region. The survey was funded by the Federal Government in the form of CEP and RCDP grants with considerable State Government involvement in the allocation of funds. Together with funds provided by the Southern Region of Councils itself, a total exceeding \$41 000 was made available to employ people to conduct the survey.

It is unfortunate that Mr Chapman, the Liberal candidate for Fisher at the recent State election, was appointed as a consultant for the survey, for it carried with it political overtones and some controversy. I hope that this unfortunate matter will not interfere with the success of the survey. From the survey, the Southern Region of Councils hopes to develop a clear image of the types of companies which might be attracted to locate in the southern suburbs, particularly Aberfoyle Park, Noarlunga, and southern Marion council areas, and is therefore a major forerunner to what I hope will be an increase in local employment opportunities.

I have seen many cases in which the combination of private and public enterprise, along with community groups, has led to the successful resolution of problems within the electorate of Fisher, and I am sure that that applies to the State in general. The proponents of privatisation argue their cause with simplistic logic. But, concern for one particular aspect of the range of matters that affect our lives has, in the past, led unthinkingly to many social injustices, including discrimination on the basis of sex, class, age, race or religion and thus hindered the achievement of equality of opportunity and access to community facilities for all members of the society.

Interference with the complex balance of private and public enterprise, which has been the historical experience of Australia since settlement, could have serious implications on certain sections of our society—indeed, on all our society. The Bannon Government is concerned about the economy, but we are also concerned about the people of South Australia. We want the people of South Australia to benefit from the forward strides that our economy has taken during the last three years. The electorate of Fisher has been in the forefront of our State's recovery and has benefited greatly from the recent housing boom. The Government has shown that it is willing to support this boom with the provision of much needed human and community services. I assure the people of Fisher that I will be working for them to ensure that this record is maintained.

In closing, I would like briefly to strike a contrast between the philosophies of the Liberal Party and those of the Party of which I am proud to be a member. In my electorate, I confront serious problems associated with poverty, social isolation and unemployment. Those who come to me with problems know that, because I am Labor, they will find not only a sympathetic ear but also a commitment to help. Our Party is proud to represent those in need, those people who, through no fault of their own, are forced to struggle to maintain the barest standard of living. That is in sharp

contrast to the philosophy and action of the Liberal Party. Central to the Liberal creed (more appropriately described as the conservative creed) is the belief that one section of the community must always be left out, or left behind. Well, I repudiate that assumption, just as I reject their defence of inequality and injustice.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** It is with some pleasure that I rise to support this motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, and it is with some interest that I have just heard the concluding remarks of the member for Fisher and seen recorded the remarks of the member for Briggs of last evening. It is quite obvious to me that, the sooner they bone up on what the Liberal Party is all about, the sooner they may make statements about the Liberal Party which do not indicate their rather sheltered and blinkered background and upbringing. I totally repudiate the last sentiments expressed by the member for Fisher wherein he seems to attribute all social conscience to members of the Party of which he is a member. Let me deal with that later.

I congratulate you, Mr Deputy Speaker, on your appointment as Chairman of Committees. I also congratulate the Speaker and other officers of the Parliament on their appointments. We will certainly miss in this place the presence of Allan Rodda, Max Brown, Jack Wright and George Whitten, who retired at the last election.

We have an influx of new blood, younger members who in due course we trust will make a significant contribution to the deliberations of this place and to the welfare of their constituents. I record my appreciation of the services of retiring members. On this side, we have a new member, Mr Dale Baker, who will represent the district of Victoria ably and, in due course, with distinction.

The opening speech this year was notable for its brevity, and I guess that that is in line with the limited program outlined in it. It is also notable for a lack of heavy politicking that we have come to expect and have seen in documents prepared by this Government which the Governor is obliged to deliver to the assembled congregation at the opening of Parliament. Earlier, I voiced my disapproval and that of the Opposition at the downgrading of the Address in Reply debate. It is a slight to His Excellency, who is performing his duties as Governor with great distinction, that this House should not get on and complete this debate as soon as possible so that, in compliance with Standing Orders, the Address in Reply may be submitted to him at an early date.

His Excellency's speech contains a reference to the high level of activity in the housing and construction industries, and it is stated that this contributed significantly to the improved employment position in this State. I submit, however, that there is strong evidence to show that the bubble is about to burst. Indeed, I believe that it may have already burst. The Premier has had much to say about improved employment in this State, but we have nothing to be proud about in the employment stakes. Indeed, we have the worst record, bar none, of all the States in the matter of youth employment. Further, the length of time for which people remain on the dole queue has increased and South Australia now leads the nation in that respect. So, in spite of the Government's huffing and puffing about its wonderful employment record in the housing industry, I suggest that its self-congratulation is overdone and that the bubble has burst as a result of the deliberately high interest policies of the federal colleagues of members opposite. Two of the new members who have already spoken in this debate were silly enough to suggest that they knew what the Liberal Party was all about.

**Mrs Appleby:** How about your members saying that they know all about the Labor Party?

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I am making a legitimate comment on the actions of both Federal and State Labor Governments in respect of matters referred to in His Excellency's speech. In their ignorance, the two new members to whom I have referred delivered a sermon to members of the Liberal Party, even though those new members had not the faintest idea of what the Liberal Party is about. If notice is to be taken of the statements of those members, the Labor Party is operating in a spirit of spite because, if one is to do something for the underprivileged, obviously one must do something about the economy of the nation to ensure that the wherewithal to help those people is generated in the nation's economic activities. If we do not get those sums right, we do not help anyone.

I will later refer to Mr Rann's contribution in this debate. We have known of his activities for some years and it ill-behoves him to preach to the Liberal Party. On the other hand, Ms Gayler made a moderate speech and I am pleased to hear that she believes that the O-Bahn bus is a worthwhile innovation. As the O-Bahn bus was initiated by a Liberal Government, she showed a certain magnanimity and I give her credit for that.

The housing and construction bubble has burst and, although the Government last year predicted a wonderful upsurge of employment in this State, as was its wont, I expect the dole queues to lengthen quickly because there is a significant downturn in housing already as a direct result of the deliberately high interest rate policy of Prime Minister Hawke and Treasurer Keating who are keeping interest rates at record levels to prop-up the ailing Australian dollar. This policy will further exacerbate the situation so that it will become much more acute in the coming months.

We have cause for considerable concern in relation to employment in this State. Indeed, we have a special concern because the Government put all its eggs in the housing and construction basket last year and congratulated itself on the record level of spending in that sector. Now, there is an enormous downturn in that area. A recent edition of the Housing Industry Association journal contained the headline 'Decline in house starts may reach 30 per cent'. The picture in this respect is especially bleak. My Party has no argument with the following statement in His Excellency's speech:

My Government's first priority remains the development of a regional economy . . .

No-one can argue with that statement. The speech also states:

My Government has built on the start made by our predecessors to ensure that South Australia becomes the centre for the development of high technology industries within Australia.

I take that statement to mean that this Government has built on the Liberal Party's initiative to develop Technology Park. Indeed, the statement shows a degree of magnanimity that is strange for the Labor Party, but I take it that it is giving credit to the previous Liberal Government for taking that initiative, even though it claimed last year, during the election campaign, that it took that initiative itself. Now, in a new found spirit of magnanimity, the Labor Government is prepared to give the credit to the people who rightly initiated the project—the Liberal Government of 1979-82.

His Excellency's speech refers to the casino and convention centre complex as providing activity, especially in tourism.

**The Hon. H. Allison:** Labor members voted against it in 1982.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Yes. They thought that it might be electorally disadvantageous but, after they came into office, they supported it. I view with concern

press reports that Mr Tredrea, who I think is known as the Sultan of Swap, is doing a record trade as a result of casino patrons being forced to sell their goods and property to make good their losses at the casino. This is a matter of some concern to me and it tends to bear out some of the points made so cogently during the casino debate by the member for Mallee, who took such a strong stand on the casino and did much research, especially at Wrest Point and other places in Australia and around the world. The honourable member spoke about the need for a gamblers anonymous organisation that must cope with the fallout resulting from the establishment and operation of the casino.

So, it was with some concern that I read media reports about the down side of the casino. I visited casinos in the Northern Territory two or three years ago and it was perfectly obvious to me, especially at Alice Springs, that a casino would be viable only because of what one might call the local trade. It was the local people who kept the casino going. All this business of attracting the enormous tourist dollar, and of tourists flocking into this State to spend their money here, just will not wash. The fact is that the casino generates several hundred jobs but, of course, if we get to the economic bottom line, we see that all we are doing is turning over money that is generated largely (I would say 99 per cent) in South Australia.

So if we are talking about broadening the economic base of the economy of the State, we do not do it by building casinos. I am making one fundamental economic statement: I am not making a moral judgment about the suitability of casinos. I am just suggesting to honourable members, particularly to a couple of new members opposite who suggest that the Liberal Party does not have a social conscience, that unless one expands the economic base of a State or nation over a period one will not do anything to alleviate the misery of the underprivileged and the poor.

In that context, the casino does precious little, if anything, to broaden the economic base of a State. It simply turns over money in the form of gambling, and, in the main, 99 per cent of that revenue comes from the local population. Unfortunately, a percentage of that population can ill afford to turn over their money in that way, as some of the press reports in recent days indicate. But the casino, the flagship part of the fleet of Labor Party achievements, rates a mention.

I was interested to read that a chair of manufacturing is to be set up. That seemed to be a novel idea and it interested me. I will follow its progress. I wonder again what the curriculum under that chair will involve. I am certainly not knocking that initiative. If it can achieve something, well and good, but again unless economic conditions are right for manufacturing industry, and unless we come to grips with the cost structure that now exists in South Australia and Australia, we could have a dozen chairs of manufacturing but we would not expand our manufacturing base or boost our ailing export income. Nevertheless, I simply say that this is a novel idea and I will watch the development of this faculty in one of our tertiary institutions with interest.

I was particularly interested in clause 9 of the Governor's speech which stated:

My Government recognises the potential for South Australian industry to benefit from large scale projects. The announcement of the go-ahead for the Roxby Downs project will have an immediate impact as the construction phase commences this year. My Government will continue its drive to secure the contract for the Royal Australian Navy's submarine replacement program . . .

It is very pleasing to me that the Government recognises the potential for South Australian industry to benefit from large scale projects. One cannot help but reflect yet again on the efforts of the Labor Party during the infancy of this

project, when members opposite tried to submerge and scuttle it. I remind the member for Briggs, who moralised about the Liberal Party and who said that the Liberal Party was irrelevant to the public of South Australia, of his activities in relation to that project. The Roxby Downs project has now become the economic flagship and the saviour of South Australia's economy for the Labor Party. To me, there is a great deal of irony in that.

The member for Briggs was very prominent indeed in the Campaign Against Nuclear Energy organisation and by the promulgation of misinformation did his damndest to halt and stall that project. I remind the honourable member, before he starts moralising and denigrating the Liberal Party, that he should think back to his activities as an ardent adherer to the beliefs and tenets of CANE. The honourable member was also associated with Greenpeace, but his activities in particular—

**Ms Lenehan:** What is wrong with that?

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I am not saying that there is anything wrong with that, but the honourable member has that bent. He was certainly very active indeed in CANE and he was well to the fore in trying to stop the Roxby Downs project from going ahead. In fact, when the left wing of the Labor Party had the numbers in the organisation to block that project, the honourable member was well in the ascendancy.

**Mrs Appleby:** Are you making a statement?

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I am not making this up.

**Mrs Appleby:** Are you making a statement?

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I am sorry—I do not understand the import of the interjection. I am referring to the activities of the member for Briggs, who did his best to stop that project. I also recall only too vividly that he leaked to the press a document prepared by the Canberra library service which sought to prove that the Roxby Downs project would be uneconomic. The document had been in public circulation but I suppose that one could call it part of the dirty tricks department. The honourable member should do well in politics in the dirty tricks department. He leaked to the media a document that was stamped 'Confidential', and tore off the back pages, a refutation by Western Mining Corporation (and that company, in association with BP, was bearing the risk for the economic viability of the project in any case) of the publication from the library service. Those pages were conveniently torn off and the rest marked 'confidential' (although it was not) and leaked to the press. That was part of the CANE campaign, of which the honourable member was a prominent adherent. They tried to confound and halt the Roxby Downs project.

It is with a certain grain of salt that I take the moralising of the member for Briggs when I recount to the House some of the shady practices in which he was involved in seeking to stop the Roxby Downs project from going ahead. In fact, the Minister of Mines and Energy and the present Deputy Premier put in a dissenting report regarding the Roxby Downs project, and that must be highly embarrassing to the Labor Party now, because that report stated that the safety requirements were not adequate and that some of the uranium from Roxby Downs would find its way into bombs. With a certain amount of amusement (I suppose 'amusement' is the word) I now read in the Governor's speech that the Labor Party has clutched this project to its bosom, and with an enhanced degree of amusement I read in Labor Party advertisements during the last election campaign that the Roxby Downs venture was one of the Labor Party's projects. They were taking credit for the project.

Well, members opposite can take credit for overcoming the concerns and the moralising of the member for Briggs in relation to nuclear energy. They can take heart from the

fact that the honourable member no longer has to doctor reports, feed them to the press, and mark them confidential. They can take comfort from the fact that they do not have to hide their obvious discomfiture at the fact that the public wanted the project. They were able to go off to their federal conference and doctor up a policy, which is a real dog's breakfast, because it allowed some uranium mines to go ahead but not others—in the name of some sort of compromise. Overseas that policy is regarded as completely incomprehensible and eccentric. Nonetheless, we now have the member for Briggs coming in here and telling us last evening:

At the end of this term Labor will have been in office in this State for 17 of the past 20 years. There is nothing surprising about that.

**Mr Rann:** Because you keep losing.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I will refer to that later. I am glad that I have stirred up the honourable member. It is always an achievement. He further said:

Our Liberal opponents again and again prove their irrelevance to the real concerns of South Australians.

How is that for a new chum? He also said:

Their brief term in office confirmed that they are fiscally irresponsible, economically incompetent, and socially uncaring. Our opponents can never claim to represent all South Australians when at the core of their philosophy is the commitment to stall change.

But the honourable member did his damndest to stall Roxby Downs. He further said:

Their task is easy, because they stand for nothing except self interest and the preservation of inequalities.

I hope that the honourable member learns to tone down his remarks in this place and that as he gets older he will become wiser, because the fact is that his behaviour in relation to this major development, which is trumpeted in the Governor's speech as the centre of the Government's economic policy, proves just how much credence we can give to the honourable member's statement.

**Mr Rann:** Isn't it about time you defended your Leader and his role in the campaign? You don't do it behind the scenes, do you?

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I do not know whether or not the new member for Briggs, who obviously will be a source of some interest and amusement to us, knows what goes on behind the scenes—I suspect that he does not know. What he does not know he makes up, and we have plenty of evidence of that. I would defend my Leader every day of the week, but I would be very hard pressed ever to have to defend the member for Briggs, because his behaviour, when he was associated with the Campaign Against Nuclear Energy, was quite disreputable.

Let me express my pleasure that the Government has now taken Roxby to its bosom and that it is no longer a mirage in the desert, as the Premier described it when the Labor Party tried to knock it and defeat it, but the Government now, to use its words, 'recognises the potential for South Australian industry to benefit from large scale projects', but there is not much else in the area of mines and energy about which we can get excited under this Administration.

I refer to the remarks contained in the Department of Mines and Energy report that was tabled yesterday, and in particular the remarks of the Director-General, where he expresses some concerns. He makes the point that the increase in exploration activity is almost solely due to greater activity in establishing the viability of a mining operation at Olympic Dam.

**The Hon. R.G. Payne:** It was an increase, though, wasn't it?

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** It was, an increase at Olympic Dam, but the increase was on the Stuart Shelf and,

if one looks at other areas of activity, we are way behind the levels of activity, which increased during the years 1979 to 1982 under the Liberal Government (the achievements of which the member for Briggs seeks to ignore), but I also point out to the House another statement which the Director-General makes on that sensitive question of Aboriginal land rights. He said:

It is apparent that new and proposed mineral resource developments will bring profound and lasting benefits—they generate new wealth, derive new sources of revenue, provide employment opportunities and create infrastructure as no other industry can.

I might interpolate that that has been long recognised by the Liberal Party and, in more recent years, recognised by the Labor Party, and in particular the member to whom I have been referring. The report continues:

And while there may be some real or imagined hurt to the livelihood of others or to the environment as a consequence of such developments, they require satisfaction of established environmental impact assessment procedures. The principle of multiple land use needs to be recognised and understood, to reconcile any conflicting aims between agricultural interests, conservation, Aboriginal land rights and mineral resource development. Accordingly, it is important that exploration activities, the maintenance of which are vital to ensure that the full potential of the State's subsurface is realised through further discoveries, are not impeded through denial of access to land.

He goes on to say:

It is a matter of concern that 19 per cent of the State is Aboriginal lands on which there has been no exploration since their dedication; 13 per cent is occupied by unallotted Crown lands for which there are suggestions that they are available for Aboriginal land claims; 10 per cent is covered by national parks and conservation parks, existing or proposed; a further 2.5 per cent is listed on the register of the National Estate; access to parts of the remainder is restricted or denied by virtue of the provisions of a number of State Acts including mining, pastoral, forestry, planning, waterworks, coast protection and Crown lands; and Commonwealth Acts also have application.

These remarks should not be misconstrued as expressing objection to creation of parks or land grants but, rather, they seek recognition of the need for provision of access for petroleum and mineral exploration development throughout South Australia, now and in the future, in the interest of all.

I think that that is a very pertinent statement. The history of denial of access goes back even further in the Northern Territory where there has been no new exploration activity going back beyond the time scale referred to by the Director-General in those comments. If one looks at the Northern Territory, one looks right back to the Fraser years when the initial proposals in relation to land rights were mooted and there has been no new exploration licence in operation in the Northern Territory since that time. That goes well back into the early 1970s, as in all these questions, so it is a matter of concern and it is a matter of balance. To suggest that, because the Liberal Party is concerned with the creation and generation of wealth creating activities which will then allow for a sharing by way of taxes and the like among the community, that signifies a lack of interest in the Aboriginal community or a lack of interest in the needy is plainly untrue.

One must get one's priorities right. One has to bake the cake before one starts cutting it up and, if one wants to give someone a bigger slice, one either needs to have a bigger cake, or someone else gets a smaller slice. That plain economic truth does not seem to have sunk in with those who adhere so strenuously to the redistributive tenets of the Labor Party, of which the member for Briggs is an eloquent and obviously misguided exponent.

There are a number of other matters to which I wish to refer in the Governor's speech. The fact is that the speech is less offensive in the sense that there is less politicking—perhaps that is because the member for Briggs is now in this House and is not doing the political vetting for the Premier—but I found the speech refreshingly free of the sort of political padding which one has come to expect from

the Labor Party when it writes something for the Governor to recite to the House at the opening. In that regard I find the speech reasonably inoffensive.

The Government is gravely concerned, it tells us, about the situation in the rural sector—that is interesting. There is precious little evidence of it in terms of its activity over a large number of years, the 15 years that the honourable member talks about. The Governor's speech stated:

Declining world commodity prices and high interest rates are causing many farmers great hardship.

We all know that, particularly in relation to interest rates, and, from what I hear from those people who have suffered some poor seasons in the immediate past, I also know it. What is the reason? The reason is that there is a deliberate Federal Government policy of keeping interest rates at record levels. Let the gurus opposite deny it! It is a deliberate policy to try to shore up the ailing dollar, which is ailing because the world judgment of Australia is that our economic performance is poor: it is as simple as that. Before we start getting hung up about denigrating the Liberal Party because of its lack of social conscience, let us have a look at the fundamental economic facts of life: this country is being administered some pretty tough medicine in relation to interest rates, because of its failure on the world scene in terms of economic performance. Unless we get down to the fundamentals and get them right, all the ranting and raving by members opposite about alleviating hardship and poverty tends to be irrelevant.

All that will happen is that it will increase and for members opposite to be talking about high interest rates causing concern when they have caused the high interest rates seems to me more than a little hypocritical. The Premier goes on to say:

My Government will work with the rural industry—

I do not know how, but they say they will—

in planning for the future of the industry, and will vigorously represent its concerns at the national level.

I asked the Premier a question yesterday about whether he would go to Canberra and try to use his influence (if he has any) in relation to interest rates. However, he said, 'There is no need for specific representations at this time.' If there is no need for specific representations on interest rates at this time, Lord knows when there will be! I might say that that answer does not sit too comfortably with the statement in the Governor's speech—the day before, namely, that the Government will very vigorously represent South Australia's concerns at the national level.

The Premier will not even tell his masters in Canberra that he thinks that their policies are ill-conceived. In fact, the most recent statement that he has made in relation to their policies was that he supported them. That was in the last quarter of last year. My interpretation of this is that here is a Government very much with tongue in cheek. Members of the Government know that they cannot do any worse in country areas. There is no electoral advantage for them in those areas. We were told *ad nauseam* that the metropolitan vote was the only one that mattered in winning elections. If they are going to start talking about the conscience of a political Party, let them put their money where their mouths are in relation to paragraph 10 of the Governor's speech, and do something for the rural community.

It was interesting to note that the Premier of Western Australia got a clear message, and I think that that has filtered through to Canberra: that the rural community might put them out of business in Canberra, which would occur if they lost all the rural seats that they hold and that they had better lift their game. I think that at least they got that message. Of course, that is largely irrelevant to the Govern-

ment here because they cannot do much worse in the country.

While speaking about country seats, I want to say what a credit the result in Mount Gambier was to the member for Mount Gambier. The whole Cabinet of South Australia was down there until, I guess, the public were sick of them. The Government had Premier Cain and former Premier Corcoran down there marching the streets. However, the member for Mount Gambier did them like a dinner. The Government did not win the only seat in the country that it thought it had a chance of winning.

In Mount Gambier the Liberal policies that were so successfully misrepresented in metropolitan Adelaide were able to be pushed through to their limit in debate by the Hon. Harold Allison *versus* the highly articulate (we were told) lawyer, Mr Humphries. The member for Mount Gambier was able to debate through to finality the issues in that little microcosm which is Mount Gambier, and the public knew, for instance, what our Housing Trust policy was. The honourable member won the Housing Trust vote for the first time in history. So, one can understand how we get this tongue-in-cheek, feigned interest in country areas, when one gets results like that. I might also say in passing that I was pleased (and no doubt the member for Briggs will be delighted) that there was a swing to the Liberal Party in my own seat. I am sure that that will be cause for some pleasure for him.

*Mr Rann interjecting:*

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** It was nothing as spectacular as Mount Gambier. I would like to thank the member for Briggs. On one pamphlet that I sent out I reminded the people of Kavel that on behalf of the Liberal Party I had the responsibility for pushing the Roxby Downs legislation through Parliament. Obviously, a number of people in Kavel thought that that was a good move and there was a swing on two Party preferences of 1.8 per cent. It was nothing as spectacular as the result in Mount Gambier, but it was a source of some personal pleasure to me, and no doubt the member for Briggs will rejoice, too, in my pleasure.

The vigorous representation of rural interests does not compel the Premier to tell his Federal colleagues that they ought to do something about interest rates, unfortunately. We have been left in the dark as to what the vigorous representation means or what it will lead to. There is no evidence of it yet. Two areas of particular interest in the Governor's speech are paragraphs 13 and 14. I think these matters would certainly be of some interest to the member for Newland, as they relate to the Adelaide Hills, and part of the Hills area is in the Newland electorate. The Governor stated:

The safety and quality of our water supply is of prime concern.

I agree with that. He further stated:

My Government will increase controls over potential water polluting activities in the Adelaide Hills.

What will the controls be? They are not spelt out, and one recalls that the last set of controls, introduced in the second half of last year, caused some consternation, and they do not sit too well in terms of the stated aims for pollution control in the Hills. The Government's latest research indicates that agricultural activities are the least polluting of all activities in the Adelaide Hills. In the early 1970s we were fed the message that everyone should live in townships, that all townships should be sewered and that, consequently, there would be no pollution. The message was 'Get rid of these bods who are pottering around on the land.' That was the conventional wisdom in the 1970s. I have lived in the area all this time; I have lived through it, and I have seen the changing thinking of the Labor Government, from the

time of the wonderful Labor Government of the 1970s that we have been hearing so much about from the fledgling member opposite.

*Mr Rann interjecting:*

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Yes, and we got more than 50 per cent of the vote in 1975 and still lost. However, I will talk about that later if I have time. The fact is that it is with some concern that I read that statement, because one of the controls introduced last year was that no second dwelling would be approved on one title, no matter whether the title comprised 1 000 acres or half an acre. If one is going to sustain rural agricultural activities in the Hills, obviously the next generation must be housed. To suggest that the son of a farmer should live in a town and travel to the rural property plainly is not sensible. So, that control does not sit very sensibly with the conclusion from the most recent studies which indicate that agricultural pursuits are the least polluting in the Adelaide Hills.

The towns and the areas adjacent to the freeway which have been developed are the major polluters of the metropolitan reservoirs. So much for the conventional thinking that there would not be a problem if everyone lived in towns serviced with sewers. There is a problem. I attended a presentation by the E&WS Department at Uraidla in the latter part of last year. I thought it was a very good presentation and that the departmental officers had done a good job. They have certainly upgraded their thinking in relation to what are the polluting elements in the Adelaide Hills. On a scale of one to 100 I think from memory the townships scored 50—a very significant influence in relation to pollution. So, some rethinking has occurred in that respect. The Government looked sympathetically at hobby farming at one stage, and it was found that the intensive keeping of horses involved more pollution than any other rural activity, so that had to be revised. A farmer engaged in genuine agricultural pursuits in the Hills causes the least pollution in terms of metropolitan Adelaide water sheds.

The Governor referred to the Government's maintaining its vigilance in the area of fire protection for Hills residents. I applaud that, but I want to know what the Government is going to do. A report (I think it was the Lewis report) was released. I loaned my copy to a journalist and it did not come back, but I remember what was in it. I think the journalist was going to give me a serve, although that did not eventuate. I made a few critical comments about the report.

The Lewis report was peopled by public servants—no one from local government, in the field, and no Hills resident was on the committee. It came up with a list of recommendations, some of which I thought were baloney but some of which made sense. However, I will repeat *ad nauseam* that the major problem for Hills residents is the hills face zone, which is sought to be maintained by some cranky conservationists in its pristine state, that is, that over a period of years it becomes a jungle, grows all the weeds imaginable and will be burnt out by fire sooner or later.

**Mr Lewis:** A tinder box.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Yes, a tinder box. Perched on top of that, including yours truly, are the Hills dwellers waiting to be burnt. It is as simple as that.

**An honourable member:** And your chestnuts!

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** My income is wiped out, but I am not necessarily speaking of self here. I speak from personal experience. I am saying that perched on top of this tinder box are the Hills communities, waiting to be burnt on a red alert day. If one listens to the cranky conservationists we will have this pristine hills face zone there for visual enjoyment. Lord knows how often they march over it.

**Mr Lewis:** They see the South African Daisy and the rabbits.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Well, it is full of rubbish which is not to be burnt. After a long struggle the former member for Todd managed to reintroduce sheep into the hills face zone in the area below where I live. That was sacrilege. This land used to be grazed before the Government took it over from private ownership. It then went to scrub with wild oats three feet high. It was a lovely tinder box. In due course along came Ash Wednesday, and up it went. Fire came out of it, completely uncontrollable, until the wind changed at Lobethal, 15 miles away. This fire occurred because the conservationists wanted to keep this tract of land—the sacred hills face zone—untouched.

After one hell of a battle, the former member for Todd managed to graze sheep on the land. At least they knocked down the wild oats and ate some of the rubbish, which is what had occurred years previously. All that did was restore a sensible state of affairs. It also had the happy result of reducing the fire hazard. However, when anyone talks about touching some of the reserves and parks in other parts of the hills face zone the conservationists just about hang, draw and quarter them.

One sensible fellow, now deceased, who had a park alongside his property in an unnamed area in the Hills had a fire that accidentally started in the park every year. That was one way that he believed he managed to survive over the years.

I read with pleasure in the Governor's speech that the Government will maintain vigilance in the area of fire protection for Hills residents. If it is going to do that it will have to get over this silly idea of putting power lines in *ad hoc* positions underground and do something about reducing the fuel load. The No. 1 priority in fire protection is to reduce vegetation that will burn. It is as simple as that. It is nonsense to force new residents to put their power lines underground when everyone else in the street has them above ground. To underground power lines around South Australia will cost the best part of \$1 billion. To talk about spending \$30 million over six years—one of the dopey proposals in the report—and reckon that it will have some impact on the bushfire danger in the Hills is plain stupid and a waste of money. I have said so locally, and I think that helped the increase in the number of votes I obtained.

There are a couple of matters in the Governor's speech that I support. The Government has now seen the light in relation to what is properly called law and order. After dragging its heels for three years it did a flip just in time for the election, and I am pleased to say that it will keep going down that track. Paragraphs 15 and 16 in the speech talk about that. However, I will believe it when I see it. If the Lefties let that through as it should be I will be surprised. However, it is here and it looks as though the Government might have a shot.

They talk about workers compensation and repeat the canard that the Government believes that the people have endorsed its proposed changes in this area. The new package bobbed up over Christmas and is precisely what the unions demanded. I thought that it was a slap in the face for the TLC negotiating team, because there was an agreed package between employers and the TLC negotiating team. However, when some—and I do not know whether or not they are more militant—unions looked at the package they said that they wanted more because their brothers in Victoria had done better. We on this side said that before the election, and that is what has come into the House—the package the unions wanted. That, I believe, is a slap in the face for the TLC negotiating team which had managed to reach agreement.



To claim that the people had endorsed the package, as the speech does, is plainly false. The Government again repeats its concern at the impact of rising interest rates, particularly for home buyers. It says that a new range of measures to assist home buyers will be introduced. That is a rather hollow statement and we will certainly be viewing those with a degree of interest.

**The Hon. P.B. Arnold:** I hope that they apply the same measures to the man on the land.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I do, too. I hope that this vigorous representation of the man on the land, of which we have nil evidence, will be to the fore when it talks about its package of assistance.

At the end of the Governor's speech we find due recognition of the visit of Her Majesty the Queen, His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh, and the visit of His Holiness the Pope, and I endorse those sentiments. It is with a degree of amusement that I remember a royal tour some years ago, when this State had a notable Attorney-General, now departed this scene for more important climes, and other members who were avowed republicans. I understand, from what has been said over the years, that the republicans were not inhibited from enjoying the hospitality of the Queen on the Royal yacht *Britannia* moored off Glenelg.

I well remember ringing the Director of the royal tour and saying that it was rough that the Opposition did not get within miles of the Queen; that the loyal subjects like yours truly, ardent monarchists, did not get within earshot, and had to queue up behind the barricades to see her, but all the republicans were queued up at the royal table enjoying the hospitality. I was a bit discomfited with it all.

I hope that all members of the Labor Party, including the republicans, share the sentiments that the Governor expresses in his speech, which was written by the Government. I hope that it is not just political pandering to the vast majority, who obviously still value this country's constitutional links with the monarchy. It is fairly obvious that the majority of people want to retain the Australian flag. The national anthem disappeared by Prime Ministerial fiat, without any legislation. He said that we would have a new anthem. My problem, along with about 90 per cent of Australians, is that we do not know the words. When standing up to sing the national anthem we do not have the faintest idea of the words, except that it contains the phrase 'girt by sea'. I thought that that referred to someone's girlfriend, who lived down by the seashore.

I hope that we do not have a repeat performance with the disappearance of the Australian flag. In getting rid of the anthem I guess that the Prime Minister toadied to elements in the Labor Party that want to get rid of all connections with the monarchy. In my remaining 10 minutes I will refer to something to which again the member for Briggs alluded.

**Mr Rann:** Thank you so much!

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I want to give the honourable member some notoriety, because it is obvious that we will score off that honourable member for a long while yet, unless he pulls his head in and does not make these sorts of statements with which he concluded his speech.

**Mr Rann:** You can be my press secretary.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I would love to go in for the misrepresentation, but I would not be able to lie straight in bed if I behaved as I would be expected to by the member for Briggs. The honourable member talks about the irrelevance of the Liberal Party, and gloats over the fact that the Labor Party has been in office for 17 of the past 20 years.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Unless the Labor Party has an early election (and I cannot see it doing that) that will probably be true. The honourable member suggests that there is nothing surprising about that. He then goes on to denigrate the Liberal Party and says that the Labor Party wins because it is the ants pants, has all the answers and because the Liberal Party is fiscally irresponsible, economically incompetent and socially uncaring, which makes the Labor Party's task easy. I would refer the honourable member to a very good publication that Legh Davis has put out. He had better look at Jaensch's work, but if he looks at the results of the elections since I have been in the House, from 1970 to 1985—and I am not complaining about losing the election because the Liberal Party did not deserve to win on the basis of the vote—one will see that in 1979 the Liberal Party, along with the member for Flinders (the non-Labor seats), gained the highest vote ever recorded in the history of South Australia. However, we won only by the skin of our teeth because of the electoral redistribution. It is unpopular to say this.

We read in the *Advertiser* that we could win on 45 per cent of the vote—and pigs might fly. That was Dr Jaensch. The chances of that happening I suggest are very long. It was suggested that the Liberal Party would win, if it got the vote in the right seats, on 45 per cent of the vote. That is patent nonsense. If one looks at the two-Party preferred vote over the 15 years to which I have referred, one can hardly come to the conclusion that the Liberal Party is irrelevant. The Labor Party won an election with 53 per cent of the two-Party vote, and now enjoys, effectively, 29 seats. The Liberal Party won with a record majority in 1979 of 55 per cent of the popular vote, and finished up with 25 seats.

If we look at the two-Party preferred vote, and if we had enjoyed the sort of majority that the Labor Party now has with 53 per cent of the vote, the Liberal Party would have had about 33 seats and would have made it a little more difficult for the Labor Party to regain office. If the Labor Party had got the vote it got in 1982 it would have deserved to win, I guess. If we look at the figures we see that in 1975 with the two-Party preferred vote (and there is no argument with these figures), the Liberal Party scored 50.8 per cent of the vote and the Labor Party got 49.2 per cent and won the election.

I have never taken a great academic interest in these predictions and trends, but there seem to be one or two underlying premises on which these political gurus base their predictions. The probability of winning elections, as I read and hear Mackerras and Jaensch from time to time, is on the uniform swing and certain seats will be above the average and some will be below the average, one is going to go in for predicting electoral results one must look at and work on the uniform swing concept. The Labor Party made enormous capital, in the time of Dunstan, of the idea of the unfairness of the former electoral redistribution in South Australia and the necessity for one vote one value.

I have looked at what Davis has written and what Ren DeGaris has written over the last few weeks. DeGaris has been particularly interested in and has a flair for mathematics. I do not know whether members opposite believe it or not, but Ren DeGaris has a flair for mathematics and is interested in the work of political pundits. I have looked at the work he has done and he makes some very valid points. He admits that during the Playford years (I forget which year) the Labor Party would have had to win 53 per cent of the vote in the early 1960s to win government.

*Mrs Appleby interjecting:*

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I think 1962—one election before the Labor Party won, I think in 1965. The contention that Playford did not, for the whole of that

period, have majority support is plain garbage. That is demonstrable. I suggest that the people who are talking about political fairness look at the work done by DeGaris. If one looks at the results on a two-Party preferred vote, on all the evidence Playford enjoyed majority support except for one election, in which case he did not. The same position, I submit, is operating at the moment. The judge of fairness should be that the Party gaining 50 per cent majority support should have an even chance of winning and the size of the win should be reflected in the number of seats that that Party holds. To simply say that by sticking equal numbers in various seats one has a fair redistribution is not tenable in this day and age.

If one looks at the electoral redistribution advocated by the Hon. Hugh Hudson on the one vote one value principle, the Liberal Party would have needed about 58 per cent to win. Let us not kid ourselves—that, because we have equal numbers in seats, we have a fair system. I am not whingeing about the election result—the Liberal Party did not deserve to win because it did not get majority support. In 1975 it got majority support but did not win. In 1979 the Liberal Party polled the highest vote ever recorded for a political Party in South Australia, and had a very modest majority. The Labor Party got 53 per cent of the vote—way below the vote for the Liberal Party in 1979—but now holds a record majority. Let members enjoy it, but it is as a result of the electoral system.

I do not for a moment suggest that the Electoral Commissioners did anything but subscribe to the terms of the Act, but, unless the terms are altered—the terms of reference which suggest that the commissioners must take note of existing boundaries which circumscribes them—it will be virtually impossible to come up with that third leg of a system which would allow, on the uniform swing concept (which is about the only prediction tool that the psephologist can use), a redistribution which means that the Party getting majority support will win and that the size of the win will be reflected by the majority.

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

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

**Mr De LAINE (Price):** Mr Speaker, I congratulate you on your election to your high office and I know that you will carry out your duties conscientiously, effectively and with fairness and integrity. I congratulate all members of the forty-sixth Parliament—the older members who have held their seats and the new members who have their parliamentary careers ahead of them. The Bannon Labor Government has been re-elected, this time for a four year term, and with an overwhelming majority in this House. I congratulate the Premier.

The election results clearly show the electors' acceptance and satisfaction with you as leader of our great State of South Australia. I am proud to be a member of this Labor Government. I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to my close friend and predecessor, George Whitten. Throughout his 10 years as the member for Price he served the community with loyalty and compassion. As Chairman of the Public Works Standing Committee he has proved himself to be a man of dedication and integrity.

I hope that I will be able to continue to serve the constituents of Price at the same high standard as did George Whitten. I would also like to congratulate the former Deputy Premier and Minister of Labour, Jack Wright, OA, on being included on the Australia Day Honours list. Jack has been a stalwart of not only the Australian Labor Party, but of the Government for many years, and his presence in this Chamber will be sadly missed. His relationship with both

employee and employer has paved the way to enable South Australia to enjoy the best industrial relations record in Australia. The honour conferred upon him, as an officer of the Order of Australia, is richly deserved. Jack Wright is a great South Australian.

My election to this Parliament was rather unique inasmuch as I really replaced two former members instead of one. George Whitten, of course, retired as the member for Price because he reached the age when he could put his feet up and take a well earned rest. Jack Wright, of course, then won Party endorsement for the seat but then, as we all know, very sadly was forced to retire because of ill health. I wish both George Whitten and Jack Wright the very best of luck and good health on their respective retirements.

I ask members to carefully consider the workers compensation Bill which is soon to come before the House, and to remember that the worker is the backbone of the State. Many people plan and organise programs and projects, but it is the workers who actually get the job done and it is only fair that they be treated with justice and equity. They have just as much right to a high standard of living as the rich in our society, but because of their lack of financial resources and positions of power their only protection comes from union membership and legislation.

I feel proud to have worked in the motor vehicle industry for many years. In fact I was employed by General Motors-Holdens for almost 34 of those years. I joined the company as an apprentice fitter and turner in the boom years following the Second World War. In these exciting years when all Australian industry was rapidly expanding GMH was no exception. In later years we saw a levelling out of the car industry and then in recent times a rapid decline, which alarms me. The importance of the motor vehicle industry and, indeed, the entire whitegoods industry is crucial to the health of the South Australian economy.

The massive increase in imported motor vehicle sales and the corresponding decline in the production of completely Australian manufactured vehicles must be addressed. Australian motor vehicle manufacturers are told by the Federal Government that they must be more competitive by becoming more efficient.

Unfortunately, we are competing against other divisions of multinational corporations, which have invested massive amounts of capital to tool up and produce vehicles on a very high volume basis, or have established production plants in third-world countries, and are exploiting the local workers on extremely low wages. It is absolutely impossible for the almost autonomous Australian divisions of some of these same multinational corporations to compete, with their old structure of traditional manufacturing and assembly methods, coupled with fairly high numbers of employees. These Australian manufacturers are therefore forced to restructure their operations.

We are now witnessing the effects of this latest industrial fashion—the restructuring or rationalisation of industry. The concept sounds very impressive and modern, and no doubt the Federal Government has the best intentions in trying to reduce the price of cars and other manufactured goods. However, all that is happening is that prices are still high, and unemployment in these industries is growing.

In an effort to become more efficient, Australian industry and, in particular, the motor vehicle industry is buying new model designs from overseas instead of developing cars suitable for Australian conditions, as it did in the past. Job and career opportunities in the area of research and development are therefore lost to Australian industry.

The same situation applies to tooling. Instead of employing draftsmen and technical staff to design machines and tools and to plan manufacturing and assembly processes, this work is done overseas at cheaper rates. The same

principle applies further up the track. Instead of employing tradesmen of all types here in Australia to manufacture and install the sophisticated tooling necessary to produce the finished product, the tools and machines are made overseas and imported. This equipment is sometimes even installed and commissioned by people brought in from overseas under contract. An ever increasing number of components of the finished product are also imported.

As South Australia was the prime manufacturing source of motor vehicle tooling in Australia, this restructuring of the industry has cost many hundreds of jobs in the motor vehicle industry alone. In other words, we are exporting jobs. If the present situation is allowed to continue, then in time the total function of Australian manufacturing industry will be, at best, purely assembly operations or, at worst, purely sales and distributing operations. This, of course, will cause thousands more people to lose their jobs.

Added to these problems is the increase in the use of robots and other labour-saving methods, to further erode employment opportunities. As if the added unemployment is not bad enough, the aspect that really worries me is the loss of very valuable skills and expertise. There is an urgent need for the Federal Government to tune its industrial policies to address these problems. I congratulate the State Government on programs already initiated, especially in my own District of Price. There has been a noticeable change in the environment of what was once called 'Port Misery'. Port Adelaide is now a thriving city, with unique historical significance.

Some years ago, there were signs that the Port was becoming a 'ghost town' but, because of initiatives taken by the State Government, in cooperation with the Federal Labor Government and local government, Port Adelaide is being refurbished and preserved. The Port Adelaide redevelopment is well under way, and the tourism potential in this area for the future is enormous and very exciting. The District of Price is a large area, spreading from Port Adelaide to Wingfield and across to Ferryden Park, Woodville Gardens, and then across to Queenstown. Like all communities based on industry it has its problems, but through the Government's initiatives, with its housing, health, and welfare policies, the people of Price take a pride in their community.

If we are successful in obtaining the Royal Australian Navy \$2.6 billion submarine replacement program, it will not only be of immense benefit to South Australia as a whole but it will also be a tremendous shot in the arm for my electorate of Price. The benefits in terms of direct employment opportunities, increased numbers of jobs in already established businesses in the area and, perhaps best of all, the creation of a suitable climate will see the establishment of many spin off industries and service organisations that will revitalise industry in South Australia.

The Housing Trust is to be commended for its work, and the establishment of regional offices has been of great assistance. I congratulate the Government on its initiative of merging health administration with that of community welfare.

Within my electorate, the establishment of the Womens Health Centre has proved to be of immense value. Welfare and health go hand in hand. It is the democratic right of all people to be cared for. Indeed, the Housing Trust has done a magnificent job in providing accommodation for thousands of South Australians but, because of the combined ravages of unemployment, spiralling prices of housing and high interest rates, the Australian dream of owning one's own home is getting out of reach for many people. The number of people who do not have the means to service private housing loans is increasing daily, and I fear that the situation in the electorate of Price alone is becoming very

serious indeed. The record of this Government during the past three years has been very impressive—in fact, we led the nation in the area of housing. However, more needs to be done.

The provision of low cost rental housing is perhaps the most pressing problem facing the Government in the short term. Either massive amounts of money will have to be allocated for the provision of this low cost accommodation, or new applicants for Housing Trust units may have to be means tested.

Care for the aged is another area of concern, especially when one looks at the projected figures for South Australia's future requirements. Once again, the South Australian Government leads the nation through its appointment of a Commissioner for the Ageing. This appointment will ensure that aged people will be cared for in the twilight years of their lives.

Within my electorate I am fortunate to have the Parks Community Centre, which was established during the Whitlam years. The centre caters for the various needs of many people, including migrants and ethnic groups. Just as the main commercial area and town hall is the focal point for the older surrounding areas of Port Adelaide, The Parks Community Centre is becoming the focal point for the parks areas of Athol Park, Mansfield Park, Angle Park, Ferryden Park and Regency Park.

Because the Parks area is very young in terms of housing development, there exists very little history, tradition or identity. These ingredients are necessary for local people to develop pride and love of their community. I commend the Government and, in particular, the efforts of the Premier (John Bannon), and the member for Spence (Roy Abbott) who, prior to the recent electoral redistribution, represented these areas for having done so much to assist and guide this relatively young community.

Indeed, I hope to continue this guidance and assistance to help this working class area to develop an identity of its own. There is ample evidence of considerable talent and ability among local residents, especially the young and, with additional funding in the right places, the future of the Parks area can be very exciting.

My main general concern and interest is in the quality of life of not only the people who live in the district of Price but for all South Australians. The areas of government which control our quality of life are the areas in which I am most vitally interested, namely, employment, housing, planning and environment, law and order, sport and recreation, tourism and local government.

During this last term of office, the Government has done much to up date our Local Government Act. New planning regulations were introduced to overcome problem areas, but I find from my own experience in local government that much more protection is required, especially for ordinary working class people, who want nothing more than to be able to live in peace and relative quiet in their homes without, for instance, having factories and other noisy and disruptive establishments built next to them. Once again, these are the people who cannot afford the services of lawyers to fight for them in the courts, so they must be protected by legislation. Law and order is very high on the priorities of people in the electorate, and rightly so.

I applaud the Government on its initiative in respect of the restructuring of our suburban policing organisation. The expansion of community policing, and the establishment of community based police stations, as well as the introduction of Neighbourhood Watch and block parent schemes, will further improve the effectiveness of our already excellent Police Force.

Here in our great State, we have natural attributes such as a beautiful climate, an absence of natural disasters, ideal

geography and topography, and plentiful mineral and energy resources. In addition, we have a diverse multi cultural society, including many very gifted and capable people. I believe that, with this foundation, together with the continuation of a good, stable and imaginative Government, South Australia can be the best place in which to live on this earth.

Finally, I wish to express my sincere appreciation and thanks to all those people throughout the electorate of Price who assisted me to become the member. Special thanks go also to my wife and family and to members of both Price sub-branches who gave me tremendous help and support. Thanks must also go to my opponents, who conducted a very fair and clean campaign. I am proud to be here as a member of the Government.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** I congratulate the most recent member to take his seat on a well thought out and obviously well conceived address, which did not get bogged down in dogma and which clearly expressed the importance of issues so far as the people in the electorate are concerned. I look forward to other contributions from the honourable member in that vein.

I congratulate His Excellency the Governor on the opening of the parliamentary session and, naturally, I support the motion before the Chair. At this juncture, on behalf of the people I represent, I would like to say (and I believe that I would be expressing the views of members throughout the House) that we appreciate the capable way in which the Governor (Lieutenant-General Sir Donald Dunstan) has fulfilled the duties of that office. His involvement in the community at so very many levels, his own personal research in relation to material that he uses regarding openings and other activities with which he is involved was exemplified by his involvement earlier today in the opening of the Mortlock Australiana Library. It was most interesting to hear him talk of the various activities which have taken place in the development of the original library on that site, of the redevelopment that has taken place in the meantime and of his expectations of that new facility in the lives of South Australians.

Both he and Lady Dunstan, I suggest, have undertaken a great workload on behalf of the people of this State. They are filling their roles very capably, and I personally admire, as I know my constituency admires, the work that they do in this office.

I would like to take the opportunity of congratulating you, Sir, on your election to the position of Speaker. The position has considerable importance in the conduct of this House, a subject to which you obviously addressed yourself because, in your acceptance speech yesterday, you very clearly said, 'and in accordance with the traditions of the Parliament'. You subsequently went on to indicate how you sought to be a Speaker in every sense of the word in order to benefit the conduct of this House and in relation to the advantages and the privileges of members on both sides.

A number of statements have been made relative to the office of Speaker. You alluded to the difficulty of being drawn from your seat because of the problem of the return from the palace in London to the House of Commons on earlier occasions being in two parts—a head and the rest. Indeed, the tradition of the Sergeant at Arms with his great war club, which we now symbolise as a mace, was one of the protective methods that was used to make certain that the Speaker returned in one piece, as indeed was the creation of the system whereby a posse of members went with the Speaker to the Crown to indicate the decision of the House and to bring back the message of the Crown. We went through that tradition yesterday in delivering you, Sir, as our Speaker and as our spokesperson.

Sir, you also clearly indicated the importance of being the spokesperson of this Parliament. I look forward to your undertaking that task with all the humility that is necessary for it, in the clear recognition that the position can be very lonely at times and that it is important that the rights of members on the right and the left are equally considered. Speakers of the past have indicated the importance of the heritage they represent as a result of elevation to this office.

Some years ago, I researched some of the material relative to the Speakership or spokesmanship. The Speaker of the House of Commons between 1728 and 1761 was one Arthur Onslow. Up until his retirement and during his period of spokesmanship he had seen the development of Cabinet government with ministerial responsibility, the creation of newspapers or the media and the very influential part that they play in the portrayal of the activities of the parliamentary system, and the development of a Government and Opposition occupying different sides of the House (and therefore the general confrontationist situation that we find in this Parliament). On his retirement he expressed the wish 'that the freedom, the dignity and authority of this House may be perpetual'.

Some few years later, Speaker Landy, again of the House of Commons, stated that sentiment in a slightly different form, when he said:

The surest way to uphold the dignity of any institution is to preserve its historic continuity.

Yesterday, Mr Speaker, I congratulated you as we went to present ourselves to the Governor for returning to an element of tradition by wearing a gown and a wig. I believe it is important that the important elements of the traditions of the House which have come from the signing of the Magna Carta in 1215 and the development of the parliamentary system through all of these years are retained so that we have this opportunity of continuity of purpose and a horizon and a perimeter within which to exercise the parliamentary system.

I am not suggesting for one moment that we go overboard and seek to retain everything. That would be impossible, particularly the beheading part of it—and I am sure that you would agree with me on that score, Sir. More particularly, I believe that there are important elements necessary in the role of the Speaker and the upholding of those traditions which are so essentially a part of the parliamentary democratic system.

I might upset my friend the Minister of Housing and Construction, and almost be looked upon as pompous, as I think he suggested this afternoon, but I will offer you a further piece of advice, Sir, as one who has occupied that role. A ruling was given to this House which I believe is extremely important for any Speaker to recognise. The Speaker is there as the spokesperson, as the arbitrator and to appear as little as possible in the pages of *Hansard*. I leave you to reflect on the importance of that statement.

Certainly, the respect of people on both sides of the House makes the job of Speaker that much more simple in that he does not have to intrude into the affairs of Parliament. I trust that, by the dignity and the goodwill that you bring to the office, Sir, it will not be necessary for you to intrude unnecessarily into the pages of *Hansard* by way of editorial comment. Another aspect goes hand in glove with this. I believe it is extremely important for the well-being of the parliamentary system that decisions are made in committee in relation to the form that the parliamentary progress or parliamentary procedures will take.

I would like to believe that deliberations in relation to future parliamentary procedural motions will be determined, in true democratic spirit, by members of the Standing Orders Committee, and that the first revelation to

members of the House, and certainly the populace of the State at large, will be by way of report to the House and not by way of the media. I shall leave those comments at that point. I believe it is important for the future of the parliamentary system that it work within itself, as is traditional. I welcome, Sir, your recognition of the importance of the traditional role.

I refer now to His Excellency's speech delivered to members of both Houses yesterday. I was surprised about the Governor's statement in paragraph 3, namely:

My Government has been pleased to note the continued strength of our economy throughout the past year.

There has been a degree of improvement in the economy, but I was disturbed by those comments, without further clarification. It was not until I heard the Governor's comments in paragraph 10 that my concerns were somewhat allayed. At paragraph 10 His Excellency stated:

My Government is gravely concerned at the situation in the rural sector. Declining world commodity prices and high interest rates are causing many farmers great hardship. My Government will work with the rural industry in this State in planning for the future of the industry and will vigorously represent its concerns at the national level.

As I have suggested, those comments allayed the fears that I had in relation to comments about the economy of this State that were first expressed in an overall euphoric manner. I represent a rural electorate, which is quite heavily urbanised. From statements made recently by the Minister for Environment and Planning about a potential new town development in the future it is quite conceivable that a new satellite town could be created in the electorate of Light, perhaps to the east, into the Barossa area. However, I do not believe that such a town would be a satellite town in every sense if it were in such a location, as the Barossa is relatively close to Adelaide.

Members who were here would recall the great concern that I and others had back in the early 1970s, when it was suggested that Murray Newtown, in the Monarto area, would be developed as a satellite city of Adelaide. At 50 or 55 miles away there would have been an element of a satellite township about a development at Monarto, but certainly a satellite township developed as near to Adelaide as is the Barossa in such close proximity to the urban development at Elizabeth, Munno Para and Salisbury would mitigate against its being a satellite town in the true sense of the word. It would be part of the urban sprawl.

I note that the Minister indicated in a press statement as recently as last week that he would not like to see an urban sprawl develop as such and that he was seeking to develop plans and directions which would allow for orderly development. I most certainly give my wholehearted support to that. However, I question the nature of some of these developments, if we are talking about a satellite town being situated only some 45 kilometres from the Adelaide GPO.

Such developments will be part of greater Adelaide, and will not be satellite towns. Referring to orderly development, I hope that an early announcement will be made on the secondary parklands which have been promised by the Government. Documents have already been circulated giving a general thrust to establishing the secondary parklands system, which would divide Munno Para and Elizabeth from Gawler and extend right across, providing for some conjunction with the hills face zone, so that One Tree Hill, for example, did not become part of a total sprawl and so that land over towards Virginia and Two Wells would also be incorporated in this secondary parklands system.

I have been well advised by the Minister—up until some three months ago—as to the developments taking place there. I trust that the general outline given to members on that earlier occasion remains the direction that this secondary parklands scheme will ultimately take, and I hope that

it can be implemented, being finally proclaimed or gazetted (whatever may be necessary), so that those areas cannot be violated.

We have seen the situation in the past where the best laid plans of mice and men have come adrift because somebody forgot to take the final step and, by a quirk of fate or by some dodge through the minefield of legislative procedure, somebody was able to destroy part of a concept. I would not like that to happen to the secondary parklands development.

I refer again to the rural electorate which I have said I represent—and am happy to represent yet again after the seventh election, and look forward to representing after future elections.

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** So Randall Ashbourne was not correct?

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I have seen things in the popular press—not coming from my mouth. I think they might have been conjecture; they might have been a wishful wink in the eye of some person but they do not happen to be factually correct. Electors and health willing, I will be back, and I will be delighted, as I indicated at the declaration of my poll, to be looking at the parliamentary system from the side opposite to that which I occupy at the present moment.

I make one comment on some of the contributions which I have already heard from the other side—and it certainly does not relate to the contribution made by the member for Price, for which I have congratulated him. I have, however, heard comments which made me think of the simple little adage—a pearl of wisdom: today's peacocks are tomorrow's feather dusters. Some peacocks become feather dusters much more quickly than others.

I say no more about the parliamentary system or about peacocks, but I come back to the proposition that I was developing in relation to the rural situation. With the change in electoral boundaries, I still represent a significant animal husbandry activity—in fact, one operation, at three sites in the electorate, involving a constant population in excess of 110 000 pigs. Local residents are not particularly happy about the problems which arise from the effluent from some of these operations—one in particular where, with the best of intent and advice given by Government departments to reduce the effect of the winds across the effluent ponds, it was found that the process suggested to by officialdom has increased rather than decreased the problem.

There is animal husbandry, grain agriculture and quite a lot of intensive industry involving poultry and, more particularly in the Barossa Valley, the wine grape industry. The wine grape industry is presently in dire straits. That is no reflection upon what is taking place at Football Park at present. The wine grape industry based in the Barossa Valley has been the mainstay of and was the original key to South Australia's pre-eminence in tourism. It became a name synonymous with South Australia and thousands upon thousands of tourists came to experience the benefits of the Barossa Valley.

The southern hills, Clare Valley and Coonawarra and Keppoch in the South-East have taken over part of that role, but the Barossa Valley, centre of the German settlements following the persecution of the German people (particularly the Prussian people) in 1840, has been a very important part of our agriculture. The people from that area have fanned out across the State and undertaken all forms of agriculture. Wherever they have gone they have been industrious and responsible for a number of important provincial town developments throughout South Australia. These people have mainly been on small holdings from which families, with perhaps one or two assistants at harvest or pruning time, have been able to put high quality grapes

into the system, grapes that have produced particularly high quality wines.

With changed circumstances and an overall reduction in the value of their product, and more particularly because of the increase in the cost of production and the need to undertake spraying and other agricultural endeavours to overcome the difficulties that arise with the concentration of one product in an area, they have been put in the invidious position of being unable to place their full harvest with a winery. I go back to the time of Sir Condor Laucke, now Lieutenant Governor of the State, who was the member for Barossa before being defeated in that seat by Mrs Molly Byrne at the 1965 election. The electorate took in Greenock, part of the Barossa Valley, Roseworthy and an area down into Tea Tree Gully.

The single issue that played a great part in Sir Condor Laucke's defeat in that seat was the fact that the wine industry believed that it should have a grape pricing system, but he had been unable to get Sir Thomas Playford and the Cabinet to accept that need and the importance of a guaranteed market for that product. It is history that the Labor Opposition, at the 1965 election, promised to introduce a grape pricing system. After Labor won that election, it was not long before that promise was kept. From that time until now, the presence of that guaranteed price has been both a salvation and a damnation at various times.

It completely misses the fact, however, that section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution allowed for the free passage of grapes across the border from the Murrumbidgee irrigation area, and from Sunraysia, Mildura, Merbein and such places, so that when there was a grape glut in those areas hundreds of tonnes of grapes could be sent across the border and made available to winemakers in South Australia at much reduced prices.

There was no guarantee of price for grapes coming across the border. Likewise, the position existed that South Australian growers were able to send their grapes to other States at a time when there was a price advantage. However, with other contingencies such as special taxation measures that have been brought into existence by a series of governments, and have certainly increased under the present Federal Government, and with the fact that the wineries themselves have been taken over by larger corporations and no longer maintain the family spirit which existed between them and their producers, a number of wineries, when they found that they were being forced to pay a price higher than the market would support, decided to produce their own product.

This afternoon in the presence of the Minister of Agriculture, when I took a deputation to him, it was explained that one particular winery that has an annual capacity of 10 000 tonnes of grapes decided this year that it would reduce its intake to 7 500 tonnes—a 25 per cent reduction. However, 2 500 tonnes of its total intake was to come from its own vineyards. Naturally, this would reduce to only 5 000 tonnes the amount it took from private vineyards—a reduction of 33½ per cent in the amount from private vineyards in an overall down-turn of 25 per cent of total intake.

Unless the winery—and it cannot be expected of them, I suggest—reduces the amount it takes from its own vineyards that inequitable situation will always exist. The private enterprise vineyard then becomes the convenience store, much like the old corner shop in years gone past, and the winery is able to look to its own vineyards for the total of its product.

That is only one aspect of a very awkward situation that currently exists for the wine grape industry. For a number of years many less scrupulous wineries have used ploys which, to my knowledge, were never used by the old family

winery, where its word was its bond and, if it had a contract, even though it was only a handshake with a supplier, it took all the product through thick and thin.

Today the same organisations, without that direct family tie, are likely to say to the vineyard proprietor, 'We will take the grapes; you deliver us five tonnes and we will pay you for four tonnes.' This is against the spirit of the pricing, but it is being done. Some organisations also go to the extent of saying, 'Those high priced Chardonnay or Rhine riesling grapes that should on a general arrangement have a value of \$400 or \$350 per tonne—you deliver them and we will give you the base price of \$190 per tonne.'

The winery is doing the right thing within the structure of the legislation by meeting the minimum price. The product it turns out will not be inferior. It will not turn those grapes into low grade wines or spirit because it has paid less for it. It will put it on the market for the value product that it is. The person who will miss out is the vineyard operator.

We also have the situation of products being bought on the basis of quality. In a year such as this when there has been a small amount of rain since Christmas, there is the presence of odium spores in a number of grapes and the very detection of one or two spores in a load of grapes is sufficient for that load to be downgraded as inferior fruit at the base price, thus reducing the income to the producer. It is not a new situation, but one which has been getting progressively more difficult.

I refer to a contribution made on 22 February 1978 in this House. A proposition was put forward by the Hon. Mr Arnold, namely:

That this House calls on the Federal and involved State Governments to—

1. limit vineyard plantings to existing areas,
2. increase duty on imported wines and brandies,
3. reduce excise payable on Australian produced brandy,
4. provide funds to convert surplus wine grapes into juice concentrate and use the product to promote and establish overseas markets, . . .

That motion was put forward and debated by a number of members. The member for Napier led the debate on behalf of the then Government, mainly because of his involvement with the Angle Vale and Virginia area and the difficulties that the growers had been bringing to his attention. At page 1730, in a brief contribution that I made to the debate, I drew attention to an article that appeared at about that time in volume 6 No. 2 of *Scope*—a paper distributed as a monthly magazine with a number of country newspapers. In particular, it had been circulated in the *Northern Argus*, the paper emanating from Clare. Under the heading 'Industry Joins in New Vine Project' was the statement:

While life begins at 40 for man, this is the age when the grapevine goes into decline.

The article continues:

Significantly over half of South Australia's 31 000 hectares of vineyards are more than 40 years old and will need to be replanted over the next 10 years.

I then drew attention to a position which existed in France, where in the very vast growing vineyards down around Montpellier and Marseilles and other parts of France and also to a degree in Germany along the Rhine, it was becoming obvious that the old vineyards were not necessarily producing the type of fruit wanted by the market at that time. It was therefore necessary to replant or graft the varieties that were going to produce a better product. However, restrictions were placed on people in France at that time, and I relate them directly from the record:

In France at present, unless the people responsible for planting and replanting vines follow the direction of the industry and plant the varieties that will benefit the industry, they are refused opportunities to replant more than 50 per cent of the area that they take out of production. In France, 70 000 hectares is being taken

out of production purely and simply because it is based on the reality that new varieties are producing better and there is not the need for a continual over supply of the product.

I am not suggesting that that is necessarily directly what will take place here, but I do know that the industry itself is becoming much more appreciative of the need to look to their industry on a long term rather than a short term basis.

We have seen recently development of the Australian Grape Producers Association, which has a federal body and a branch structure. The President and Vice President of the federal body and President and Vice President the Barossa branch were members of the deputation that I took to see the Minister of Agriculture this afternoon. The dialogue, to which I will not refer, was meaningful and I look forward to some assistance arising out of the information that was given to the Minister on that subject.

Concurrently we have a vine pull program which is available and which has been taken advantage of in New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia. It was originally put forward as a scheme to assist in taking out of production table grape varieties or those varieties that could be turned into dried products such as currants, raisins and sultanas. Whilst that is the basic scheme being implemented in New South Wales and Victoria, it did not suit the demands of the South Australian scene where the greater part of our production is of wine grapes.

After deliberations by the former Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Frank Blevins) and subsequently by the present Minister (Hon. Mr Mayes) action has been taken to incorporate wine grape production into those schemes. However, if one has five, 10 or even 20 hectares of grape vines and one is assisted to pull them out, what does one then use the five, 10 or 20 hectares for to give a meaningful production? That land will not grow enough grass to run a sufficient number of dairy cows to become a new industry nor will it run a sufficient number of sheep either for fat lambs or for wool to pay for the servicing of the value of that property. All it will do is take out of production a product which, at this moment, is not currently in vogue.

In the agricultural field, whether it be in stone fruits (such as peaches) or pomes (such as pears and apples) where tree pull schemes have been used in the past not infrequently very soon after one has implemented the project there is a sudden demand for that product and the whole system starts over again. We have seen it also in the orange industry. At present, there is insufficient citrus production in South Australia to meet our demands and we have to import fruit.

When I first came to this House some 16 years ago we were constantly being harassed by statements from people in various parts of South Australia and there were arguments on the floor of this place about the oversupply of citrus in South Australia. Many acres were pulled out and we suddenly found ourselves behind the eight ball. Certainly, the new technology which allows fresh orange juice to be placed on to the home market almost at the time of squeezing has played a very important part in that overall balance.

I wanted to make the following point, which is quite valid and which is causing a great deal of concern to a number of people in the viticultural industry: yes, we accept the money that is available; yes, it will get us out of some of our present problems; we will not have to sit by and see the grapes wither away on the vine because there is no outlet for them, but what do we do with the land which will not return sufficient income to allow us to pay the rates and taxes?

I will come to rates and taxes in relation to local government in a minute, but let us be quite clear that in a number of those areas one is looking for a return upwards of \$5 per

acre per annum to meet one's rates and taxes, water rates and other associated compulsory charges, quite apart from any of the production costs of management, stocking or whatever.

The final comment I wish to make about the plight of the grape industry and its importance not only in the Barossa Valley but also in other places is that there is a very real risk that vital vineyards will be taken out of commission under this vine pull scheme, and that will destroy the tourist potential or the tourist actuality of a number of those vital Barossa Valley areas. I am advised that a number of quite large old plantings in a vital area on the main highway through the Barossa Valley are likely to be pulled, leaving a blank spot instead of a landscape of vineyards. That is another hidden agenda in this whole problem: we are likely to see the destruction of the very elements that draw people to an area or at least a diminution of the value of some of these areas by the loss of the traditional crop.

I refer now to rates and taxes and the major requirements of local government during 1986 and into 1987. We have already seen the Government and indeed the Opposition quite unashamedly on the same wavelength on this matter, giving a commitment that the balance of the Local Government Act should be updated and that the next stage of that Act to be considered will be that dealing with assessments and rates. The questions arise whether we should have a minimum rate or a service rate; what do we talk about in relation to a differential rate; how do we assess—on an improved value or an unimproved value (using the old terminology), a site value or a capital value; whether the same system is to be used for provincial towns and for cities in the main metropolitan area; and what happens when we get out into almost totally agricultural council areas with small towns, none of which have a population of more than 200 people? There are a number of areas that come into that category.

The way in which we go about making these alterations is a very vexed question. I am indebted to the Minister for advising me that position papers in respect of this phase are expected to be circulated within the next two or three weeks. I know that both the Local Government Association and the Municipal Management Institute of South Australia, as well as a number of individual councils and indeed the Department of Local Government, have been preparing their attitudes on this very vital matter. I believe that in the past 18 months members of both sides have received through their electoral offices a number of complaints relating to the more aggressive attitude adopted by some local government bodies to maximise the rates that they can obtain from each parcel of land within their corporate or district areas. Most councils have expressed the attitude that a minimum rate should apply and some tenant organisations are complaining that by this means the whole of the rating system is subject to inequity because we are forcing on people a minimum rate that is more than the rate in the dollar paid per unit of value by a person with a property of higher value.

We have a recognition by local government that both State and Federal Governments have advised that it will be more on its own in future than has been the case in the past, and that it is essential for local governing bodies to be responsible for raising the funds that they will expend, albeit with a top up in various areas for particular projects and through the Grants Commission.

We have seen the tabling of the Self Report that was commissioned by the present Federal Government to overview the whole approach to the personal income tax share of funds that are made available to local government. We recognise that in 1985-86 the sum made available for distribution through the State Grants Commission was reduced

from 1.96 per cent of the personal income tax collection to about 1.7 per cent. Indeed, that greatly reduced the sum that was expected by large numbers of local governing authorities.

The Self Report, although it is not the final word, clearly indicates that the number of people in a particular area should have a rather more significant role to play than has applied in the past, and it reduces the topping up that has been available to some councils in the past where there has been an element of isolation. These matters will exercise the attention of members on both sides of the House and both Houses during 1986.

Again, while many of us on both sides of the House believed that the first stage of the Local Government Act rewrite which related to the structure of local government—the roles of individuals within local government both at a staff and elected level—would be the most difficult part, I hazard a guess that most if not all of us, by the time we finally come to grips with the financial aspects of local government, will be saying that it was a much bigger job and indeed a much more difficult job to determine than the matter dealt with in the first stage.

The rates and taxes that are being applied to many people in rural areas and in shopping and commercial areas are causing a problem of capacity to meet costs. This in turn is creating problems in the general pricing structure. Although I cannot recall the exact figure, there was a significant increase in the CPI for South Australia in 1985-86 directly associated with the involvement or with the amount of money that was being extracted for local government purposes, and those issues are still with us and are yet to be totally addressed.

The present Minister of Education as the then Minister of Community Welfare previously had carriage of a report that looked at all the concessions available to people in this State, whether it involved concessions for motor vehicles, whether it was up to 60 per cent to a maximum of \$150 for local government rates or whether it involved water and sewer rate and various other concessions. I think I am correct that the total bill that the Government expended to meet all those commitments in 1983 terms was about \$92 million. Certainly, those costs are much higher now.

If one adds that to the other problems of government in meeting the heavy costs of subsidising of housing—and I am not suggesting that the subsidy should be reduced or taken away; I am just drawing attention to the fact that the housing subsidy in this 1985-86 year is much greater than it was previously because of the price freeze on rentals that was instituted by the Government—one sees that the bill to meet the subsidies and the benefits to the community is getting greater and greater, and that we have yet to find a solution to many of these problems.

I want now very briefly to draw attention to the problem which many members of Parliament, particularly through their electorate offices, encounter on a daily basis. The member for Briggs in his contribution last evening rightly drew attention to the problem of people who come to the electorate office with problems as to how they will pay for accommodation, which is escalating at a tremendous rate, when they are on what they look upon as a pittance by way of social security payments.

The member for Price referred to housing and the increased need therefor. We are all aware of the massive costs associated in more recent times with the housing industry. This was caused by the heat that was generated in that industry. Although it provided additional employment and homes, there was also a great demand on the relatively few artisans that were available to provide some of the services, which increased the length of time that it took to build the house. There was also the problem of a greater demand for the

products that go into the building of a house, and one lost out on the benefits of discounted bricks, wood or glass, so that the eventual effect was an increase in the end price of the house.

That problem is still with us, and it has not been assisted, I suggest—I do not want to start an argument at this time of the night on the whys and wherefores of this—by the pressures applied by the BWIU, the demands on the subbies and the fact that the South Australian Housing Trust now requires an element of unionisation in the housing industry. All of those matters have an influence on increasing the cost of housing. Again, it is not assisted by the intrusion of some of those outside influences when, for reasons which I will not necessarily delve into, a company goes out of business because it cannot meet its costs.

We had the situation, for example, of one company which had building projects in hand in four different areas of South Australia, but the company went into receivership. One project was located at Elizabeth and another was at Ingle Farm. I believe that the latter, which was shown on *State Affair* in January, involved partly built homes with the wooden frames erected. Those frames have been out in the weather now for something like six or seven months, and there is a certain amount of discolouration of the wood. From what I have seen from a distance, I believe that there is warping of some of the materials. There has been no action on those units for those six or seven months. The contract was let for work to be undertaken to complete those units, but the successful tenderer withdrew his tender very quickly when, the very next day after it was announced that he had the job, he was visited by members of the BWIU asking for their \$90 000.

The completion of these houses went out to contract, but the BWIU, believing that it knew which of the contractors around Adelaide were likely to take up the contract and complete the work, approached those contractors and advised that the tender price to be submitted to the South Australian Housing Trust for the completion of these units was to be increased by the sum of \$90 000, that is, in the bottom went \$90 000, and then was added the cost to the organisation of completing the units.

That \$90 000 was to be siphoned off to pay members of the union workforce who had missed out on their weekly wage as a result of the company's loss of liquidity. Unfortunately, the successful tenderer had not been looked upon by the union as a likely contender. Therefore, he had not been waited on and advised to put the \$90 000 in at the bottom end. I am not quite sure whether the Deputy Premier is nodding his head in agreement with what I am saying.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I'm listening very intently.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** When, as I suggested earlier, it was indicated to the contractor that he had the job, and he was waited on for the \$90 000, he withdrew his tender because he could not and would not meet that form of blackmail, and he had made no provision for it in his tender price. A number of builders in Adelaide who were approached are prepared to stand up and indicate that they were approached on the basis that I have revealed to the House. They did not put in a tender because they would not be party to what they looked on as a form of blackmail. Not only was it a form of blackmail but it was going to increase the finished cost of those houses to an unrealistic level.

As recently as Sunday of last week I went past one of the groups of houses and found that they are in precisely the same state as they were on the day of the liquidation, with no further action having taken place. We are screaming out for houses at a reasonable price, houses that will not see an increase in the cost of rental to meet the cost of production;



yet we are living with this sort of blackmail and this sort of action. One would suspect that this is condoned by the Government, even though de facto, because it has not sort to finalise the matter. That is one problem in that area.

I genuinely accept the plea made by members on both sides of the House on the need to sort out a number of these tactics. I hope that members will support the reinstatement to the Notice Paper of a motion that I brought forward towards the end of the last Parliament. The motion sought to have the Government take a positive stand against not only the BLF but also the BWIU, which was using similar intimidatory tactics.

In the three minutes left to me I will quickly draw attention to another major problem that besets members in their districts. I refer to the argument that unfortunately constituents have with computers, the bureaucracy and its very narrow interpretation. The only place in Australia where people suffering from melanoma cancer can be referred for ultimate testing and for diagnosis is Sydney; likewise, if a person anywhere in Australia requires the services of a cranio maxilla facial unit, they are referred to the Adelaide Children's Hospital. They are national centres for those fields.

The isolated patients transport provision, a Commonwealth initiative, indicates that a person living in a metropolitan area may not benefit from any assistance available through the isolated persons transport and accommodation provision. Regrettably, there are people who have interpreted the fact that a person who happens to live in the metropolitan area of Adelaide and is referred to the Sydney melanoma clinic cannot receive assistance because they are travelling between two metropolitan areas. Certainly, isolation of nearly a thousand kilometres as between Adelaide and Sydney needs a more reasonable interpretation than that, as would be the case for someone coming to South Australia from Brisbane, Perth or Darwin for the purpose of the cranio maxilla facial unit.

I hope that some of the bureaucracy and narrowness of the interpretation which pervades a number of departments will soon be a thing of the past. My federal colleague, the Hon. Neil Andrew, is taking up the matter to which I have just referred with the Hon. Neal Blewett, Federal Minister for Health. I believe that this area needs attention, and it is not the only matter—

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

**Mr ROBERTSON (Bright):** I may make history tonight by being the first new member whose maiden speech is actually shorter than his first question, although I hope to be able to spin my speech out a bit beyond the 10 minutes that I took yesterday to ask a question. I take this opportunity to thank those of my friends in the gallery for coming along and sharing the anxiety with me. I would particularly like to thank my wife, Penny, and two of my three children, Dougall and Shona, for coming. Of course, without their help and support throughout the recent election campaign, and that of some 200 or so friends and helpers, I certainly would not be here tonight, and I am certainly very much aware of that.

In my contribution to this debate, I want to echo the congratulations that have already been expressed by other speakers to you, Mr Speaker, and to the newly elected members of the House, most of whom are sitting alongside me on the backbenches here. I take the opportunity at this stage to put on record my belief in a fair and equitable Australia, and my determination to bring some of that fairness and equity to the people of my constituency, who have been generous enough to put me into this House. My colleague, the member for Briggs, on my left, in seconding

the Address in Reply motion referred to the fact that certain groups of Australians are becoming increasingly poor, while others appear to be enjoying increased wealth. The honourable member mentioned young people and women in particular as being two groups of people who are most at risk in relation to this unfortunate trend: to those two categories I would add the category of aged people.

I believe that we are in the process in this country of degenerating into two societies: one of opportunity and affluence and the other with no money, no choice and no hope. The greatest tragedy is that the people who fall into the latter category are those who are least able to help themselves. I am referring to people at both extremities of what should be a productive working life. They are the young, who for one reason or another find it impossible to obtain and hold worthwhile and satisfying employment, and the old, who have been discarded by the system and in some cases abandoned by their families. In both cases people give up hope because they believe that there is no hope, and despite the massive efforts of the Hawke and Bannon Governments in addressing the problems of youth unemployment and providing support services for the aged they are partly right.

In a society such as ours such a social division should not be tolerated. Equality before the law and equality of opportunity are not enough. We must try to create a society in which every person has equal access to the benefits of that society and in which the not-so-quick and the not-so-brave also have a chance of a rich and fulfilling life. There are certain things to which I believe all citizens have an absolute right. I believe that we have the right to live and die with dignity. I believe that we all have the right to adequate high quality food, clothing and housing. I believe that we have the right to education which is both free and secular, and I believe that we have the right to a choice of work and leisure activities, and to work in an environment which is free of dust, pollution, noise and discomfort.

I believe that we have the right to a choice of a number of lifestyles and the right to freedom from physical, mental and spiritual persecution. I believe that we as adults have a right to financial independence and to relationships which are based on choice and not on financial or physical bondage. Until our citizens have those rights, I do not believe that our task here is finished, and I do not believe that the mission of the great Australian Labor Party, to which I am proud to belong, is finished.

I wish to turn briefly now to some of the motivations and experiences which have drawn me to this place. Like many others here. I come from a rather confused line of Anglo-Celtic Scottish tenant farmers, on the one hand, and English convicts, on the other. My father and grandfather were at various times farmers and shopkeepers, and my childhood and early adolescence were spent on a scrub block in the Northern Tablelands of New South Wales. That probably explains some of the things that people have been saying about me. However, it also explains the sympathy which I have for the plight of small farmers at times when commodity prices are down and interest rates are comparatively high.

In addition, however, the knowledge that my father chose to deforest 1 500 hectares of northern New South Wales in order to support his family has left me with an admiration and appreciation of his industry but, on the other hand, a deep sense of loss and responsibility for the damage which was done to that relatively fragile environment. This concern for environmental quality is something that I have carried into adult life. Indeed, issues of environment and conservation still rate very highly with me in my dealings with people in the Bright electorate.

I welcome the Government's proposal for a second generation of parklands around Adelaide. I particularly welcome the proposition that Christie Creek is to become a linear park. I have also been working to ensure that the Field River between Hallett Cove and Lonsdale will be included in that concept, and that the Worthing Mine, which nestles within the valley of the Field River, should remain an integral part of a new linear park on the boundary between Marion and Noarlunga councils.

One of my great joys over the past decade before entering this place has been to work on a number of committees with a succession of dedicated and highly competent Ministers in the area of environment. In that context, I would like to pay particular tribute to the present Minister, notwithstanding our differences on plaster ducks. I believe that the Minister has done more than any other environment Minister—either State or Federal—in the history of this country to ensure the survival of our fast disappearing native animals and plants. As a result of that Minister's vegetation clearance legislation, South Australia has a network of refuges outside the national parks system, which should help to ensure the preservation of endangered species, and which should provide a biological refuge if it should ever become necessary to revegetate exhausted farming or grazing land.

I must also say that I fully support and endorse the move to establish a register of toxic materials and to monitor their transport and use throughout this country. Arising also partly from my concern about the environment, but also from my training and experience as a geologist, has been my concern about the efficient and effective use of energy resources and my desire to see alternative forms of energy, such as solar, wind and bio-mass, effectively encouraged and utilised in this State.

We have more resources here in terms of wind and solar energy than any other State in the Commonwealth. I have also expressed the concern that consumers of electricity and gas, who use energy responsibly and therefore demand smaller quantities, should not be disadvantaged compared to other consumers who use energy inefficiently. I therefore welcome the initiative taken by the present Minister of Mines and Energy to make electricity tariffs less regressive, and I welcome the renegotiation of the gas pricing agreement with the Cooper Basin producers, which will lead to a containment of gas, electricity and water costs in this State for some time to come.

Another concern that I have carried for most of my adult life has been an interest in young people and their concerns. I have spent 15 years of my adult life as a teacher in front of high school aged people in classrooms. My eldest daughter recently began her high school career and I have spent two years on the local management committee of the Marion CYSS project. However, I still do not pretend to understand all the motivations and problems of young people in our society.

I have a suspicion that some of the answers lie in parenting and that some of the answers may lie in education of both children and their parents. I am convinced, however, that policing and regulation of young people offer nothing more than palliatives to deep underlying social problems and, while I sympathise with the STA and local government authorities which wage a continuing battle against graffitiists and people we call 'vandals', I believe that compassion, rather than coercion, is the answer. In this context, I am pleased to note that as many as three separate projects are under way in the southern suburbs at present which will provide drop-in centres for young people in the Brighton and Marion council areas.

Another area of interest to me, one which has unfortunately occupied all too little of my time in the past four

and a half years, is the area of handicapped children and their education. As members of the House may be aware, our youngest child has Down's syndrome. In 1981, when she was born, I developed a renewed interest in and insight into the field of intellectual disablement and the emotional and physical demands placed upon parents of disabled children. Ironically, as members would know, 1981 was the International Year of Disabled Persons. My only hope is that other people gained as much from that year as my family and I did.

Thanks to the work of the Early Intervention Programme run at the Sturt campus of the South Australian College of Advanced Education, my 4½-year-old is about to attend a normal kindergarten, and we expect her to go on to attend normal schools. The aim of early intervention programmes of this type is to maximise the potential of intellectually disabled children and to enable them to fit, where possible, into mainstream education. It is hoped that the end point for all disabled people in our community will be a move out of the workshops and into the community. I look forward to the day when early intervention of the kind available to Down's syndrome children at Sturt campus is available to all intellectually disabled children in South Australia.

I hope, Mr Speaker, that I have been able tonight to briefly demonstrate to the House a care and concern for humanity which transcends the normal day to day business of being what I hope will be an effective local member. I hope that I have shown, and will continue to show, compassion and understanding for those in our society who have not enjoyed all the benefits of living in our great free and affluent country and who are still suffering because we have not been able to distribute some of those rights and privileges to them. I hope that I have shown, and will continue to show, a willingness to fight for, and with, those people to obtain social justice, as well as some of the economic freedom which most of us in this place have long taken for granted.

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to His Excellency's speech opening this first session of the forty-sixth Parliament. I listened with great interest to the new member for Bright's maiden speech and congratulate him on it. It was very refreshing and pleasing to hear him raise a topic that obviously has been very dear to his heart and the hearts of his family. It is something about which I hope this Parliament will be able to do more in the coming years so that the lives of many children and adults in our community are improved.

We look forward to many more contributions from the member for Bright in future months and years.

It was interesting to listen to the maiden speeches of the new members and I take this opportunity to congratulate them on their election to office and on the contributions they have made to date. Likewise, I take this opportunity to congratulate you, Mr Speaker, on achieving this high office in the Parliament of South Australia. It is interesting, coming in for my second term, to see members take positions of responsibility. Whilst I hold them in the respect and honour they deserve—or I certainly hope I will—I do not see them in quite the same awe that I perceived earlier holders of these offices some three years ago when I thought that this institution was almost a magical place that was perhaps the ultimate in what people could achieve.

We will endeavour to keep high standards and I again congratulate you, Mr Speaker, on your remarks yesterday when addressing some of these standards. If we want the people of South Australia to maintain standards then we as

their representatives should do everything in our power to set them in the first place.

This forty-sixth Parliament, as has been clearly recognised, sees a change in the number of members on either side of the Chamber. It is only right that I congratulate the Government on being re-elected to office. Perhaps it is with some reluctance that I say that.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Goyder is addressing the House.

**Mr MEIER:** In the political arena one never knows how fortunes may change. It will be interesting to see how this Government performs over the next four years, after which the people will have their say again. I trust that the Government will do everything in its power to see that the economic problems that we are currently facing in this State—high interest rates and related problems—are tackled with all ferocity and that things will get back soon on a much more even keel. I thank the electors of Goyder for returning me to office.

**Mr Gunn:** A very wise choice.

**Mr MEIER:** It is for others to comment on the choice or otherwise, but it was heartening to see a swing to the Liberal Party in the electorate of Goyder. I am grateful to my campaign committee, headed by Mr Des Lodge, for the hard work it did during the lead-up and the four weeks of the election campaign. It was of interest to me that my opponent at the recent election was the son of the former member for Adelaide and former Deputy Premier (Hon. Jack Wright), namely, Mr Michael Wright. I do not think he had any false pretensions about winning the seat of Goyder but I acknowledge that Jack Wright assisted me in the electorate of Goyder, and I thank him for it. I compliment his son on the way in which he conducted the campaign for the Labor Party.

The new electorate of Goyder is different from the old because Hamley Bridge, Tarlee, Riverton, Auburn, Watervale, Blyth, Brinkworth, and Snowtown have now disappeared and have gone into the new electorate of Custance. The Copper Triangle towns of Moonta, Kadina and Wallaroo have come into Goyder. That is a sensible move, because the peninsula is now almost in its entirety contained in Goyder. There is still the irregularity of Goyder that one has to travel a considerable distance north before one can travel south into the rest of the electorate. Upon taking measurements of distance since the election I have noted that the extremities from one point to another in Goyder are as great as are those in any electorate, with the exception of the electorates of Eyre and Flinders. So, travelling will still be a significant feature of the electorate.

The Copper Triangle towns of Kadina, Moonta and Wallaroo offer a considerable positive presence to the electorate in that they have an important business sector. They are key tourist centres and have considerable manufacturing enterprises. Wallaroo is a very important shipping port, and I hope that it will grow in importance. Agriculture surrounds those towns, and to some extent they are service centres. If one considers Wallaroo, the silos for the taking in of grain are a key feature in the area. Their history one could speak about not only for an hour but probably for the better part of a week. Whilst I would love to go into details of it this evening, it would be appropriate, if I had the opportunity, to get to know the area a little more as its member before bringing up the finer details. Needless to say, its history is centred around copper mining and the Cornish people who came into the area.

Undoubtedly, all members of this Parliament and most people in South Australia would be aware of the Kernewek Lowender, the Cornish festival held biennially in the three Copper Triangle towns. It is a marvellous tourist attraction

for this State, and I know that it will be going from strength to strength.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Is that why you had the outfit on yesterday?

**Mr MEIER:** I could not help overhearing a comment from the Government benches. The member for Gilles would be aware that this is the Jubilee 150 year, and certainly the Copper Triangle towns will be having quite a few celebrations this year. The Kernewek Lowender will not be held this year, as it is a biennial event, but a substitute program will be put in its place.

It is very important for all members of Parliament, where possible, to show a lead with respect to being part of the Jubilee 150 celebrations. I draw members' attention to some of the excellent books, available from the Government Information Centre, by Brian Reader, who has put out various documents on making costumes for the Jubilee 150. His research apparently is based on the 1830s to 1840s costumes. Anyone who does not have their costume yet should read those books. I was at the Information Centre only today to pick up another book relating more to childrens' fashions so that the whole family can be dressed up, if my wife can finish sewing in time.

The Information Centre told me that some new books are arriving. It was out of several copies. As Ministers would know, the Information Centre is in Grenfell Centre, Grenfell Street. Let us hope that all members of Parliament do not wait until October or November to take the opportunity to get their costumes together. Adequate patterns are available. I would be happy to offer any help to members who require it.

Remember, of course, that in two years time we have the bicentenary. So, members will probably get full use from their costumes if they wear them on some 40 occasions during those two years. They would probably be well on the way to wearing out the costumes anyway.

**Mr Ferguson:** Is it tax deductible?

**Mr MEIER:** The Minister could take up with the Federal Treasurer whether or not it is tax deductible. I guess we will receive guidelines on that before 1 July, when the new guidelines come in.

Coming into this Parliament for the second parliamentary term has reinforced my belief in liberalism. Clearly, I am very proud to be a Liberal in this State. I am certainly disappointed that the people of South Australia did not see it in their wisdom to return a Liberal Government. I just wonder whether the people fully appreciate the philosophy of liberalism. For that reason I wish to refer to some key aspects of liberal philosophy in—

**Mr Ferguson:** Is that the little blue book?

**Mr MEIER:** Yes, the little blue book—the State platform of the Liberal Party, South Australian division.

**Mr Ferguson:** I've been trying to get hold of one of those for a long time.

**Mr MEIER:** If the honourable member would like a copy I can arrange that for him probably tomorrow, but if he will give me enough time—until next week—without any question it can be arranged. I would like to draw the attention of members of this House and electors of South Australia to some aspects of Liberal philosophy, as follows:

Liberalism is a philosophy based on concern for the needs and hopes of each person. Liberalism is about people . . . This philosophy looks to the individual and not to the State and sees the State not as an end in itself but as a means of helping people to achieve their own goals.

Diverging momentarily, I think that is a key difference there: we do not look to the State and we do not see the State as an end in itself. That is clearly one distinction between us and the Government. The document continues:

Liberals believe that Government should consider people and their needs as individuals allowing their personalities to develop subject to the rights of others... Liberalism tries to create an environment in which people can be individually successful and rejects any doctrine, including socialism, which results in levelling downwards. People should be able to choose their own way of living as long as they do not interfere with others who are seeking to do that also. For such a society to function there must be freedom of speech, freedom of association, freedom of religion, equality before the law and equality of opportunity for each individual to achieve according to their personal goals and abilities.

**An honourable member:** What a load of drivel!

**Mr MEIER:** It is disappointing to hear someone say from the Government benches, 'What a load of drivel.'

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr MEIER:** I heard that comment come from the Government benches. It is disappointing to me and it is a pity that the people of South Australia do not hear some of the comments of the Government about principles that I believe are very important and a key to the future of our society. Members opposite are entitled to their opinions, of which we will hear more in the coming years. I am certain of that. The document continues:

Liberalism calls, too, for self-reliance, respect for individual moral and spiritual values and an understanding of the concept of service. The fostering and preservation of the family unit is all important.

The right of an individual to hold private property is essential in a free society. Liberalism provides the opportunity for a high level of general education, available to all, with freedom of choice and with adequate incentives to attract those with ability to undertake advanced studies. Liberalism recognises the need to provide adequate social services to help those who cannot support themselves and to maintain vital health standards. In the application of social services, it strives to maintain the dignity of the individual.

I must say that it is very disappointing that for some unknown reason some people in the community seem to have the misguided view that Liberals do not believe in social security or social services. I hope that what I have quoted makes very clear that we are committed to helping those who are less fortunate than others. In fact, I think that we could find many examples where Liberal Governments have led the way.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Give us a few examples.

**Mr MEIER:** The member for Gilles asks for a few examples. The housing program of the Government under the premiership of Sir Thomas Playford would be quite sufficient to get the ball rolling. I refer once again to some of the basic principles of liberalism, and I am picking the highlights. The platform further states:

Liberalism aims to create a society in which private enterprise is the major factor in achieving general economic progress. It acknowledges the importance of effective competition and a deterrent to the power of monopoly, and as an incentive to creativity and productivity.

Again, I hope that that puts to rest any thought that Liberals seem to promote monopolies or are simply concerned with big business, because we are concerned that there is effective competition and certainly there must be a deterrent to the power of monopolies. It also states:

It recognises too that the State may intervene to ensure effective national development, to preserve and conserve the environment and its resources and to stimulate a spirit of competition, whenever such intervention can be clearly shown to be necessary.

It grieves me that on occasion any suggestion by the Liberal Party of the Government interfering is claimed by the Government to be socialism. I hope that the Government realises that the Liberal Party and liberalism recognise that Governments have to interfere on occasion. It further states:

Liberalism emphasises that human satisfaction and well deserved profit making are vital to work and to achievement. Personal incentive in a competitive society is the spur to increased productivity and to the creation and expansion of a sound national economy, upon which good living standards for all depend. To

the Liberal, voluntary saving and self help are important qualities. It is recognised that organised labour is one of the interests with a significant role in a modern, complex, industrialised society. The Liberal view is that such a society will function best when all elements are intent on working together in a responsive and cooperative manner. The Liberal concept of Government is that ultimate authority lies with the people.

They are the highlights of the philosophy of liberalism as stated in the State platform. I would certainly be happy to make that available to members opposite. It is interesting to note the words of a former American President, Abraham Lincoln. In referring back to—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Goyder and no other member has the floor at present.

**Mr MEIER:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. In looking back to my maiden speech of 14 December 1982 I noted that in referring to the former member for Goyder, Mr Keith Ruskack, I said that he often referred to the words of Abraham Lincoln and I quoted those words. Looking at those words, I am reminded that Labor Governments are on a course that could lead to disaster for both this State and country. The words of Abraham Lincoln that I wish to quote are brief. He said:

You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift.

I believe the Federal Government is doing just that. He continued:

You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer.

We had quite a few debates in the last parliamentary session on the tax incentives that have been taken away from people, and it seems that the wage payer is being pulled down and down. I wonder whether the wage payer can afford in many cases to keep putting on more wage earners. If he cannot, then things start to go wrong. Abraham Lincoln further said:

You cannot further the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred.

That is certainly clear in countries in other parts of the world and I hope it never comes to that here. Abraham Lincoln then said:

You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich. You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you earn.

If we look at the national debt and the State debt, we see it is clear that we are spending more than we are earning or collecting in revenue.

**Mr Ferguson:** Malcolm Fraser did not do a bad job.

**Mr MEIER:** Malcolm Fraser was a complete amateur compared to Gough Whitlam and Bob Hawke in terms of accumulating national debt. It is tragic to see—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr MEIER:** One has merely to study the figures. Let us be realistic. Bob Hawke has just gone from madness to greater madness, yet the people of Australia do not seem to recognise it. One cannot deny that the national debt is there. Indeed, if any family or business ran its budget or business finances in the way in which Bob Hawke is running this country they would be virtually written off overnight, which is what is happening to Australia now. We are being downgraded into a third world country. One does not have to ask me about that: one has merely to ask anyone associated with the business or money sector of this country. Abraham Lincoln further stated:

You cannot build character and courage by taking away a man's initiative.

*Mrs Appleby interjecting:*

**Mr MEIER:** I suppose Abraham Lincoln would have been happy to restate that principle by saying:

You cannot build character and courage by taking away a man's or a woman's initiative.

I hope that makes the honourable member happier. The initiative is being taken away by the Hawke Government. Indeed, it is being taken away by this State Bannon Government, through taxes that are increasing higher and higher. I have examples of people who want to transfer or sell land where the stamp duty is so high, and land tax is a big problem. In fact, we have had much discussion on taxes in the past three years, but I do not intend to rehash the arguments. The initiative is being taken away and the supposed tax reform that is coming on 1 July will remove even more initiative. People here well recognise that. Finally, Abraham Lincoln said:

You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves.

We must be very careful in our parliamentary democracy where we have two Parties which are not so different in the percentage that they receive. It certainly depends on the State that you are talking about but, when you get two Parties which are getting fairly close to 50 per cent each, you will find that those Parties will make promises to the people simply to attract, or buy votes.

I believe that governments are doing a lot for men and women that those persons should be doing for themselves. It grieves me occasionally when people from certain communities, who have done a lot of voluntary work over the years come and say, 'John, how about getting us a Government grant for such and such: it is a small thing.' I usually try to see if there are any service organisations or other groups which can raise some if not all of the money, because eventually we will become totally reliant on governments to provide everything, and I believe that that would be a very retrograde step.

While we have this closeness in the percentage vote, we will find that both Parties will probably offer terrific attractive schemes to communities or individuals and say, 'You vote us in and we will give it to you,' forgetting that we are grabbing their money to do it.

**The Hon. T.H. Hemmings:** What about Dean Brown's \$500 million to buy all the votes down the south over the north-south freeway?

**Mr MEIER:** We were talking about getting men and women to help themselves. We are talking about the smaller types of projects here. I acknowledge that governments must come in for large projects such as roadworks, distribution of water supplies, electricity, and so on. However, it is in relation to the smaller things that we are starting to give too many incentives. Perhaps a classic example would be the subsidising of building society interest rates. That \$3 million, in my opinion, could have been better spent to develop aspects of the State that are screaming out for things such as better roads or water supplies rather than (and the press certainly saw it in this light) its being used to catch voters in marginal electorates. Many other examples could be looked at.

In His Excellency's speech (and, as I said earlier, I do compliment His Excellency on his speech), the following appears:

My Government is gravely concerned at the situation in the rural sector. Declining world commodity prices and high interest rates are causing many farmers great hardship. My Government will work with the rural industry in this State in planning for the future of the industry and will vigorously represent its concerns at the national level.

This Government obviously recognises that the rural sector is in dire straits.

**Mr Tyler:** They're playing down at West Lakes.

**Mr MEIER:** In fact, I did not mean to make a pun there. The honourable member is right: Dire Straits are here with us tonight. However, 'dire straits' is another phrase that can be used to refer to the rural community, which is in dire

straits, whereas the Dire Straits group is in the urban community this very night.

A particular aspect that I wish to highlight in this Address in Reply debate relates to water problems in the rural community. I believe that some of my colleagues will identify other areas of concern in the rural community. I was looking at my file, and I think that the former Minister of Water Resources would appreciate this. It is a pity that I am not allowed to hold up the file in my possession, because it would contravene Standing Orders.

If I could do that, the Minister would see that the file is becoming very thick with returned correspondence from the Minister. The former Minister (the member for Gilles) would appreciate that there are many problems associated with water, certainly in the district of Goyder, and I guess there would be other problems throughout the rest of the State. In looking back over the file in the past few weeks, I was amazed at the wide diversity of problems apparent in my district. It appears to me that urgent action—and I am very pleased that the new Minister is in the House—must occur with respect to the water situation in this State.

While I do not wish to be hypocritical or contradict anything that I have just said, if there is one area for which I believe the State Government should increase the debt and borrow money it is to expand reticulated water throughout most of this State. That would increase productivity, tourism and the total economic income of the State, and therefore I believe that any loan repayments would not be so hard to meet. Perhaps that is highlighted in the latest newsletter of the District Council of Minlaton, which states:

Future water supply for Yorke Peninsula—A recent meeting of the Yorke Peninsula Local Government Association was advised by senior officers of the E&WS Department that mains water will not be made available to any future land divisions in towns on the coast of Yorke Peninsula which are already serviced by mains until the department has completed an investigation of requirements and then established priorities.

If that was announced in the metropolitan area, it would not be accepted. I do not believe it should be accepted in the country, other than the fact that certainly priorities will have to be given.

The area of Goyder, particularly on Yorke Peninsula, is expanding rapidly. I know that the Minister of Housing and Construction could vouch for that because he has a property at Edithburgh and he would appreciate how so many other towns are expanding. However, people wishing to build new houses in new subdivisions are being told that no water will be made available even though there may be a main just down the road. That situation cannot last for too long.

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

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr MEIER:** I will highlight some of the problems that have occurred over the past three years. The first was broken water pipes. It seems that when the early scheme was put down many years ago the pipes, other than the main pipe, were laid underground in many areas. If it was clay soil or rocky soil, too bad—the pipe went in. As a result, ground or earth movement has created havoc with the pipes. We are now finding that pipe breakages are a regular occurrence, particularly in the warmer months of the year when the earth is affected by sudden increases in temperature. The piping cannot take the sudden changes and cracks or splits before bursting. In a township one can probably put up with that because, although one depends on water to some extent, one can obtain a drink of water from a person in a nearby street not affected by the broken main.

However, as a representative of a rural area once again my phone has been running hot this summer, with farmers telephoning me and telling me that they are sick and tired of going away for a day and coming home at night to find their animals pawing or pushing at the water trough and

not being able to get any water, becoming quite frantic. I guess that if the RSPCA knew of some of these cases it would intervene. A farmer may be unaware of a burst water pipe, even if he is present on the property, because the troughs are filled by an automatic system. On checking the stock at the end of the day the farmer may then find that there is no water, with no alternative water supply having been made available.

I must admit that the past January was not one of the better times that I have had at home because the telephone rang much more often than I wanted it to. It is all very well to say that one should contact the E&WS Dept. Thankfully, in most cases the people involved have done that and the department does as good a job as possible in fixing up burst pipes. I have no complaints about that. However, it is quite obvious that pipes which break on a reasonably regular basis must be replaced. I give credit to the former Minister who was responsible for having a 10 inch pipe replaced, which was breaking regularly at a location close to Moorowie. That made life much more pleasant for me because people in that area no longer ring me up complaining about broken water pipes. The new Minister will be receiving a reasonable amount of correspondence, including a petition, in relation to another pipe, further north, which has started to erupt on a regular basis.

The people concerned have said to me that E&WS officers have said that the pipe should be replaced. However, an E&WS officer indicated to me that the pipe had not broken often enough yet to require replacement. It is a poor situation when a pipe has to break a number of times before its replacement is given a sufficiently high priority. Perhaps it comes back to how much money is available, and therefore a pipe that is broken only, say, 10 times a month is okay, whereas a pipe that has broken 13 times a month has reached the allowable limit.

*Mr Klunder interjecting:*

**Mr MEIER:** I am not suggesting that it should be the first time but that it should be on a more regular basis. I point out to the honourable member that, when people clearly are frustrated, when animals have become very distressed due to lack of water, and when the E&WS seems to think that it is quite clear that a pipe should be replaced, it would seem to be quite appropriate to replace it.

In relation to preventing further pipe breakages, at least new pipes are being put into a sand enclosed base or otherwise placed above ground, and that is a sensible move. It is a pity that that was not done years ago. Another common complaint relates to the quality of water. I acknowledge that filtration plant development is well in hand and that some are operating. This will certainly improve the situation. However, I was interested to look back at some previous correspondence. In a letter dated 31 July 1984 a correspondent brought to my attention that on two occasions after taking samples of mains water on his property half an inch of sediment was left at the bottom of a clear plastic container which had been filled with water. This had occurred on more than one day. I took up the matter with the Minister responsible for these matters at the time, and, in fact, things did improve somewhat. However, the sediment problem has occurred continually in various parts of my electorate. In the Stockport area one lady said that it was a waste of time washing her husband's overalls because they were always a lot dirtier after they had been washed than before she had washed them. That person certainly is not at all happy with the Stockport water supply. Unfortunately, it seems that it will take some time to rectify that problem, although—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr MEIER:** Seriously, it was a situation where the person concerned had young children and felt that it was not

healthy to bath them any more, because, again, they were coming out of the bath dirtier than when they went into it. Those sorts of problems are things that this State is facing right now in 1986. Likewise with the quality of the water: when sufficient chemicals are added to make it clean and pure from a health point of view, we then have the gardeners becoming very dissatisfied with the water because their vegetables may start dying.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** What about the goldfish?

**Mr MEIER:** Yes, as the honourable member suggests, the goldfish could also suffer. I believe that people with goldfish, though, would have enough sense to use tap water if possible, but the gardeners have been in difficulty with the high amount of chlorine and other additives that have had to be used to make the water safe from amoebic meningitis and possible other infections that can occur.

Whilst we are concerned about the health of people, the recreation activity for many other people is being seriously disturbed. There are times when I believe people must be wary about dealing with agents or representatives, be they land agents or other operators, although I make no reflection on land agents: I think there are many land agents of very high standard in this State.

Many people, after buying a property, have come to me seeking a water supply, and I say, 'How long have you had the property?' They might reply, 'Six months' or 'A year', maybe it is even less, and I say, 'Surely you looked into having the water before you bought the property?' They have said, 'We were told that the water was available.' When I asked, 'Is it available?' they have replied, 'Yes, the main is just down the street,' and when I have then said, 'Well, that should be straightforward,' they have replied, 'No, they will not put it on for a variety of reasons' (the land may have been subdivided—since 1972, I think—or there are no plans to extend the main), and these people have said to me, 'But the land agent told me it would be all right.' When it comes to the point, invariably it has not been all right.

I consider situations involving a variety of areas. At Bowmans, near Balaklava, quite a few transportable buildings were put on blocks some years ago, yet the people occupying those transportable buildings have been unable to get a water supply. In fact, some of those buildings have, in my opinion, gone right down in the way they have been maintained, probably because the people concerned just cannot live there for any length of time as a result of the poor water supply.

I instance also the Virginia and Two Wells area. In fact, I will be very interested to hear the reply from the Minister of Water Resources, when it comes to hand, as to whether the Virginia mains are to be extended. Some Virginia residents are furious because their neighbours have reticulated water but they themselves do not have it, despite representation after representation being made to get it. They know where the water main is: it would be very easy to extend it, but there is no intention (or there has been no intention up until now) to do so.

These people are living in what one could call the Virginia township—it is not as though they are living out on a block somewhere. One hears complaints from metropolitan people if they do not get reticulated water immediately they require it, yet many Virginia people have not had reticulated water since they came into the area. In the Two Wells area massive expansion has taken place, and there have been new subdivisions. People are looking to be supplied with water. There are grave problems because some properties have been connected to the water supply, thereby causing pressure and volume to decrease generally.

Most of the Adelaide Plains area seems to be experiencing low water pressure. People have told me that they cannot

shower between midafternoon and 10 or 11 p.m. because there is insufficient water pressure for them to do so. They cannot water their gardens.

**An honourable member:** Is this a new form of electioneering?

**Mr MEIER:** I am sorry if the honourable member puts that interpretation on my remarks. However, this is a serious matter. I am pleased that the Minister is smiling, because many such cases will be raised. I hope that during his term of office, even if he does not go some way towards solving this problem, he will have put forward a plan for the next five, 10 or 15 years, a plan that will solve this problem; it will not be solved overnight. If we shut our eyes to it we are deceiving ourselves.

The one big hope that I have is that government in this State seems to be won or lost in the metropolitan area because of metropolitan voters, more and more of whom are coming out into Goyder where they have holiday houses—there are thousands of them. It will not be long before this number creeps up to tens of thousands of metropolitan people coming into the Goyder electorate for their holidays. Many of these people are ringing me—

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** They are not on the roll.

**Mr MEIER:** They are not on the roll, but many of them are living in marginal seats and, if the Government does not introduce a system to alleviate the massive water problems occurring in the rural sector, particularly in the electorate of Goyder, those people may start to cast their vote in a different way.

There is poor water pressure in the Two Wells area, through part of Dublin and into Windsor. It is heartening that a move has been made (one virtually forced on the Government because a Saudi Arabian livestock company decided to set up its establishment near Dublin), whereby after a lot of pushing (and the former Minister of Water Resources, the Premier and a few other departmental officers would know this) for about two years the Government came to an agreement with that company to supply water. I do not know the exact conditions of that supply agreement. Certainly, the Saudi Arabian livestock company had to pay a lot of money to get that water, but it was at least supplied. As a result, an upgrading has occurred through the Redbanks reservoir and Mallala to the Dublin area, so some of the rural sector is benefiting from that upgrading. In fact, it might be nearly completed now but the last extension was reported only in last week's edition of the *Plains Producer*, the newspaper covering most of that area. That is a step forward, but let us see that there are many other steps forward in this direction.

There are many other problems with water supply when people wish to subdivide land. One problem that comes to mind is where a person owned more than an acre of land in the Virginia area and one of the children wanted to build a home and have water connected to that block. One would think that that would be straightforward. Application was made for water to be supplied to the new home right next to the parents' home. The parents had reticulated water connected to their home, but the new home next door could not get reticulated water from the mains supply as the land had been subdivided since 1972.

It is clear that the Government will have to address this problem, which is restricting and upholding subdivisions in the area. I feel very sorry with people who, regardless of whether or not reticulated water is available, have gone ahead and tried to make do with what they have got.

To diverge, the State Government might be advised to put pressure on the Federal Government to see whether a tax incentive—and the Federal Government hates the words 'tax incentive'—can be put in place for people with certain size rainwater tanks. This has been mooted previously, but

I do not think that there are regulations at this stage. I suggest that the minimum size rainwater tank for this tax incentive should be 2 000 gallons and there could be a graded scale for tanks of 5 000 gallons, 7 000 gallons and 10 000 gallons.

I was at a new house in the Barossa Valley last Sunday and the young couple who built it have 10 000 gallons of water in rainwater tanks and have a concrete slab laid out for a third tank when they can afford it. If there was a significant tax deduction on the installation of those rainwater tanks not only would it help the water situation where people need to be supplied immediately, where no reticulated water is available but it would also help to take the drain off the reservoirs. That is another problem that the Minister and this Government are facing. Is there a sufficient supply of water for South Australia during a drought?

We have been fortunate so far. The former Minister must have been holding his breath come the latter part of last year when it did not look too hopeful, but thankfully the rains came. We will probably get through the summer all right. During the Dunstan era considerable advertisements were run to save water. I do not think that we have had much increased storage capacity, although there has been some. However, the population has increased phenomenally since then.

**An honourable member:** Kangaroo Dam.

**Mr MEIER:** The reticulated water supply at Kangaroo Dam has been built since then, but the population has increased phenomenally since that time. These problems have to be addressed and if the Government says it has a plan to do things for the next six months, that is not good enough. I hope that it has a plan for the next four years but preferably nearer to 10 to 15 plus years, so that we can see a light at the end of the tunnel.

Likewise, we have problems in areas that do not have reticulated water, such as at Warooka and in the Point Turton area, where reticulated water is supplied by the E&WS Department from freshwater wells. Point Turton is going from strength to strength. Two new subdivisions are being opened up, with hundreds of new blocks being available for sale. Houses are starting to go up in large numbers at Point Turton and in adjacent areas, where the provision of water is causing major headaches. It will require a large expenditure of money. However, we cannot close our eyes and say, 'Too bad, you should not have opened it up.' People living in these areas have an equal right to water as people living in the metropolitan area. If there is any area in which the Government should give consideration to borrowing, it is in the area of borrowing for improving and extending the reticulated water supply.

I have brought to the attention of this House on several occasions the problems of the Moorowie area, where mainly rural farmers live, and there is also the possibility of the settlement at Hardwicke Bay needing water. It has been very disappointing to see that in the period from the previous Tonkin Government until now, it is my understanding that that project has gone from being close to top to about No. 10 on the priority scale. If one could talk with the farming population who run smaller farms and appreciate that some of the wells have dried up, and realise that in this January/February period they are carting water almost daily in trucks and the like with suitable containers, one hopefully would have a more sympathetic attitude or approach to extending the water mains in the Moorowie area. I will not be letting up on that issue.

I have also had problems with respect to people purchasing property where licensed bores have existed. In fact, the Minister will be handling the problem shortly; I believe he has the letter already. The person buying the property was told that it had a licensed bore and that they had only to

apply for it to be reinstated. It seems that there are restrictions on opening up the bore for water use, let alone the whole problem that the Adelaide Plains area is experiencing with the restrictions on bore water in that area. It is a problem that will need to be readdressed in the near future because it is some years since the original allocations were made. It has changed significantly and markedly in that time. I hope that the House can see that water in the rural area of Goyder, in fact the whole area of Goyder, is a massive problem.

I hope that some of the examples I have brought to the attention of the House will be noted and that this Government will make a positive commitment towards improving the situation, towards tackling it, and not towards band-aid measures for the next four years. If not, these people who in many cases are suffering already because of high transport costs and related factors, will simply find that they cannot support the economy as we would like them to.

I have pleasure in supporting the Address in Reply and look forward to serving the electorate of Goyder for the next four years and to working in this Parliament during that time.

Mr FERGUSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Minister of Housing and Construction):** I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** New home buyers in South Australia must be wondering what to expect under the current Government following the State Bank's .5 per cent per annum increase in its small loan rate, the interest rate increase of 1.5 per cent granted by the Government to the building societies pushing those rates up to 17 per cent per annum, the disappointing fall in the value of the Australian dollar overseas in the last few days, the instability of the Australian dollar and the impact it is having on the economy as it is propping up that dollar, and the Federal Government's policies supporting those economic events.

Of course, this is all leading to the difficulties of fulfilling the great Australian dream of owning one's home. Last Friday the Deputy Premier made a statement which gave a clear impression that the subsidy scheme for building society borrowers would continue until after March. To be fair to the Deputy Premier I will read the press release that he made under the heading 'Building Society Rates Rise, but Monthly Fees Go and Assistance Measures Expanded'. It is a pleasure to see that those monthly fees have gone: the situation was clarified this afternoon. The statement reads:

Dr Hoggood said to minimise the impact of higher rates on new and existing borrowers, the Government and the societies—that is the building societies—

had negotiated a package of housing initiatives. These are: continuing the Government's .75 per cent subsidy to building society borrowers already receiving it; building societies, where possible, to ensure that eligible borrowers are not committed beyond 30 per cent of gross household income in mortgage repayments; implementing the Government's election promise to introduce an interest rate protection plan; abolishing monthly loan administration fees charged by societies on 1 July; ensuring borrowers are aware of the Government's home guarantee assistance programs; developing measures to help people seeking home loans through low start loans.

We have been trying to find out from the Government exactly the future of the subsidy scheme. In Parliament yesterday the Premier would only say that the scheme was being reviewed on a daily basis, in answer to a question put to him by my Leader.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr BECKER:** No, that is exactly what the Premier said: we are reviewing the situation on a daily basis. The system will operate until the end of March. As I said last year, if necessary we will certainly continue it. We are looking for that guarantee and we have not received it. I think it is only fair that we go into the issue a little further. When this afternoon we again tried to clarify the situation from the Minister of Housing and Construction, all the Minister would say was that the Premier and his Deputy are not in conflict.

To us, plainly the Deputy Premier's statement last Friday has been contradicted by the Premier, because very clearly in the Deputy Premier's statement—the Minister, I believe, had a part in the announcement—was 'continuing the Government's .75 per cent subsidy to building society borrowers already receiving it'. There was no mention of any date or anything else. It was quite clear, if you accepted it that way. Now the Premier says it is a day-to-day situation.

The public and Parliament want this issue clarified: the Government must clarify the position within the next 24 hours. Over the last year the Labor Party has caused enough problems for home buyers with constant promises of lower interest rates. Let us go back to 2 December to a report in the *Advertiser*, and I do not recall any of those statements being withdrawn. The report reads:

The Premier, Mr Bannon, has ruled out any short-term increase in building society interest rates but has refused to rule out the possibility of an increase before March next year.

Mr Bannon said yesterday he would not take any action which could 'jeopardise' the financial viability of the societies.

I agree with that; it is common sense. The report continues:

He said he had an understanding with the societies that because the Government was providing mortgage relief to people with society home loans, they would not seek increases until that relief program expired on 1 April next year.

That means 1 April 1986. The report continues:

Mr Bannon said he would veto any moves by building societies to increase home loan interest rates immediately after the election.

Two months ago the Government had placed money with the building societies to provide interest rate relief to home buyers with loans from those societies on the understanding that there would not be any further increases in rates over the period of that assistance.

The Premier was also quoted as saying:

I don't think we should get ourselves locked into the view that interest rates inevitably will rise. Leading economic commentators are now predicting that interest rates may have peaked.

I wish that he was right in that respect. It would certainly be welcome relief for most of us, but it has not had that effect. Furthermore, in the *News* of 29 November the Premier was reported by Randall Ashbourne as having made several statements. It was stated:

... he also issued a further warning to his colleagues in Canberra that they would have to rethink their economic strategy if the pressure on interest rates continued into the new year.

When the Premier was asked to clarify his answer yesterday, he would not do so, and the Minister joined in today. It is quite clear that the Premier should follow that matter through with the Prime Minister in view of the current situation. I am quite sure that the Prime Minister would have been made well aware of the decision by the State Government of South Australia to grant an increase of 1.5 per cent to the building societies. Therefore, we look to the lead from the Prime Minister to act responsibly to ensure that interest rates can be reduced. What worries me about the statement of 29 November is that it was also stated:

However, Mr Bannon predicted a major home building crash in South Australia, with thousands of families forced to sell their homes, unless there was a firm message that the bank loan ceiling would be kept intact.

He is also on record as saying that the living standards of South Australian families would be affected, and so on. He



further said that the interest rate for a bank home loan would soar to 17 per cent, having a catastrophic effect on the building industry. He pointed out how dangerous that would be, considering the finely tuned nature of the housing industry, the rejuvenation of that industry and the opportunities to purchase homes. It will require a very careful and cautious Government to handle this situation without putting anyone in jeopardy.

I refer once again to the housing assistance package. The situation must be clarified because, as I told the Minister this afternoon, no matter where the line is ruled we create a situation where someone misses out. In an article in the *Advertiser* of 8 February announcing the increased interest rates it was stated:

If the borrowers were earning less than \$533 gross a week (30 per cent above the average weekly earnings) and the new rates pushed their repayments to more than 30 per cent of their gross income, they would qualify for assistance under the interest rate protection plan. If a borrower's loan took more than 30 per cent of gross income when the loan was written, the borrower would not qualify.

That seems to be a little bit tough because, in good economic and finance terms, it is not wise for one to exceed 25 per cent of gross income. However, in some circumstances that figure is now extended to 30 per cent. I do not like it at all, and I never have. That was never my policy when granting such loans. When we consider the figures, we see that a person on an income of about \$27 800 would just qualify for relief, but the repayments would be as high as \$695 a month. That is a tremendous amount to repay an average loan today. But, as I said, unfortunately when we bring down guidelines someone misses out. There must be some flexibility.

The problem is that the State Government has pushed the issue back to the building societies. Each case will have to be considered on its merits and each client will have to approach their respective building society and have their mortgage reconsidered. The clients will have to be counselled and reconsideration or restructuring of financial assistance must be considered.

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

**Mr RANN (Briggs):** Before talking about the subject to which I had intended to refer, I must comment on the speech of the member for Goyder, who quoted Abraham Lincoln. That quote is about 30 years old and does not come from the 1850s or 1860s, and for the past 12 years or more it has been proven to be a total fraud. In fact, it was first used in the John Birch Society in the United States, and I will explain that to members later. It was used by the League of Rights in Australia, and it was probably even used at conferences of ex tractor salesmen in Kadina.

It is certainly interesting to see the member for Bragg sitting on the front bench. Perhaps it is a portent of things to come from some of the scuttlebutt around the Liberal Party's chambers of power. They are not quick to defend their Leader's role in the last campaign and are saying they want to groom a few of their members, including the member for Bragg and two of the Bakers to see how they might go.

I want to talk about repetition strain injury. I am sure that members will be aware of the statements on this subject made in Adelaide last month by Dr Gwyn Morgan. He was quoted as saying that RSI was an exclusively Australian disease that was mostly in the minds of sufferers. He said that RSI basically was a hoax and a recent meeting of doctors specialising in treating injuries of the hand in Darwin 'almost unanimously agreed that RSI started out as a fatigue which grew into a neurosis'.

**An honourable member:** The member for Bragg reckons she's quite right.

**Mr RANN:** The member for Bragg apparently says that RSI is a neurosis. Perhaps we will talk to his electorate secretary. The doctor said it concerned many people at the meeting in Darwin that this condition, known only in Australia, was costing industry millions of dollars each year. Dr Morgan's statements came as no surprise, because last year a Tasmanian doctor, Dr Denis Mackey, described RSI as a form of mass hysteria, saying that it was a relatively unknown disease that is not recognised in other countries and for which there are no diagnostic criteria. He stated:

This disease was invented two years ago as a bit of a joke so that workshy people, including public servants, could have an excuse for a sicky.

He said:

RSI was invented as a diagnostic entity to support a hoax.

I did some research—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr RANN:** You never have. A hoax is being perpetrated against the people of Australia. Indeed, it is being perpetrated by the bogus, mischievous and fraudulent claims of people like Drs Mackey and Morgan. I am a temperate and moderate person, but the word 'fraudulent' is a pretty strong accusation. So, let us look at the facts. The member for Bragg, who aspires to greater things, I am sure will be interested in this. Dr Morgan says that RSI is known only in Australia. That is poppycock.

After seeing Dr Morgan's statement, I asked the research section of the Parliamentary Library, which all of us believe is very efficient, to do a quick search. Within an hour I was given a printout describing case studies of repetition strain injury in countries such as France, Sweden, United States, Finland, Japan, Britain and West Germany.

In France there were 30 industrial case studies by the Occupational Disease Service of the French Social Security Scheme. There is statutory compensation for forms of rsi, such as tenosynovitis in European Economic Community countries. An ILO publication also lists references of medical and university studies on RSI in Paris, Prague, Stuttgart, Stockholm (it is in Sweden, by the way), London and Helsinki.

In the United States the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health reports that tenosynovitis was compensated or reported in a number of States. That institute provides reports on tenosynovitis and other repetition injuries amongst food packers, assembly line workers, furniture makers, electronic appliance workers, slaughterhouse workers and meat cutters. Of course, many reports are available on repetition strain injuries among keyboard operators and journalists. In fact, the *Advertiser* knows that RSI is not an imaginary disease, as several of its most respected journalists presently suffer from it. It is interesting that they are making a joke about the problems that workers face. That is the contempt of people like the member for Bragg and the member for Hanson who are soon to be redemoted to the backbenches, according to a few people.

It is ridiculous to suggest that repetition strain injuries are not known internationally. If Doctors Morgan and Mackey are that light on in their research, I hope that I am never treated by them. I can only conclude that Dr Mackey's outrageous statements were motivated more by temporary hysteria or emotionalism rather than any professional interest in the facts. Indeed, if they were to go on a refresher course, they would find that a disease known as telegraphists cramp was recognised back in the 1860s. RSI has been recognised in Japan as an occupational disorder since 1955, so so much for claims that is kangaroo paw.

Of course, RSI is the collective term now given to tendon and muscular injuries resulting from excessive and contin-

uous body and hand movements performed during various forms of repetitive work. Members will be aware of the study by the South Australian Health Commission on RSI. The commission's study in 1984 found that RSI was common amongst keyboard operators engaged in data entry or word processing in the South Australian Public Service. About half those examined in the study reported symptoms where keyboard work was thought to be the cause. About one in 12 operators had consulted a doctor for pain, and the great majority of these were diagnosed as having RSI.

The study also revealed that 94 per cent of the group worked under poor ergonomic conditions; 60 per cent of keyboard operators had not received proper training in the use of their new equipment, or had received training but felt that more was needed. Seventy-five per cent had not received any instruction at all in the use of their present work equipment, and one in four had never discussed with a supervisor their workload or what was expected of them.

Keyboard operators, as we have seen from overseas studies which absolutely and outrightly refute the claims of Doctors Mackey and Morgan, are not the only sufferers. Process workers in the food and fruit packaging industry are particularly vulnerable. Indeed, 25 per cent of the workforce of the Riverland cannery were diagnosed with RSI symptoms between July 1982 and December 1983. In the retail industry item pricing guns, which require a lot of pressure to operate, are causing serious RSI problems. So, RSI is not caused by hysteria or by an excuse to claim compensation, but usually begins as a frictional strain of tendons, muscles or other soft tissues caused by overuse in activities such as typing and process work.

Poor posture, often due to poor ergonomics in the work area, and occupational stress are also significant contributing factors. It is bizarre that some so-called medical authorities want suddenly to remove stress from their catalogue of health problems. Perhaps it is because a number of the most outspoken critics of RSI are financially sponsored by insurance companies to run around Australia peddling these myths.

Obviously, stress and its symptoms are related to the length of time spent at the keyboard without a break and the pressure of heavy workloads. We all on this side of the House know that clearly a concerted campaign is going on around Australia to try to discredit and humiliate RSI sufferers. It is a campaign that is designed to make people with RSI symptoms afraid or embarrassed to raise their problems or seek medical advice. Actually, it is a counterproductive strategy that will be far more costly for employers and insurance companies in the long run.

RSI can be effectively treated in the early stages, although obviously prevention is the best course of action. If workers are too nervous to report their symptoms because of fear of ridicule, delays will add to suffering and to costs, and delayed treatment means higher costs and less chance of recovery. I am amazed that members opposite treat this subject so frivolously. They are a rural rump, but they can still develop wind, obviously. We need to look at much better workplace design, more job rotation, and regular and compulsory rest breaks. We must educate managers and workers about the need for ergonomically designed chairs.

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

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** Mr Speaker—  
*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Morphett has the floor.

**Mr OSWALD:** Thank you, Sir, but I was hoping that you would let the interjections continue because they are quite good value. I have received a letter from the Marion

council addressed to the Minister of Transport on the subject of graffiti. I raise the subject not in any criticism of the Minister and the fact that he has not yet replied (because he received the letter on only 7 February) but because I share the concern put forward by the Marion council at the increasing incidence of graffiti that it is having to put up with in the city area. Of course, it is not only in the city area; there is a rapid increase in graffiti in the Education Department, and the STA and other Government departments are also having to contend with it.

The whole question is getting totally out of hand. Obviously these bodies—the Education Department, the STA and local government—will need a great deal of assistance in handling this very real social problem, which is costing millions of dollars each year. The letter, which is addressed to the Hon. G. Keneally, states:

Dear Sir, I wish to draw your attention to a continuing annoying problem that is occurring throughout the city area. I refer of course to the longstanding problem of graffiti and defacement to public buildings and structures. Such practices unfortunately are on the increase throughout the city area not only on council buildings and structures but are quite predominant on railway stations and other STA buildings in the area. It has been noted with some dismay that little action has been taken by the STA to remove or cover such graffiti. Council has found that failure to properly remove this form of vandalism only encourages more such efforts. It is believed that the authority's actions in not combating or removing vandalism will only undermine this council's stringent efforts in promptly removing graffiti from council property. I would be obliged if you could investigate this matter with a view to improving the authority's actions in graffiti removal.

I think it is fair to say that the STA does make a genuine effort to get rid of graffiti. We really have a social problem on our hands; despite the efforts made by the authorities, the graffiti army continues to increase.

An article appeared in the *Sunday Mail* of 10 November last year where a whole page was devoted to a young 20-year-old by the name of John Reynolds (the name is in the press, so there is no difficulty in disclosing his name here). He claims to be the self proclaimed leader of an army of hundreds of Adelaide graffiti artists. Some of his remarks show how hung up this particular lad is. In fact, I would almost say that he has a psychological problem that we as a community must address along with the other sufferers who feel they must go out and vandalise. The article states:

'I just cannot stop,' Reynolds admitted. 'You have to experience getting a spray can in the middle of the night and putting your name where it is not supposed to be. I am not a vandal—

like hell he is not—

I am an artist. What you can do with a spray can is far superior to anything someone does with a brush. My parents think it is great. They do not like me going out all weekend, but they go around taking photos of my pieces and show them to their friends.

Of course, that begs the question of the involvement of the parents in what their youngsters are doing around the town at night. The article continues:

'They just wish I put my talents to better use.' Reynolds, offers no apologies. Graffiti is all about fame. He said: 'If I have a big piece up on the side of the railway line, I reckon hundreds of people each day will go past and see it . . . I am famous.'

He said a large piece took up to four hours work, using more than 40 spray cans. He worked through the night with six assistants. As the leader usually he did the outline and the assistant filled in the color. Others stood around watching for police.

'By morning, we just ride back and forth on the train watching people's faces as they see our work,' Reynolds said.

That begs another question: how can they sit on a train all day travelling up and down past their work?

It is a great feeling.

It was further reported that he said that he had been caught twice, earning two fines of \$200. I have not ascertained whether they were ever paid. Reynolds claimed that the police were fighting a losing battle against graffiti. Reynolds was quoted as saying:

It is a joke. They know who I am and my work, but they cannot put the two together. We go out on jobs and are then on a stake-out. I have worked with them parked only a short distance away. A patrol car stopped and was hassling one of my mates. I sprayed the back of the car while they were talking.

That lad is obviously proud of what he is doing. I submit to the House that we have a grave social problem with that type of individual and, of course, hundreds of them around the place are doing the same thing. The STA has made an effort in this regard. However, time will not permit me to go through other press releases in detail. An article in the *Advertiser* of 13 November 1985 highlights the fact that the STA is talking in terms of millions of dollars a year in attempting to do something about the problem. The STA stated that vandalism cost taxpayers about \$1 million a year to remove and that that certainly will not diminish. The STA was highly critical of the report that I have just read to the House, and in that regard the STA stated:

It seems to make a bit of a folk hero out of him [Mr Reynolds].

In conclusion, I point out that in our duties on school councils many of us are now finding that graffiti is around the schoolyards. It is now being put inside buildings, and 14 and 15 year olds are getting involved in this practice. Of course, once graffiti has been placed on a building it cannot be taken off. The cleaning of the Adelaide railway station, cost hundreds of thousands of dollars extra because of graffiti. I put to the Government that the local government authorities, the STA and the Education Department have reached the stage where they desperately need Government support. I do not think that we can continue to feel sorry for these people who are going around and committing acts of vandalism. That is all it is, but at the moment lenient sentences and warnings are being handed out.

I believe that offenders should be hit hard and should be taught to learn respect for other people's property. They

show no respect for other people's property when committing acts of vandalism. What would any member in this Chamber think if a newly-erected brick wall erected on their property was vandalised with graffiti and an offender was given a \$20 fine or a warning? People who commit these acts are vandals and should be treated as such, and when caught I believe they should be dealt with severely.

Earlier tonight a member opposite referred briefly to graffiti and said there should be a softly softly approach to it. However, I do not believe we can go on in that way. Overall it is costing the country millions of dollars. Last year in relation to South Australia a figure of \$5 million was quoted, and that amount is growing. The Government must take up the challenge and do something about graffiti.

This matter must be picked up in the courts, which must hand out stiff penalties, so that these youngsters, and perhaps adults as well, are taught to realise that when they go out and put graffiti on walls they are vandalising private property. It is unacceptable behaviour in the community, and the penalty should fit the offence. No-one has the right to go out and cause \$4 000 worth of damage, as was the case a year ago, when a person damaged a large sign. After being apprehended, that person was fined only \$20. That is absolute nonsense. Until stiff penalties are handed out youngsters will not take any notice and will go on their merry way making a complete and utter mess of walls and buildings around Adelaide. There is no excuse for their behaviour, and the authorities should clamp down in the most firm manner that the Government can bring to their aid.

Motion carried.

At 10.30 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 13 February at 2 p.m.