

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 7 August 1986

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.P. Trainer)** took the Chair at 11 a.m. and read prayers.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 6 August. Page 147.)

Mr KLUNDER (Todd): In supporting the Address in Reply, I would first of all like to say how pleasant it is to see all of these smiling, cheerful faces of my colleagues here in the morning. Normally, when I see my colleagues here in the morning, it is at the end of a late night sitting and the beards have grown to unmanageable proportions, the eyelids are heavy, and basically people are feeling fairly curly and fairly nasty at that time. It is nice to see them here so bright and cheerful and happy, and I hope that it will carry over into the rest of the debate this morning.

Members interjecting:

Mr KLUNDER: Would you like 30 minutes of that? I do want to speak this morning about the Estimates Committees which are coming up in a few weeks time. The Estimates Committees were set up during my temporary enforced absence from this House from 1979 to 1982. When I returned to the House in 1982, they were here fully fledged. I must admit to having been rather curious as to how well they would work. The trouble with wanting to find out how well something works is that you have to have a yardstick by which to measure that success. So, I went back to the original introduction of what were then called the Budget Estimates Committees by the Tonkin Government in, I think, 1981. It was interesting to look at the reasons that were given at that time for the introduction of the Budget Estimates Committees.

The first was to improve both the efficiency and effectiveness of all public expenditures, which basically is a motherhood statement and does not need to be taken very seriously, because no-one can be found to disagree with it. The second reason given was that the Government was committed to presenting the budget papers and public accounts in such a form as would permit that standard of performance to be properly measured. That of course is a clear reference to the program performance budget papers which appear in the House at about this time each year. Without digressing too far from the Estimates Committees that I want to talk about, I do want to talk for a moment about programmed performance budgeting. I believe that, while the idea of program performance budgeting was a very good idea, it was introduced far too rapidly by the then Tonkin Government. There is no doubt that it preceded a common accounting system for the entire State, now called the Treasury accounting system. The Treasury accounting system has now been introduced, as far as I know, across the entire Government spectrum and—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr KLUNDER: While the honourable member is quite right, it has taken a long time to do, I think that the Liberal Government in 1981 fell into the fallacy that seems to get so many of our American colleagues, that all you have to do is pass something in this House and, hey-presto, all of a sudden it will exist completely and in full form. That just does not happen. When you ask people in Government departments to make changes, time is needed to train those

people to readjust to different ways of doing things. All of that takes time. While I must admit that I feel that six years was too long, it was necessary to have a waiting period before program performance budgeting could come into force, and that waiting period included the creation of a common accounting system in order to make sure that you could build on a common base.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Which departments have declined to adopt that system?

Mr KLUNDER: I do not know of any department that has declined to adopt the Treasury accounting system. There are still a number of problems in the program performance budgeting area. I believe that only very few departments are in full use of it. Most departments are still not in a situation where they can do that. I remind members who are interrupting that program performance budgeting was originally introduced by McNamara in the United States in the early 1960s and that the governments of all the States of the United States that I know of, and the Federal Government, have now pulled away from program performance budgeting on the basis that it just is not possible to do it.

Certainly, for the large size areas they have there and the large budgets they have there, it creates major problems. I am still hopeful that in South Australia, with its smaller base, we will be able to introduce program performance budgeting, but I do not think that this is something that can be done rapidly. Certainly, the Public Accounts Committee has been pushing departments towards the introduction of full program performance budgeting, if that helps the honourable member.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: You are insisting on it, in principle.

Mr KLUNDER: As Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee I am fully aware that that committee has been pushing departments in that general direction.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Are there any departments reluctant to take it on?

Mr KLUNDER: There are very few departments at the moment that are currently on full program performance budgeting: I said that a moment ago. The third reason given in Mr Tonkin's speech in 1981 was that the Government was determined to restore to Parliament the means by which this institution—meaning the Parliament—can more effectively discharge its constitutional responsibilities. I have nothing but sympathy for that statement. I, too, believe that the Parliament of South Australia, in common with all the other parliaments throughout the Westminster system, is no longer as influential an organisation as it used to be. In fact it is perfectly reasonable to say that its major function at the moment is as a forum in which the Opposition can put an alternative point of view.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr KLUNDER: If the honourable member wishes to make a speech, he will have a chance to do so later.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr KLUNDER: The honourable member can respond in his time and not in mine. While I feel a great degree of sympathy with that particular statement, I am not sure that the introduction of Estimates Committees has actually managed to achieve this. It is fairly difficult, still, having read those three paragraphs of Mr Tonkin's speech, to find out what the Estimates Committees were actually intended to achieve. A further statement in the Tonkin speech was this:

In these circumstances, Governments of the day have retained the confidence of this House more from a sense of Party loyalty and Party discipline than from an informed parliamentary judgment of government performance.

I think that that is perfectly true as a statement, but it has been true of Westminster Parliaments for at least the past

100 years, and Walter Bagehot in his major work of the last century very clearly indicated that.

There is not much point in trying to confuse a mythical ideal of what Parliament ought to achieve with what Parliament is actually doing. But, it is unnecessary to use the Estimates Committees as a method of providing backbenchers with more time to inform themselves of Government financial matters, because Government backbenchers can inform themselves of these matters by other methods much more easily than through the parliamentary session.

To assume that Opposition backbenchers can act in other than a Party political system is to take a view of politics which is not a rational one in the twentieth century and, indeed, was not in the nineteenth century. We have in this place a gladiatorial contest between the Opposition and largely the Government front bench, and the Estimates Committees have merely continued that gladiatorial contest.

It is fairly easy to say what Estimates Committees are not expected to achieve. They are not expected to achieve a change in the Estimates; after all, the Government hangs its hat in a matter of confidence on the Estimates passing unscathed through the House. Consequently, there is no perceived intent of the Estimates Committees actually altering the Estimates before the House.

Perhaps it was originally intended that the Estimates Committees would act as a one day Public Accounts Committee for Opposition members and, if so, of course, it was automatically doomed to failure. A number of members of this House have been, or are currently, members of the Public Accounts Committee and are fully aware of the amount of very tedious and backbreaking research that is necessary before one even knows what kind of questions to ask of public servants. To assume that an Opposition can get the information and make inroads into a Government Minister in one day of asking questions, is asking far too much.

The situation that we then have is that, after the Estimates Committees, Opposition members can go away and say that the Minister was unresponsive or uncooperative, that the Minister was too longwinded in his answers and that Government members took up too much time. Although that must be a very nice, warm feeling to take away from Estimates Committees, it has not really achieved much. Both Opposition and Government backbenchers have an opportunity to do some parish pump work and massage their electorate by asking questions which can later be used in their electorates. The Minister and the departmental staff can go away after a day of facing the Estimates Committees with the full knowledge that they do not have to do so again for another year.

Therefore, if the purpose of an Estimates Committee is merely to gain information from Opposition members—which seems to be the only option that is left over—it must be possible for us to do it in a far cheaper way than using the full paraphernalia of the Parliament (with *Hansard* and everybody else present and the full cost of the Parliament being involved) in order to achieve that kind of information gathering. We really need to look at whether or not there are any other solutions to the function of an Estimates Committee other than the way in which it is currently being done.

Broadly speaking, I think there are three solutions, two of which are not really feasible at all—the first because it is a pretty poor solution and, the second because it would engender considerable extra expense. However, there is one compromise solution which may or may not be feasible, but I will briefly go through all three of them. Probably the worst possible solution would be to provide staffing for the

Estimates Committees. You cannot really ask staff to be there for only a month before and the fortnight of the Estimates Committees, so you would have people employed on a full year basis in order to provide nothing more than questions for Opposition and Government backbench members. It is obviously a silly solution. One way out of it might be to take staff away from other areas, such as the Public Works Standing Committee, the Public Accounts Committee and the Library, for the required time period. In my view, that would be a disastrous solution because, if the questions that are engendered by people in these positions do not rock the Government, the Opposition would be disgustingly unhappy, and, if they do rock the Government, the Government would be disgustingly unhappy. Consequently, this would achieve very little more than a politicisation of those various staff members. Certainly, in my position on the Public Accounts Committee, I would be very unhappy about lending the Public Accounts Committee staff to such an exercise.

There is a solution which is used very effectively in the American Parliaments, but, of course, that is due to the fact that their set-up is markedly different from our Westminster model. In a typical American State Parliament they have two committees of the Legislature which parallel the Government's major areas of interest.

For instance, in the State of Iowa eight committees deal with legislative functions of government in the Legislature, and there are eight parallel appropriation committees. These committees are bipartisan, sometimes bicameral, and in many States they meet jointly when the estimates are being considered in order to bring together the expertise of the people in both the legislative and appropriation fields. In this State that would be pretty well impossible because the Executive actually sits in the Parliament, and it would also be impossible because there would need to be members on these committees. Quite obviously, it will not be possible to have in the Lower House eight major committees for a legislative function and eight for an appropriation function, because, basically, we do not have enough people here. Iowa, for instance, which is a quite small American State, has 100 legislators in the Lower House and 50 in the Senate. So, that solution is not a particularly good one, either.

The only other solution that has been tried elsewhere is the Victorian solution, where the Estimates and Budget Review Committee has been set up and, consequently, a committee of the Lower House now carries the estimates function in the Victorian Parliament. I last checked with that committee some time last year and at that stage it had been in existence for about two or three years and had never used the estimate function of its estimates and budget review capacity. Consequently, that particular model has not been given a fair trial anywhere and it would be very difficult to know whether or not it would be successful here.

Nevertheless, I think that if we are to go in any direction at all that would have to be the way to go: that we set up a committee of the Lower House with an estimates function, with that committee being staffed in the same way as other committees of the House; it would then have the job of going around to the various departments and putting them through an estimates function, which can be zero based budgeting or any other way in which the committee wished to do it. That would not be a particularly welcome solution to the Government at the moment, because it would require extra staffing, and I can well imagine that in this current tight budgetary situation the very last thing that we should be doing is taking on extra public servants.

Further, it would hardly be a welcome suggestion to a number of departments, because if there was one thing that

a department would utterly dread it would be to be put through a zero based budgeting exercise. It would also, in line with the various other committees of the Parliament, take an awfully long time to do the rounds of the various Government departments and agencies. I have said on many occasions that the Public Accounts Committee is perfectly capable of doing a cycle of the Government departments and agencies in a mere 300 to 400 years. Quite obviously, an estimates function committee would also find it quite difficult to go around the entire Government sector in anything under, say, 50 or 60 years. That would mean, therefore, that it would not be possible for it to have the kind of overview that the Auditor-General, for instance, achieves by having sufficient staff to look at all areas of Government each year. On the other hand, to me there is very little doubt that our current attempt to inform the House of the estimates function of government is not successful and that we need to try virtually any alternative that looks reasonable.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): First, I refer to an article written by one Greg Sheridan in the *Weekend Australian* of 2 and 3 February 1985. The article is entitled 'The lies they tell our children', and it was particularly relevant not to the 1985 year but to 1986—the International Year of Peace. In the article, Greg Sheridan criticises the contemporary educational scene and, among quite a number of other things, he says:

Large areas of the State education system have been captured by mediocre talents who adhere to a variety of fruit-cake ideologies with little regard for serious scholarship which conflicts with their views.

In many social sciences Australian students are receiving the worst education possible; plenty of moral anger and little intellectual substance. In peace studies they are in a vice which, on one hand tries to scare them into pacifism, while on the other leads them into shoddy, anti-American clap trap as a substitute for rigorous analysis.

In sex education and similar courses, values clarification techniques are used to convince students that everything is relative, no one set of moral standards is any better than any other, and that traditional customs are, at best, a curious anachronism.

In human rights education, and other areas that deal with international poverty, updated derivatives of Lenin's theory of economic imperialism are promulgated to convince students, against all the evidence, that the Western industrialised nations are the cause of Third World poverty. No mention is made of the analysis of economists such as P.T. Bauer or Kenneth Minogue who have demonstrated the falsity of such theories.

National pride is assaulted, European settlement of Australia is increasingly portrayed as some kind of hideous crime against humanity instead of the beginning of the Australian nation.

I believe that article is relevant to the International Year of Peace because I have been personally inflicted with an absolute plethora of peace documents which purport to emanate from the Australian Department of Foreign Affairs; however, the majority can be sourced beyond the Department of Foreign Affairs to a very wide number of organisations that are using the department simply as a vehicle for the promulgation of their own ideas and for getting their ideas into our State schools.

I am not only tired of receiving this, as I have said, plethora of peace propaganda, but I am also being told that I need to be a peaceful man at home, that I need to push peace into our schools, that I need to be peaceful with my neighbours, that I need to be peaceful at work and that I need to be peaceful in politics. I suggest that there would be very few more peaceful fellows than I in Parliament at this time.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I am quite happy that my colleagues opposite agree with me. I am being told of all the things that I should be doing for peace. I simply question

the motives of those people who are pushing this material, not only to members of Parliament but to the rest of the people of Australia. I suggest that in many cases their motives are very questionable and that they are using the Christian side of modern Australian society simply as a front for their own purposes. In the middle of last year I recall that there was a communist meeting in Melbourne which suggested that, unless they managed to get the churches solidly behind them, the International Year of Peace functions in Australia in 1986 would fall by the wayside. Hundreds of thousands of dollars are being spent on the International Year of Peace in Australia, and I cannot help but reflect on the struggle that we had last year in 1985 to get International Youth Year off the ground.

The Federal Government simply made a token gesture towards International Youth Year and after two or three months decided to put it in the too-hard basket. It handed over funds to individual States and said, 'You handle the whole thing.' International Youth Year in 1985 could have been much more successful. But look at what is happening this year. In International Year of Peace an amazing number of organisations are not only joining in but also being funded by the Federal Government.

Mr S.J. Baker: Even the Communist Party.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The Communist Party receives substantial funds, and I will refer to the grants later. I draw members' attention to the Million Minutes of Peace campaign. I was asked to contribute to this campaign. Although the target sounds astronomical, it is almost laughable. I have not yet met an Australian who wants to go to war.

Ms Gayler: The member for Coles—

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Will the honourable member sit down? I am on my feet.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Appleby): Order! It is not for the member for Mount Gambier to tell other members to sit down. If members are to sit down, they will be told by the Chair.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Thank you for your support, Madam Acting Speaker, but I have not yet heard you tell members to sit down. I suggest that this is a peaceful meeting and I do not wish to become embroiled. As I said, I have not yet met an Australian who wants to go to war. We are essentially a non-aggressor nation. If we examine the mathematics, we find that, if we multiply 60 minutes in the hour by 24 hours in the day by 365 days in a normal year, there are 525 600 minutes in a year, so I suggest that the target of one million minutes for peace could be met by any two of us who wish to go sleepless during the whole year and who would confess (as most of us would) that we are essentially pacifist at heart. If we want to provide some sleeping time, any four of us could do it.

Any four clergymen in South Australia alone would be pleased to meet and capable of meeting the target of one million minutes for peace. I suggest that the committee itself could knock off the target without even thinking about it—by a bit of weekend commitment to the idea. It is a nonsense to ask a non-aggressive Australian society to commit one million minutes to the very peace to which they are already committed by their very nature. If we think that Australians have a choice in any case, let us consider the realities. We have F111 bombers that cannot even fly from Sydney to Perth without being refuelled: we would have a heck of a time sending them from Australia and back on any aggressive mission. Our defence fighter airforce is currently in the throes of being replaced.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: We are not looking for a strike capacity, I remind members who are trying to interject. We

have very few capital ships, or larger ships, in Royal Navy terms. We have no battleships or battle cruisers. In fact, our aircraft carrier served the enemy cause more often than the Australian cause by sinking friendly ships as a matter of habit. We also have very few arms and little ammunition of a conventional nature: we do not have enough ammunition to train our troops let alone to equip them officially to carry out acts of aggression. When we look at the Australian forces, we see that they are not even equipped for defence.

We find it very difficult, with the few ships that we have—the smaller ships, destroyers and frigates—even to police efficiently the 12 000 mile distance around our coastline; there is probably 24 000 miles of coastline if we count the bays and indentations. We could not even stop a troop of Vietnamese boat people from coming ashore a few years ago—that proved difficult for us. It is rather laughable that we expend hundreds of thousands of dollars trying to convince the Australian people that they should be peaceful by nature. What a nonsense!

I suspect that the peace movement is conditioning Australians against improving our meagre defences. It is softening up our underbelly, which is already amongst the softest of all the Western nations. The International Year of Peace material I find to be propagandist and it is entering our schools under the guise of being an official Government publication purporting to come from the United Nations Organisation. In fact, it is being scripted by groups here in Australia whose motives I question.

I believe our children are being brainwashed in spite of the fact that the Director-General of Education in South Australia is statutorily responsible for all curricula in this State. For that I am very thankful because I believe that the Director-General of Education has already made a stand against some peace material entering the schools by advising headmasters and staff that they should be wary of it. I support his perception.

After reading these numerous documents that are sent out by the Department of Foreign Affairs, I find that the peace movement is anti-American and anti-RSL. It is a strange beast because it can only flourish in a democracy, yet it ridicules the very institutions that have made the continuation of democracy in Australia possible. I refer to friendships with the United States and the United Kingdom. We are told in one of these documents that the diggers may be the great Australian myth. That would go down very well with the RSL. After all, these diggers were volunteers when Australia was a non-conscript nation.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: If the honourable member is referring to the few who served in Vietnam, they deserve our utmost respect. They are one of the most neglected groups of ex-servicemen I can think of (servicemen from the First World War, the Second World War and Korea are greatly respected) and they can hold their heads up high because they were not only volunteers but also conscripts. If that is what the honourable member is referring to, I agree. However, the documents are also knocking Pine Gap, which may be one of our defence mechanisms. They are knocking nuclear ships visiting Australia and Australia's nuclear presence. That might not be so bad. People are entitled to their points of view.

However, let us go back to the Federal Government, the State Governments (including Victoria which I will mention later) and to the guidelines under which funds are allocated by those Governments. The application form states:

Applications in direct conflict with established Government policy on peace, disarmament and arms control will not be considered.

Members should notice 'will not be considered', let alone granted. Let us look at one or two of the policies that the current and past Federal Governments have espoused as their own: that it is firm Australian Government policy to have, to hold and to encourage joint United States/Australian bases; to support the United States/Australian alliance; to provide port facilities for United States ships; to express opposition for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic's expansion in the Pacific zone and to express concern; to support bilateral nuclear weapons reduction—not unilateral but bilateral; to support equal nuclear weapons reduction; and to support verifiable nuclear weapons reduction.

What do we see? In Victoria alone \$90 000 is allocated, in spite of the guidelines, towards a peace youth conference which will be held this year, and included on the agenda are gay rights, land rights, Roxby Downs, Pine Gap, how to organise action groups, and how to organise rallies and campaigns. One should remember that the last Roxby Downs campaign—the anti-uranium rally—cost South Australia alone \$2 million in policing. That rally was not pacifist in spite of the labels under which those demonstrators travelled. That \$2 million would more than have funded the whole of the International Year of Peace; but that is an aside.

There are also courses on how to get peace and youth issues into school through student representative councils and how to organise student protests at institutions. I remind members of the House that this is all being done using taxpayers' funds and will really, by the sound of things, be training 300 young political activists in order to subvert our society to what I strongly suspect are left wing or, at the very best, questionable causes.

This is the straw that broke the camel's back since, only two days ago, all of us received a peace kit from the Department of Foreign Affairs. There is not a word anywhere in any of the peace documents to remind us of the attacks on all of our freedoms, on our peace, on our individual rights by totalitarian governments whose principles, I suggest, many of these doctrinaire peace activists do, in fact, espouse.

I would suggest that the biggest threat to domestic peace in Australia results from impoverishment and the running down of an economy, and that is common to the Western world. I also suggest that if the hundreds of thousands of dollars that have been spent on the International Year of Peace in democratic, non-aggressive countries had been directed towards the problems of youth, unemployment, the aged and the disabled, as have previous Years, which were by no means funded as well as this one or attacked as well as this one, then we would really be addressing the ills of the world. But notice how subtle is the correspondence that emanates from the Department of Foreign Affairs. I am told:

For those of us who really are concerned about solidarity with the poor of the world, this attack on peace—

that is criticism of the peace movement—

is an attack against the poor.

What arrant hypocrisy! It says:

Peace education does not presuppose any correct solution or promote any particular ideology as the most appropriate.

That, I suggest, is the same humanist solution that goes into our schools in humanist social education, which says that no one value is the best; you have a look, decide how you would react, and how you would react is the best way to react. It does not inculcate into our youngsters a sense of contemporary Western world social and moral values. It is a subtle way of indoctrination, and is really moral disarmament.

The document to which I refer has been put out by the Department of Foreign Affairs. The heading says 'Conflict surrounds peace studies'. I suggest that it is better to spend money on looking after the poor of society rather than putting out garbage like this. Not only that, but I see that Community Aid Abroad puts an imbalance scale in one of its advertisements. That is a group to which I have been subscribing and of which I was a member for a long time, raising money through charitable works in the South-East as a committee member. I noticed recently that this group handed over my membership number to the ALP so that they could solicit funds from my wife prior to the last election. I wonder which way that group is moving.

I wrote them a letter, incidentally, and thanked them for their efforts on my behalf. I discontinued my subscription. They say that we should be spending far less on defence and far more should be given away to overseas foreign aid. When we look at a lot of the governments in that overseas foreign aid group, I suggest that a number of those are highly questionable. In the Million Minutes of Peace correspondence which I received, I was reminded that I should be taking part because a great number of countries were taking part in the appeal, and they were listed, and I find that most of them are democracies. This is an exercise in self-gratification.

Let us think of the countries that are not listed here and see whether we would not be better advised trying to convert them to a more peaceful stance on the world scene. These have no part in the International Year of Peace, and I am sure that the few I have jotted down are not an exhaustive list by any means. They include Iraq, Iran, Syria, Lebanon, Libya, Hungary, Rumania, Yugoslavia, East Germany, the USSR, South Africa, Pakistan, Tanzania, Chile, Belgium, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia—part of the Communist bloc—Nigeria, Uganda and North and South Vietnam, and so the list could be extended.

If the International Year of Peace, as we know it and as is being advertised here in Australia, is simply asking the non-aggressive nations of the world to maintain their non-aggressive stance. I suggest that much of it is a waste of time. We in Australia neither are in the frame of mind nor have the capability to attack anyone: we are a pacifist nation. We are not, however, prepared to stand by inactive at times of stress when we, our ideals, standards and morals are under attack.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Does the honourable member not recall that we have been under stress in the past 40 or 50 years and that volunteers from Australia have gone overseas to fight to help to maintain this wonderful democracy of ours? If members do forget that they do both themselves and Australia a tremendous disservice, because Australia has a reputation for defending the weak and the defenceless, but we do not have a reputation for attacking. If members can prove to the contrary, I would be very surprised.

That is another point. Many of these young banner waving, flag waving activists were simply not around when those people they currently criticise in the RSL were fighting in their defence.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: We do not have a drafting system: the honourable member would be the first one to scream if we did. We do not have a conscript system.

Ms Lenehan: We had one.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: And I did not agree with it.

Ms Lenehan interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I simply remind members that as a conscript who did serve in the armed forces, who was bombed in the 1939-45 Second World War and who saw a little action on the receiving end, I support the RSL members across the world who were ready to fight for freedom but who on return have not favoured a return to war. I suggest that any member here go to RSL members and people who have fought and he or she will find that the last thing those people want is for their children, including children of Australian parents, to have to do the same thing. They were under the impression that they fought to get rid of war. No RSL member would ever advocate a return to that state of affairs. It is that sort of thing and the activist clap-trap that comes out of many of these documents that make ex-servicemen in Australia angry.

I am very pleased that in South Australia the Director-General of Education has a statutory responsibility for material which goes into our schools. It is not the Department of Foreign Affairs, and it is not the peace activists or the church organisations that are being used as a front in many cases.

Mr Tyler: That is offensive to the churches.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Offensive it may be but true it is. If the honourable member does not think that the World Council of Churches has been infiltrated and used as a front, he is even more naive than I gave him credit for. They certainly have been infiltrated; there is no question about it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. H. ALLISON: As a confirmed Anglican I say that. There is no doubt that many of the documents that currently go into our schools are nothing more than pseudo peace documents that are being distributed by activists who have used this as an excuse (rather than a sound reason) for putting their ideas before our schoolchildren. I am very pleased that the Director-General of Education in South Australia is statutorily responsible for curriculum that goes into our schools. I am quite sure that he will keep a close watch on this material that is being distributed by the Department of Foreign Affairs and that he will urge our school principals and staff to exercise their proper judgment.

Whether propagandist material is left wing or right wing, it is not welcome anywhere. We only have to look at the extreme right wing of Nazism in the Second World War, or the extreme left wing of Communism, to realise that evil can emanate from either side of politics.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: As the member for Davenport reminds me, schools are the best place to attack because, once you have captured the minds of the children, you have captured future generations.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Education is one thing, but indoctrination is another. The member for Mawson reminds me that I was a teacher. If you consider that one of the youngsters who came out of my classes is now in Melbourne and a left wing political activist who currently runs one of these schemes and that three other young people whom I taught are currently left wing members of Parliament, you can see that very little conservative indoctrination was carried out in my classes.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I support the motion before the House. At the outset, I extend my condolences to the families of the two former members of this House who passed away in recent months. I did not know Mr Albert Hawke at all, but I knew and respected Charlie

Harrison for his sincerity in the way that he represented the constituents of his electorate. Charlie was always good for a yarn. I would imagine that he was able to assist a number of people who had grievances and problems relating to his own constituency, and I know that he will be sadly missed. I extend my condolences to both families.

His Excellency the Governor opened the Parliament and, in doing so, he put forward plans for this session as they relate to legislation and other matters concerning the Government of South Australia. I (and I believe the people of this State) appreciate the excellent work that is being done by both Sir Donald and Lady Dunstan. I know that, travelling widely throughout the State, they have made many friends. The responsibility assumed by them in that high office is appreciated by the people of South Australia. I hope that the Governor is able to continue in that position for many years to come.

I do not want to say a great deal about the Governor's speech, because the opportunity will be given to refer specifically to legislation that was mentioned in that speech when such legislation is brought before the House but, sadly, one area was not mentioned, and that relates to planning legislation. I realise that notice has already been given that minor legislation (and I do not know the contents of it) is to be debated in this House within the next few days. I believe that there is a need to look at the Planning and Development Act and to recognise a number of the problems that are there and have been recognised since the legislation was first introduced.

Ms Gayler interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: That is all right. I was just about to say that I am responsible for the Planning Act. I believe that the Planning Act is a very sound piece of legislation, despite what is being said by some people on both sides of the House. I still believe that whoever has the responsibility for planning legislation, no matter which Party is in Government, will have difficulty in bringing down a more sound piece of legislation than the one before us at the present time. It has been recognised, I believe, by both sides of the House that there are problems.

I certainly made the point when I introduced the legislation that it would only be by trial and practice that we would recognise how successful certain sections of it would be. I believe that we have now had the opportunity to recognise that some provisions within that Act are not working as originally intended. We have had a review, looking at the legislation since 1982, that has brought down a number of recommendations, some of which have been adhered to, while others are still being considered, as I understand it. There are some which I would support that obviously the Government and the Minister of the day do not support. The changes that I believe are necessary I suggest would result in fairly major legislation being introduced. I was interested to learn that no mention is made of such legislation coming before the House this session. Again, I reiterate that I believe that the legislation is sound and it can work. I believe that it is a substantial improvement on the Planning and Development Act and its provisions, but at the same time recognise that there is still a very real need for fine tuning in some areas of that legislation. I do not want to spend a lot of time on it now. I hope that the opportunity will be provided at a later stage to bring forward some of my concerns in regard to the Planning Act.

I want to refer briefly to some of the matters that I was able to involve myself in during a recent trip to the United Kingdom, taking in a number of areas. I looked particularly at four matters, the first being drug abuse, particularly as it

relates to teenagers. In the past six months, I have been able to look fairly extensively at that issue. I know much is being said about it, and I appreciated what the member for Hartley had to say in this debate over the past couple of days regarding drug abuse. However, I wanted to specialise more and look specifically at the misuse of drugs, particularly on the part of teenagers, and I will refer to that a little later on.

I also looked at the conservation of built heritage. That obviously has been an interest of mine over many years. Some 23 years ago I was able to spend 18 months in the United Kingdom, particularly in London, and I was aware of many of the historic buildings in that city and was interested to learn of the provisions under legislation in that country that assist private owners of heritage items in the conservation of those buildings. I will come back to that matter, as well.

I also spent some time in the Home Office in London looking particularly at the subject of community policing. Again, I have been most impressed with the advancements made by the South Australian Police Force under the present Commissioner (Mr Hunt) with regard to community policing and, in particular, the Neighbourhood Watch program. As I said earlier in relation to the Planning Act, that again is a system that will need some fine tuning. I know that the Commissioner and his department are aware of that and are looking, on a continuing basis, at improvements that can be made to that system. I believe that we have come a long way down the track in South Australia with regard to the involvement in the community of the Police Force.

The other matter I looked at was the English and Wales parks system. Having had some concern for some time about the National Parks and Wildlife Service in this State, I was anxious to look at that system. Of course, it is very different from the one that we recognise in this State, mainly because so much of the land that is held under the 10 national parks in the United Kingdom is privately owned. I believe that the enthusiasm shown the Government and the community—referring to both the central and local government—in regard to the conservation of those areas is very encouraging indeed.

I will turn now to some of the matters that I looked at earlier with regard to the drug issue, particularly as it relates to teenagers. I was very pleased indeed that the office of the Agent-General for South Australia in London was able to arrange for me to spend some time at the Institute for the Study of Drug Dependence in London. That is a very worthy institution, and one where I hope later to spend some more time studying. It has one of the most extensive libraries in the world and one could quite easily spend considerable time—days and days—just going through that material. Young people, and the abuse of drugs, is a problem that is becoming more significant day by day. I suggest that fewer things arouse stronger feelings in parents and the community than the fear that children generally, or their own children, might be involved in the use of drugs. The most difficult aspect of the problem is often a sense of helplessness, and I am sure parents who have had some involvement with the problem would recognise this.

There is genuine uncertainty about what is going on and the right course of action to adopt. Parents ask, 'How should we, as caring parents, behave if we suspect or know that our child is using drugs?' There is, of course, no simple answer to that question. The correct reaction to any problem involving growing children must inevitably be determined by individual circumstances, the nature of the problem and the established attitudes and relationships of people con-

cerned. However, in the case of drugs, it is fair to say that many parents face a grave handicap in their efforts to do something: they are, quite simply, ignorant of the facts associated with that problem. I was particularly pleased to see in that institute in the United Kingdom the number of publications being made available to parents for guidance on this very perplexing question.

I would suggest that the reasons for the widespread parental ignorance are based on the fact that the young drug culture is a relatively new phenomenon in the world. It is certainly seen as such in Britain, and I know that that is the case in Australia. Few parents with teenage children have personal experience of illegal drug use.

I am afraid to say also that the media tends to confuse the issue by concentrating on the more sensational aspects of drugs and the results of their abuse. We often see and read or hear about tragic stories of young heroin addicts in pitiful circumstances, deaths under the influence of drug taking, youngsters turning to crime to support their drug habit, and so on. Of course, these examples are by no means typical or representative of the reality of drug abuse for thousands of young people. This sensationalist approach tends to make parents frightened and liable to react harshly if their children become involved with drugs. However, if parental attitudes and behaviour are based on incentive and they are able to seek out proper information to help, it will help with matters like appropriate communication between parents and children, and they will be able to see the problem in a constructive way and discuss it with them in a positive manner. It is certainly a very controversial subject, and I was pleased to see in the United Kingdom (and I know the same thing is happening in Australia) that much more emphasis is now being placed on prevention rather than cure.

Young people are inclined as a matter of course to experiment with new experiences and sensations, and this has always been so. The use of certain drugs undoubtedly fulfils this requirement, and that is an unfortunate fact of life. However, the chances that children will actually turn to drugs at some point are greatly increased if, for example, they come from a home where the use of legitimate drugs is commonplace. It is recognised that we are unfortunately a nation of drug users, taking anything from vitamin pills, cold cures, pain-killers, or whatever might be available from the chemist, to tranquillisers that doctors prescribe for adults to help them cope with the stresses of modern life. It is only natural that, if a growing child sees parents smoking, drinking or reaching for pills at frequent intervals, that child will form the opinion—consciously or unconsciously—that drug usage is an acceptable form of behaviour and an acceptable means of solving problems.

I know that much has been done to help advertise and bring to the notice of people the problems that young people will have if they follow along that path. Of course, it is important that parents should set an example by not using drugs indiscriminately and by making the effort to educate children about drug usage from a very early age, stressing that the taking of any drug or medicine has a very serious purpose which should not be abused. Such example gives children respect for drugs and also establishes the whole issue as a subject for discussion.

I know that this statistic is published freely, but I was very concerned to learn that the value of drugs seized by Customs and Excise officers in the United Kingdom in 1985 exceeded the 1984 figure by over 60 per cent. These drugs (mainly cannabis, heroin, cocaine and opium) were worth £102 million at street prices. I would suggest that that emphasises the extent of the problem that we have in

this area. However, the work that is being done by commercial enterprises in the United Kingdom to make young people aware of the hazards of the misuse of drugs is commendable and I hope that members of this House take the opportunity to read the report that I have prepared for the Parliamentary Library with regard to my experiences in this area while overseas.

I was most impressed by what is being done in the United Kingdom in relation to the conservation of built heritage. It seems quite incredible when looking back at the history of the British Isles and the heritage that has been recorded during that time that it was only a relatively short time ago, some 100 years, that the first legislation was introduced to protect areas of significance, special monuments, in the United Kingdom, and that it was only some 50 years ago that the first legislation was introduced to prevent the demolition or significant alteration of a heritage building. I know that much attention has been given, I believe by both sides of the House, to the need for incentives to be provided in one form or another, particularly financial incentives, to private owners who have property on the register.

I was particularly interested to learn just how this system is handled in the United Kingdom and I was somewhat surprised to find that very little is done in providing financial incentives in that country. In fact, the information that I was able to obtain while in the United Kingdom has perhaps given me a different outlook on this subject overall. Through the offices of the Department of Environment in London I was able to ascertain what the situation was in relation to other parts of Europe. I was interested to learn that only France has really gone into the matter of providing compensation. France is the only European country that has gone down that track, and I understand from those with whom I was able to consult that the administrators of the scheme providing that incentive are in a significant amount of trouble as a result of providing it. However, obviously the matter should be further debated. It has been debated to some extent in South Australia and the matter will have to be further considered in the near future.

While on the subject of heritage, I want to refer to three examples of what I regard as excellent examples of conservation in our own State, and they are situated in my own electorate. I refer particularly to the magnificent work that has been undertaken by Ross and Janet Sands to Mount Lofty House. It is one of the earliest substantial houses built in this State, and, if ever any structure had heritage significance, it was that one. It is quite significant to the history of this State, considering those who have been associated with it and those who have lived in it, etc. Members would appreciate that the building was completely gutted during the Ash Wednesday fire. When Ross Sands suggested to me that he would attempt to rebuild that building, I must admit that I questioned whether he would be able to do so. Those who have had the opportunity to visit Mount Lofty House, which has a restaurant, a convention centre and facilities for entertaining, and where people can stay, have appreciated the significant work that has been done. The owners have won significant tourism awards in this State and nationally. They certainly deserve commendation for their work.

Another building that I want to refer to is the Bridgewater Mill. It was only in the past week that I had the opportunity and indeed the very real pleasure of being shown the work that has been carried out at the mill. I hope that the Minister responsible for built heritage in this State (and he is currently in the House) will take the opportunity to look at what is being done to that heritage item. When that building came on the market there was much discussion about its

future use. I made representations to the Minister and also brought before the House a petition with a large number of signatures, representing the feelings of my district about what should happen. I was delighted to go through the building. I was the guest the other day of Brian Croser, of Petaluma Wines, who now owns the building. I was delighted with what I saw. I am sure that any member or any person who knows the significance of that building will appreciate it as much as I did. They, too, are to be commended.

The other is the old Dunn Mill at Mount Barker. As Minister I was responsible for placing it on the register. In fact, I spent many sleepless nights considering that decision because I knew of the problems that the owners had with the building at that time. I knew that the decision would not be welcomed by some people associated with the building. The current owners have restored that building and have set up yet another restaurant—one that I am sure will go well. I wish those people well in their venture.

They are three examples very close to my home and within my electorate where the people of this State have accepted their responsibility in preserving the built heritage of this State. I am sure that those responsible for the administration of our State heritage will agree with my sentiments in this regard. I have referred to the parks of this State. As I have said, I was interested to learn how the national parks in England and Wales are administered. I returned from there even more convinced of the need to place a higher priority on our parks. I make no bones about the fact that during my time as Minister one of my most pleasing responsibilities was to learn more about our State national parks. I often wish that more people had the opportunity that I had to spend several days in our parks: for example, I spent five days in the Unnamed Conservation Park in the north of this State; I spent some days in a four-wheel drive travelling around Coffin Bay; and I spent time in the Flinders Ranges, and so on.

The National Parks and Wildlife Service in this State is under terrific pressure. I will not go over what my colleague the member for Coles said about this subject last evening, but I certainly share her sentiments and concern. In this month's edition of the *Public Service Review* I was interested to learn of the critical way that that publication deals with the state of decline and the problems associated with funding and staffing the State's National Parks and Wildlife Service. I can only hope that the Government will recognise its responsibility in this area. It amazes me that more people are not pressuring the Government to do something about this. I can only presume that many people in South Australia do not know of the seriousness of the current situation.

This issue should be taken very seriously by the Government. The other thing I want to say (and I feel that I am now in a position to be able to say it) is that I am gravely concerned regarding any future idea that the current Government or any other Government might have in relation to mining in national parks. I know that much has been said on this subject: I certainly received a considerable amount of representation on the issue. It is obviously not a popular subject with members on either side at present. I would hate to see anything happen to open the gates so that full-scale mining could occur in national parks. I have watched the situation in relation to the Flinders Ranges National Park very closely.

I am aware that the three-year exploration program being undertaken by the South Australian Department of Mines and Energy in that park has found significant amounts of lead and zinc, which could have wide implications for Port Pirie. I would be the last to want to see jobs lost or the

industry affected in any way. But I would also be very concerned if it was found that the only way in which that company could be maintained and jobs retained was that mining had to proceed in national parks. I will be very interested to observe what happens in this matter. There are many other subjects to which I wish to refer, but I do not have that opportunity now. I support the motion.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to have this opportunity to speak in my sixteenth or seventeenth Address in Reply contribution.

Mr Ferguson: You've lost count.

Mr GUNN: Yes. I look forward to making considerably more Address in Reply speeches. I would like to join with other members in expressing my condolences to the family of the late Mr Harrison, who entered Parliament on the same day as I. I knew him as a pleasant person, and I was pleased to be associated with the motion expressing regret at his passing. I did not know the late Mr Hawke, although part of the area he represented was in my district for a number of years and I still represent some of the area that would have been in his old seat of Burra Burra.

In times of difficult economic circumstances, the State and the nation must address themselves quite fundamentally to some hard facts. There are one or two facts that this State and nation must appreciate and understand. This country was built and developed by the agricultural and mining industries. People should not forget or misunderstand that. If those industries are given a fair go, they will continue to sustain the country. No matter what economic theorists might say, those two industries, because of the expertise and the will involved, can provide this country with the sort of export income to ensure a reasonable standard of living for our citizens. As the member who has been given the responsibility to speak on agricultural matters for the Opposition in this State, in the short time available to me this afternoon I want to refer to some of those problems.

People who have not been involved in mining or agriculture, unfortunately, are under many misapprehensions about those industries. Both the mining and the agricultural industries are, first, capital intensive. Large amounts of capital are required for those industries to continue. Costs are escalating. I do not know whether any member has sat down and looked at what it costs to supply fuel to put in a crop or to provide chemicals (such as weed spray). It costs \$1 000 for a 44 gallon (or 200 litre) drum. We can spray it on the ground and not get anything, but it has to be done. The costs of superphosphate, replacement of machinery and labour are high.

This country has been fortunate. We have had the most effective and efficient farmers in the world because we have had some sensible taxation concessions that have allowed them to continue to purchase the latest technology in machinery. That in turn has allowed firms such as Horwood Bagshaw and Shearers to continue to operate successfully, and they have produced the best tillage machinery in the world.

What is happening now? People are not purchasing the machinery and that is having a flow-on effect across the whole economy. People are not purchasing this machinery not only because they do not have the income but because the Commonwealth Government, in its wisdom, decided to do away with what were sensible and necessary taxation concessions, that is, an adequate investment allowance, adequate depreciation allowances and the opportunity to opt in and out of averaging—those sorts of concessions.

Those concessions were not allowed to try to unduly lift the incomes of the farming and mining communities but

because it was necessary for those industries to play a significant and necessary role in the development of the country. I sincerely hope that this Parliament and the community recognises that good farmers and good mining industries are assets to the country. The groups that have set out to try to downgrade and pour scorn on the farmers and the mining industries, and put unnecessary barriers in their way, are acting in a way that is contrary to the interests of this State and nation, and are helping to create more unemployment.

I believe that every member of this House is concerned about the high level of unemployment and the downturn in the economy, where something like 20 firms a week are going bankrupt. However, some basic things have to be done. Governments have to face reality. We cannot continue to have an ever-growing Public Service and to inflict taxes and charges, and produce more red tape.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Eyre has the floor and no other member.

Mr GUNN: I will address those interjections at the conclusion of my speech. It is the responsibility of Government to set the priorities—not the responsibility of members of Parliament. It is the responsibility of members of Parliament to bring to the attention of the Government, either directly or in the forum of Parliament, the issues and concerns that are affecting them. If members of Parliament do not do that regularly on behalf of their constituents and groups in the community they are failing their electors. The priorities are set not by the Parliament but by the Government, and members should clearly understand that.

It is the role of Parliament to debate the issues and approve appropriation. Members of Parliament and the Government have to ensure that the resources are fairly allocated and that they will be in the long-term interests of the community at large. That has always been my view. I do not believe in pork barrelling. I believe that Governments have to make decisions that are fair and reasonable. In my role as an advocate for my electors I have ensured that these isolated communities I have the privilege to represent are given a fair cut of the cake, and I do not believe that that has been so in the past. The Government should not continually put its hand in the taxpayers' pocket. That is what is happening. Businesses and the community in general are over taxed and the Government is getting out of control. There are many areas in which there should be cutbacks and a reallocation of resources.

People talk about attacking single parent families. I do not believe that is the way to go. Those people should not be punished: they are the victims. I have in my electorate an area where nearly 70 per cent of the community are on social welfare. People do not have to tell me about how the underprivileged live.

What concerns me is that we have large unproductive bureaucracies across this nation and too many public servants who are taking huge amounts of resources when we should have a reallocation of those resources so that the productive capacity of the State and the nation can be improved. Surely, at the end of the day, we want to employ people, lift their standards of living, and provide them with housing and other necessary benefits. The argument between this side and that side of the House is about which is the best group to provide work, whether it is the State or private enterprise.

We believe in a mixed economy and believe that there are certain areas in which the State can involve itself, but they are limited. The Government seems to believe that big government is good government. That is a fallacy which

should have gone out the door years ago. Unfortunately, the massive increase in the public sector is continuing, to the general detriment of the community at large.

Members interjecting:

Mr GUNN: I will ignore those interjections because I want to inform the House of a few of the benefits which agriculture has provided to this country. We are fortunate for the contribution made by the farming community. I want to quote from the *National Farmer* of August, which says (and I hope that members will listen):

Australians enjoy the lowest priced foods amongst the nations of the developed world, courtesy of their farmers. The most recent global food price survey compiled by the United States Department of Agriculture confirms that in many cases Australians are getting their staple foods at prices way below those paid in nations with comparable living standards. A shopping basket of 15 basic foodstuffs costs \$40 in Canberra, \$45 in Washington, \$47 in London, \$85 in Switzerland and \$110 in Tokyo.

That is the difference in price which has been achieved because we have effective and efficient agricultural industries. What we have to do is make sure those industries continue, and the fringe benefits tax and capital gains tax will have a detrimental effect.

I cannot for the life of me understand how this Premier, who has been reported in the paper as attacking Premier Burke, can be so foolish and shortsighted as to continue to support such a stupid bureaucratic bungle. Governments must have revenue; we accept that. But the Government does not have the first right on the dollar earned by John Citizen. The Government should take the minimum amount from that dollar, but it appears that the current Government in Canberra believes that it has an inherent right to continue to tax the community, even if it means locking them into this administrative nightmare.

The Treasurer of this country has had to admit that in the past we have financed the imports into this country through wheat, wool and mining, and he wants to put in the way all this nonsense about determining what rent should be charged for an employee's home, how much people are charged for the parking lot they get at the factory or the office, and all that sort of nonsense.

It perturbs me to think that in this country we have to put up with this nonsense when the real objective of the Government should be to encourage these people to go forward and to employ all these young people who are coming on to the labour market. It ought to be a matter of common sense, and it is really hard to understand why grown men, who are supposed to be intelligent and the leaders of this nation, would inflict on the nation such an abomination of nonsense. The average citizen finds it difficult to understand how politicians can be so shortsighted and irresponsible, because this action will interfere with the productive capacity of this nation.

If this nation is to succeed it has to have growth in its economy. All the academics in the world can talk about protecting the environment, but we must have growth in our economy or the aspirations of the nation will not be met. It is as simple as that. As someone who classes himself to be an ordinary practical Australian, I understand and find it most frustrating in my dealings with the bureaucracy that people want to get in the way of good hard working Australians who want to succeed. We should encourage people to succeed. When you put artificial barriers in the way of incentive or enterprise you drag down the productive capacity of the nation. What do we end up with? We have high inflation and—

Mr Groom: What are the solutions?

Mr GUNN: I am coming to those. If the honourable member looks at the current rates of inflation he will find that Belgium has 1.5 per cent, Denmark 1.7 per cent, France

about 2.5 per cent, Germany 1 per cent, Greece (a good socialist government) 24 per cent, Italy 7.2 per cent, Luxembourg 1.5 per cent, The Netherlands .7 per cent, Portugal 12 per cent, Spain (another socialist government) 8.7 per cent, the United Kingdom 3 per cent, Australia (another socialist country) 9.2 per cent, Japan .9 per cent, and the United States of America .6 per cent. Costs are one of the problems we have. That is why we are having so much difficulty selling our products overseas.

If one compares the inflation rate and looks at some of the export prices this country has received and at what has happened over the past few years, one will find that coal has fallen by 25 per cent between 1981 and 1986. The price of wheat—one of the largest areas of export income in this country—has fallen from 1980-81 by about 30 per cent. Wool has fallen between 1981 and 1986 by 21 per cent. Beef has fallen from 1984 to 1986 by 20 per cent. Barley has fallen since 1982 by about 50 per cent. Those figures indicate the falls in commodity prices.

The farming community has tightened its belt and become more efficient, but it is at the end of the road. The number of people facing negative incomes is increasing. Those people are not asking for handouts but only want a fair go. This State and Federal Government must be prepared to pull in their belts and make sure that resources are put in the right areas. If we look at some of the facts that the Bureau of Agricultural Economics has given under the heading of 'Net value of rural production', we see that the difference between the gross value of rural production and farm costs is forecasted to fall by an estimated \$3 350 million in 1985-86, which is 24 per cent below the last financial year. This follows a fall of 9 per cent between 1983 and 1985, and the proportion of farmers with a negative income is expected to increase by 35 per cent.

The depressed state of some farm industries in recent years has been reflected in changes in indebtedness and land values. The average debt per farm is projected to rise in 1985-86 to some \$74 000. However, some 38 per cent of farmers still have little or no debt. The number of farms at risk is projected to increase. The farmers experiencing most difficulty in maintaining their economic viability are those with low incomes and low equity. I could go on and talk about the rural adjustment scheme and many other facets. I hope that honourable members will take the trouble to read documents put out by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics as they give the basis of some of the problems facing those areas. As one who spends a lot of time on aeroplanes, I have the opportunity of either having a sleep or doing some reading to try to further my knowledge—

Mr Peterson: Not while you are flying.

Mr GUNN: No, when I am a passenger. This week's *Business Review Weekly* states (and this is most enlightening):

Whatever the economic growth forecast in next month's budget, a crunch in domestic demand is inevitable. There has to be a fundamental switch away from the public and private consumption growth that has been driving this economy until now. Instead, growth has to come from exports, import replacement and, the Government hopes, private investment. That means the outlook is bleak for all those industries built on consumption growth or importing. Retail sales are clearly one area that will feel the pinch. Housing activity has already slumped. It is currently enjoying a modest recovery.

Clearly, that indicates that we have to promote our exports in order to live. In the same magazine, an article written by Kenneth Randall states:

World wheat markets are unlikely to regain normality in less than five years, according to expert opinion in the trade—and those will be five hard years for growers in Australia. Growers, however, will not be the only victims.

For the first time, the Government faces the possibility next year of having to pay out through its underwriting arrangements with the wheat industry. Payments are likely to rise steeply in subsequent years, with significant implications for the budget.

He later states in the article:

Figures released by the board last week show that a record 16 million tonnes of wheat was shipped in the year to 30 June.

That is the best performance ever and the wheat board is to be commended for the marvellous job it has done in shipping our wheat, but we now face the challenge from the United States, which will make an attempt to regain some of its own traditional markets. If this Government and the trade union movement do not accept that they have a responsibility to assist and protect these export incomes, then the other sections of the community will have to pay a very high price.

These are the facts: every time there is a stoppage which affects the export of Australia's produce when it is stopped on the wharves, then we are exporting our jobs because, unfortunately, those markets can be filled from other parts of the world. If the Federal and State Governments do not stand up to those union officials and take stern action against them, then they are helping to export jobs. When a rail strike occurred this week, people quickly had to make alternative arrangements in order to ship perishable goods. The union official, with his bloody-minded arrogance, did not have even the courtesy to advise the public what would take place, so that valuable commodity could have been lost. The irresponsible demands of those people in New South Wales who prevented the export of wheat is a national disgrace. Governments must have the courage to stand up and deal with these people. The lily-livered approach that you have to have consensus in the union movement and talk quietly with these people is finished. Either they accept their responsibility, or they should be dealt with firmly. The law should protect the community from these sorts of fifth column activities. Why should the rest of the community be penalised? Why should more jobs be lost? Why should businesses close?

The Mudginberri dispute was a watershed in common sense and was an example where people should have been allowed to get on with their jobs and make their own arrangements. They should not be stood over by irresponsible trade unionists. If those people do not want to work, let them go home, but let the rest of the community get on with earning a living through which they can create products and create an export income which will be of benefit to the nation as a whole.

In relation to the environmental lobby, common sense ought to dictate that we should take sensible and reasonable steps in the area of environment, but we have reached a stage now where fringe minority groups are exercising far more influence over government and government decision making than such a small number should. Common sense has gone out the window. Many of these people have no regard for common sense; they are not practical people; they are academics; and they are people with political axes to grind. As a result, they are causing untold damage and misery in the community. Recently a seminar was organised at Hawker and because of the actions of a Mrs Fisher, who wrote to the Minister for Environment and Planning (Dr Hoggood)—and I have a copy of the letter—

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood interjecting:

Mr GUNN: Yes, she wrote to you. It was because of the sort of pressure she exerted that the Minister refused to allow Government officials to attend that conference. Mrs Betty Fisher, the Conservation Council representative on the Flinders Ranges Management Review Consulting Committee, wrote to the Minister complaining about a draft

press release. After that letter went to the Minister, they were suddenly advised that no Government officials were allowed to attend what was a constructive and I understand most informative conference.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood interjecting:

Mr GUNN: I received this document from people associated with Mr Spiers. Mr Spiers is a reasonable, responsible and highly regarded person. He is a practical person who has to live in these areas. I would back him every time against the sort of nonsense with which Mrs Fisher is associated. Mark my words, these people are about to have their day, because the public at large has had a thorough gutfull of these arrogant, irresponsible people trying to impose their will on the people of the Flinders Ranges and elsewhere. The people in the Flinders Ranges are quite capable of making their own decisions. They are the people who live there. They have done a good job in the past and do not need these irresponsible academics trying to come in from outside and impose their will upon them.

Ms Gayler interjecting:

Mr GUNN: It is all right for the honourable member to laugh. We know of the sort of influences on her during the last session. I am well aware of some of the activities that she was involved in when she was in the Minister's office. I will deal with those on another occasion, because they need highlighting in this House. With the sort of nonsense that this woman has written, and for the Minister to be so weak and naive, it reflects badly on his administration. I want to refer now to the Vegetation Clearance Authority—

Members interjecting:

Mr GUNN: Members opposite are saying that I should not raise this matter in the House.

Members interjecting:

Mr GUNN: Of course you are, because you do not like the facts. Well, you will get them. That organisation was set up to fairly judge applications to clear native vegetation. Just this morning I read through the joint press statement that was made by the United Farmers and Stockowners and the Minister's office. I have had the unfortunate experience of appearing before that authority on a number of occasions.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

Mr GUNN: I was the advocate on behalf of my mistreated constituent. Most of these people are good, hard-working Australians, the sort of people who built this country, the sort of people who will continue to provide the funds so that these irresponsible elements can live here, so that these great non-productive departments will continue on their merry way putting unnecessary barriers in the way of the community and not doing one ounce of good for the community. It would appear to me that this authority is a complete waste of time, because the environmentalists on it are not a bit interested. Facts do not seem to count with them. The Chairman is the one who determines what will take place, so why not allow the Chairman to determine the lot, if that is how it proceeds? The United Farmers and Stockowners have taken a most responsible line on this issue.

Ms Gayler interjecting:

Mr GUNN: The honourable member would not know anything about clearing native vegetation. If we took her out into the scrub and turned her around three times, she would not find her way out of it. She cannot tell me anything about native vegetation. I have had a long experience in that area, and I will not be told a lot of nonsense by that academic. She will only be here for a very brief period. The 22 per cent swing that took place in Sydney ought to be a clear indication of what will happen to her and a number of these oncers sitting on the back benches.

However, let us not get too excited about the honourable member.

A review of this legislation is long overdue. People should be entitled to clear reasonable areas of land. Not only should there be a review, but commonsense should apply. It is not applying at present. People's expectations were raised, and they thought that they would receive compensation. However, the compensation that they have been offered is not only inadequate but an insult to the intelligence of those people who have to apply for it. In one case with which I dealt I was absolutely horrified with the response, so I wrote to the Chairman and said that obviously they did not understand what we had put to them, because no reasonable person could come to that conclusion. We requested the right to appear again but have not received an answer to that correspondence. So I am not particularly impressed with that organisation. I believe that the time has come not only to review this matter but also to replace the personnel involved with more reasonable and practical people.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

Mr GUNN: The compensation is so miserable that it is an insult to people's intelligence. There were other issues that I wanted to talk about, but time has escaped me. However, finally, I believe that the Minister of Agriculture has a great deal to answer for in this State. He and his colleagues supported the Kerin rural package, which was an exercise in public relations, nothing more. What has happened about the plant breeding facility? Where is it to go? When is that project to commence?

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

Mr GUNN: It is going to involve not only Government money. The honourable member does not understand. What about the money industry puts in?

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

Mr GUNN: The Labor Party does not understand that that is putting money into the future: that is building an income. The non-productive things that the honourable member's Party wants to spend money on all the time are a continual drag on the community—it is like people carrying a bag of lead on their shoulders. We are advocating doing things that will encourage production. We believe that you have to produce to survive!

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

Mr GREGORY secured the adjournment of the debate.

[Sitting suspended from 12.48 to 2 p.m.]

STATUTES AMENDMENT (RURAL AND OTHER FINANCE) BILL

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

PETITIONS: PROSTITUTION

Petitions signed by 436 residents of South Australia praying that the House oppose any measures to decriminalise prostitution and uphold present laws against the exploitation of women by prostitution were presented by Messrs De Laine, Groom, and Keneally, and Mrs Appleby.

Petitions received.

PETITIONS: ELECTRONIC GAMING DEVICES

Petitions signed by 1 116 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to permit the use of electronic gaming devices were presented by Messrs Becker, M.J. Evans, and Keneally.

Petitions received.

PETITION: 652 BUS ROUTE

A petition signed by 260 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to reinstate the 652 bus route as a matter of urgency was presented by Mr Oswald.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: WORLD THREE DAY EVENT

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I wish to inform the House of the actions that the Government intends to take to resolve the financial problems of the Organising Committee of the Sixth World Three Day Event staged earlier this year at Gawler. One point I wish to make is that the controversy surrounding the financial affairs of the Three Day Event should not be allowed to negate its success as an international sporting and touring event. As I have said in this House previously, there is no doubt the event was staged successfully, and as an event was a credit to South Australia.

It gave us a considerable amount of national and international attention, and the economic activity generated in the tourist, hospitality and service industries was significant. Despite this, there is no doubt the event was a financial failure. The origins of the event go back to 1981 when it was decided by a group of private individuals involved in equestrian activities to stage a World Three Day Event as part of the Jubilee 150 celebrations. An organising committee was established and Government assistance was sought through the Jubilee 150 Board.

In May 1983, the Government received a formal request from the organising committee for assistance to meet the deficit for staging the event. In September 1983, the Government was presented with a statement from the committee which indicated a projected deficit for the event of \$244 300. On that basis the Government decided to commit \$240 000 to the event.

However, based on the most up-to-date information the Government now has from the organising committee, the actual projected deficit is \$2.2 million. Already the Government has committed significant funds to the event. Government grants totalling \$1 279 453 have been committed from the Jubilee 150 Board, Department of Recreation and Sport, and a special extra allowance from Treasury. In addition, Government departments have provided services to the value of \$22 437 for which they have not been paid. That is a total of \$1 301 890, compared with the original expectation of \$240 000 Government funding. Additional assistance was provided when the Government purchased the land to be used for the cross-country stage at a cost of \$702 000. The land was purchased on the basis that it would be available for Government use or sale after the event. And now the Government is being asked to commit a further \$920 000 to the event so that all creditors can be paid.

Of course, there were some factors over which the organising committee for the event had no control. For instance, the falling value of the Australian dollar meant that the costs of transporting the horses that were to take part in the event into Australia rose \$200 000 above the original estimate. Similarly, a number of other costs were increased due to unavoidable inflationary pressures. But these in themselves did not constitute a financial crisis. There were other costs which had not been properly assessed.

As an example, the cost of laying out the venue for the cross-country event was originally estimated at \$101 000. The actual cost was eventually \$1 479 395. On the income side, the event also suffered through less ticket sales than anticipated and there is evidence that many gained admission without paying. Less money was received for television rights than originally anticipated. Television rights were estimated initially at \$60 000, but actually yielded \$13 860.

In March this year, only nine weeks before the event was about to begin, and at a time when arrangements were irrevocably in place, the Government was informed that there were severe organisational and grave financial problems with the event. Even at this point, contracts for track construction had not been finalised. Ticket sales were well below target. The committee had not negotiated the final television rights for the event and, as I detailed before, there were significant budget overruns.

The Government reacted promptly to the situation and discussed the options available with the organising committee. The Grand Prix Board was called upon to provide its expertise and organisational ability on a fee for service basis to ensure the event would go ahead. On this basis the Government agreed to provide extra funds on the assessment that the deficit would be a maximum of \$860 000, and indeed might be less. This figure, far from being a maximum, now appears to be about half the actual amount needed.

The problem we now face is that some of the creditors who contracted to the event in good faith and confident of payment are now facing bankruptcy. In some cases creditors may well have believed that the Government was underwriting in full the entire event without qualification. To leave these creditors without any payment now would be unfair. Accordingly, I informed the Chairman of the organising committee a short time ago that the Government would provide further funds to pay validated and verified accounts. Funds will also be available immediately for the payment of the prize money.

However, I want to make it clear to the House that this decision does not mean the Government is a bottomless pit of funds for any private, non-government event that runs into financial difficulties. The community demands, quite rightly, that the Government must be administered efficiently and in the most cost-efficient way. At the same time, the community should also insist that non-government administered and funded schemes should be run efficiently and to budget. In the current economic climate, the Government simply does not have the funds to step in and bail out projects that run into financial difficulty. Certainly we will continue to assist in funding such projects in the community interest, but where it is a shared responsibility, people must realise that the Government will not, and cannot, automatically underwrite all costs.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:
By the Minister of Transport (Hon. G.F. Keneally)—

Pursuant to Statute—
Parks Community Centre by-laws.

STANDING ORDERS

The SPEAKER: Members would be aware that the Chair has been endeavouring to discourage members from breaching Standing Order 125 in relation to introducing debate, comment and opinion into their questions without notice. This has led to attention being given to the responsibilities placed on the answers to such questions. The Chair intends to uphold the traditional view that a certain degree of latitude is given to ministerial replies to questions. However, the Chair acknowledges the point of order by the member for Davenport regarding Standing Order 125 that Ministers are included as members for the restraint that, 'In answering any such question, a member shall not debate the matter to which the same refers.' The Chair is of the view that an earlier interpretation of some years ago is not a correct one.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair accordingly upholds the point of order of the member for Davenport that Ministers should not debate the substance of a question. However, the problem then arises as to what constitutes 'debate' in a Minister's response. Ministers may feel an obligation to provide information to the House that may not have been specifically mentioned in the question, and it is in the interests of the House that they should do so. In providing that additional material, it is the view of the Chair that Ministers should refrain from introducing material which is likely to provoke immediate debate in the Chamber by way of interjection and other such responses.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has no wish to unduly restrict the liveliness of Question Time, but calls on Ministers to refrain from introducing irrelevancies or unduly provocative comments in their replies, particularly when questions have not incorporated material of that nature. However, the Chair would stress that mere dissatisfaction with a Minister's reply is not in itself an excuse to justify interjections or points of order claiming a Minister is allegedly 'debating' a response. The Minister's reply would have to be, in the view of the Chair, excessively irrelevant and provocative before the Chair would entertain points of order based on claims that a Minister was participating in a debate on the matter raised by a question without notice.

QUESTION TIME

STATE BUDGET

Mr OLSEN: In view of the Premier's statement to the House last Thursday that, 'We are in the middle of budget deliberations . . . members should wait and see the impact of the federal budget . . . we are going through the process of finalising the budget at the moment', will he say whether the 1986-87 budget has still to be finalised?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes.

FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT

Mr PETERSON: Will the Minister of Marine inform the House of the specific items of firefighting equipment that

has been upgraded at the Port Adelaide oil berths (not the terminals or the depots—but the berths) in the past year? In July 1985 a Marine and Harbors report containing, in part, an assessment of the emergency equipment protecting the berths stated:

Firefighting standards are inadequate at all berths, with virtually nothing at M, N and OH4. J berth is the best in the Port, but only complies with level 1 of the AAPMA recommendations on tanker terminal safety. Level 2 is the minimum desirable level.

A question was asked in this House on Wednesday, 14 August 1985—51 weeks ago, or one week short of a year—about the adequacy of fire protection. The Minister's reply was:

Yes, action is under way on the whole question of petroleum facilities in South Australia, especially in relation to the very important safety issue of firefighting equipment . . . I assure the honourable member, in response to his specific question, that firefighting and other safety issues have been treated as matters of urgency.

It has been put to me that 'action' and 'urgency' should now be clarified in relation to shore facilities that are acknowledged, in the Department of Marine and Harbors own report, to be below the acceptable Australian standards.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The situation in relation to the tanker berth at Port Adelaide is that on 15 October last year Cabinet approved, in principle, the provision of a new petroleum products tanker berth on the inner harbor. Discussions were held with the oil companies and they provided useful assistance and input into the design of the new facility. Estimates of the cost of the new berth are \$9.4 million and details were submitted to Cabinet for referral to the Public Works Standing Committee on 10 March this year. That Cabinet decision was referred to the Capital Works Budget Committee for a report. That committee, in its report of 16 April this year, indicated, amongst other things, that it was its opinion that other solutions that may fit better into longer-term planning of the whole port should be considered, and the department is currently reassessing the whole matter on that basis.

I expect to be briefed on the department's findings in the next few days. In the meantime, operational procedures at the wharf during tanker discharge are in accordance with the best safety practices, thus minimising risks as much as possible. I understand that, following the Coroner's report and recommendations, the Shell company has upgraded its loading facilities in the road transport loading bay where a fire occurred on its land. I am concerned as much as the member for Semaphore is about access to the wharf area and the need for upgrading the firefighting equipment. Following the briefing that I will receive following the further investigation by the department I will be taking up those concerns with them in the hope that we can soon do something about upgrading these matters.

STATE BUDGET

Mr OLSEN: In view of the minute from the Under Treasurer to departmental heads dated 22 July, will the Premier cease misleading the Parliament and the public and announce what revenue raising measures, if any, will be contained in the State budget? The minute from the Under Treasurer exposes the Premier's statement last Thursday, which was repeated in this House today, as being completely false and misleading. The first line of the Under Treasurer's minute states:

Cabinet approved the 1986-87 budget at its meeting on 21 July 1986.

In fact, the Government has already made its major spending and revenue raising decisions and departments have

been told precisely how much they will have to spend this financial year. Newspaper reports over the past two months indicate that the Government has been responsible for constant speculation about its financial position. This culminated in the Minister of Health floating the property tax proposal.

Last year the Premier announced the major revenue implications of the budget on 5 August. In 1983 he announced them on 4 August. The Under Treasurer's minute shows that there is no reason why the Premier cannot do the same this year. It has been put to me that failure to do so indicates that he is waiting until after the federal budget announcement of 19 August to blame the bad State budget news on his federal colleagues.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair suggests that the Leader of the Opposition use the phrase 'It has been put to me' rather judiciously in phrasing his questions.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Leader of the Opposition was at one time, admittedly for a very short time indeed, a member of a Government—a most undistinguished Government, almost forgotten now—of this State, although the residue of it still sits along some of the benches opposite.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There is another of the fossils interjecting. I would have thought that, even though it is now some considerable time ago and Opposition members memories do dim fast (I know that their memory and attention span represents 12 hours, if they are lucky, and certainly not 24 hours), the Leader of the Opposition could remember—

Mr Lewis: Mr Speaker—

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: He has to have protection from his back bench.

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, as I recall at the outset of Question Time, you provided the House with a statement about your interpretation of Standing Order 125 and others relevant to debating a question. So far we have heard nothing from the Premier, as I understand it, relevant to the question put to him by the Leader, and I would ask for your ruling about the relevance of the remarks made by the Premier in response to the question put to him by the Leader.

The SPEAKER: In response to the point of order raised by the member for Murray-Mallee, I will quote my exact words from the penultimate paragraph of the statement, as follows:

The Chair has no wish to unduly restrict the liveliness of Question Time but calls on Ministers to refrain from introducing irrelevancies or unduly provocative comments in their replies, particularly when questions have not incorporated material of that nature.

It would appear to the Chair that the question did incorporate material of that nature.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Part of the problem is the interjections from the other side, because members opposite do not like what I am going to say. It is very relevant indeed to remind the Leader of the Opposition about the budget process of Government because, if he casts his mind back, he will understand the meaning of the minute that he flourishes so grandly before us. In fact, the budget has not been finalised.

Mr Olsen: The Under Treasurer says it has.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Well, the Under Treasurer is wrong. It has not been finalised. If the interpretation that the Leader of the Opposition seeks to give to that statement

is put on it, it is a wrong statement. A number of very major decisions are still to be made on the budget this year.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition should be aware by now that he is not permitted to brandish documents in the Chamber or stage any other displays.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: When caught out the Opposition becomes very desperate—it is quite interesting. What the Leader of the Opposition has done every year. At such time as the Government is in a position to provide indicative estimates for departments in relation to their planning and, more particularly, their expenditure over that period between the introduction of the budget and the end of the financial year, those estimates are, and indeed have been, provided. The Leader of the Opposition is well aware of it, because he has already complained about his particular indicative allocation. Those indicative allocations have been approved. The Leader and Deputy Leader are going to try to re-interpret or alter it. Those indicative allocations have been finalised, but they are subject—

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The way in which the statement is being interpreted is wrong. All departments have been advised of their indicative allocations. They are told what they are going to work to. It has also been made clear that these could be subject to change, and there are many other elements of the budget in relation to revenue and specific expenditure items that have not been determined. That is exactly how it works every year. We lock up the budget as early as we can. This year, as I have said on a number of occasions, we have a particular and major problem in that we cannot anticipate the federal budget.

It is not just simply knowing what the Federal Government will do in relation to expenditure cuts and their implications for the State: it is even the actual estimates on which the federal budget is to be based. The Leader of the Opposition might learn a little if he listens to this instead of asking smart alec questions. How about trying to understand something about public finance? Already—

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Leader of the Opposition to order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Already—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will just go on and ignore the interjection, and get it on the record. Already the Federal Government has, we understand, begun to adjust its inflation estimate for this year. That has a very direct impact on the Government's anticipated expenditure. As I have already said, we are this year under-providing in the incidental areas to departments. That is, we are providing a lower than inflation level. There are some who are objecting very strongly to that—the Leader of the Opposition in the forefront—because they do not want to accept the savings that are involved.

I am sympathetic to that, because, if in fact we provide a difference below the rate of inflation that simply cannot be handled, that could cause real problems to Government departments and indeed to the Leader of the Opposition, the last person whom I would wish to restrict. For all of those reasons, this year's federal budget is particularly crucial, and I stand ready to make quite major changes to our budget even at that late stage of the proceedings. So, this is merely a standard circular that Treasury sends out when the indicative estimates are being prepared stating, 'This is what is being finalised; this is what you can work on; and there it is'. It does not mean that the budget is finalised. Indeed, I can assure members that it is not.

'STOP DROP' ZONES FOR SCHOOLS

Mr TYLER: Will the Minister of Education ensure that the Education Department discusses with local government the establishment of 'stop drop' zones in the planning of future schools? The Reynella East campus, which is one of the biggest campuses in the State, has demonstrated to me the horrendous traffic management problems that can arise around a school. Accordingly, it has been suggested to me that, had a 'stop drop' zone been incorporated in the original plan, many of the problems which now exist and which would involve costly solutions could have been avoided. Of course, it has also been put to me that this is not a one off or unique situation. In fact, other schools in my electorate, namely, the Flagstaff Primary School, Aberfoyle campus and Happy Valley Primary School, have demonstrated similar problems to that of the Reynella East campus.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I can give the honourable member that undertaking. I have visited a number of schools in the honourable member's area, including the Reynella East High School with the honourable member, to consider some of the matters that he has raised. The Education Department does have a policy of negotiating with the relevant local government authorities on the most appropriate provision for the depositing and collecting of children for any specified site. A number of factors affect the selection of the preferred option, including the width of roads, traffic density, nearby housing, the shape of the land, provision of controlled crossings, public transport routes, and the like.

I would confirm that there is already close consultation with the local government body in making this assessment with respect to this provision. I have asked the Education Department to review its regulations and instructions on this matter to see that they are brought up to date if there are some deficiencies. I suggest that in many cases the decisions that have been taken in the past have proven to be inadequate because of changes in circumstances of one sort or another, so it is then difficult to remedy those at a later date. I think that may well be the situation with the school to which the honourable member has referred. I will once again have a look at it to see if any further assistance can be provided.

FRINGE BENEFITS TAX

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: My question is directed to the Premier. How will the Government meet the cost of the fringe benefits tax? The Under Treasurer's minute, which indicates that the budget has been finalised, also states that no allowance has been made for the fringe benefits tax. Either the Government will have to cut its spending on education, health and the like, the budget deficit will have to blow out and State taxes rise, or assistance to public servants in remote areas will have to be reduced.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: So that members of the Government who made the decision may know precisely the basis on which the Under Treasurer sent out the minute, I shall quote from it as follows:

Cabinet approved the 1986-87 budget at its meeting on 21 July 1986.

Later, the minute indicates that the method of payment of the fringe benefits tax has not yet been worked out. The document states:

Fringe benefits tax: These allocations include no additional provision for fringe benefits tax. The way in which this matter will be treated is still under consideration and you will be advised as soon as practicable.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is perfectly clear to a rational reader. It says, in effect, 'It has been approved. Here is your allocation. We yet have to work out how we will pay the fringe benefits tax.' So, I ask the Premier how he will do it.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This is quite extraordinary. I can give the Deputy Leader a little more credit than his Leader, because he has had a little more experience in Government and he knows the process. In fact, the Deputy was a member of the so-called razor gang of the previous Government, being directly involved in the budget process; so he knows much about it. From the way in which he asked his question and the look on his face, one knows just how seriously he is treating it! I have already answered a question in this House on the fringe benefits tax, and I repeat what I said then. First, I was asked, I think by the member for Coles, what the tax would amount to. The honourable member will recall my answer. I gave the amount that we had so far identified in approximate terms. She asked how we would treat it and I replied that at that stage it had not been decided. A number of options are available. We either continue with the existing level of fringe benefits and make no adjustments or changes, simply paying the tax to Canberra, or we consider the nature of fringe benefits and whether adjustments or changes should be made. That process is proceeding.

The minute refers to the indicative allocations given so far (which I again stress are subject to change: I have made that warning clear and I am glad that it is on the record openly). The minute referred to is from the Under Treasurer, not from the Treasurer. The way in which we shall treat this matter has not been determined, as has been made clear. At this stage departments have not been given specific allocations to make up that amount. That does not mean that we shall not pay the full amount. It can be done in various ways. The first of these is simply on a whole of Government basis, the Government paying whatever is the amount of tax involved on behalf of all departments, and not showing it in the individual departmental lines.

Therefore, in the restricted document that is being quoted by the Opposition (restricted in the sense that it applies to the estimates of one department) it would not show on the departmental allocation. Another way in which to approach this matter would be to absorb the amount by requiring departments, if paying FBT, under whatever the general policy decision on that may be, to find savings from other areas. This would mean that there would be no overall cost to the Government. As I have said, various options are available. At this stage we cannot determine which of those options we should adopt. Again, this highlights exactly what I have said previously: certain key decisions must be made in relation to this year's budget but they cannot be made until, in particular, the Federal budget is published.

ENERGY NEEDS

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Has the Minister of Mines and Energy seen published remarks made by the Hon. Ian Gillfillan calling for a study to assess the least costly option for providing power in South Australia, and suggestions by him that the State should be examining utilisation of energy derived from the wind and the sun to help meet our energy needs?

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I am sure that the member for Mitcham would know all about wind power. Does the Minister believe that Mr Gilfillan's claim is justified?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: As a matter of interest, I saw the article in the *Advertiser* which no doubt prompted the honourable member's question. I must express some amazement at the contents of the article, because most members of this House, if not members of the public generally, would agree that Mr Gilfillan has purported recently to become some sort of guru on energy matters in this State. Yet we find that in calling for this study he has overlooked (perhaps I should say that he has forgotten) that the Advisory Committee on Future Electricity Generation Options spent a year doing precisely what he says we should be doing. That occurred in 1983-84, and the committee released a three volume report on that topic. Apparently, Mr Gilfillan has also overlooked the fact that one of those volumes, entitled *Possible Contribution of Alternative Energy Sources*, specifically addressed all the main alternative energy technologies, including sun and wind, and assessed their ability to contribute to the State's power needs and the cost of that contribution in the future.

At this stage, I am tempted (and I think that I may because it would be factual) to suggest that I would not quarrel with any suggestion that Mr Gilfillan would make an ideal expert in wind—wind only. The advisory committee found that few, if any, of the alternative technologies were at that stage economically viable for large scale supply of electricity to the ETSA grid, and it said that, if current trends continued, some might be viable options by the late 1990s. The committee recommended continued monitoring and evaluation of six alternative technologies for possible use in South Australia, and the Government is following that recommendation. That has been announced during the period since 1984.

The advisory committee recommended specific evaluation programs on wind, photovoltaics, co-generation and load management, and members may be interested to hear an update on how these programs are progressing. It is even possible that these details will get through to Mr Gilfillan and we will not have any more wind on this topic. First, Statewide monitoring of South Australia's wind resources is now being undertaken with 29 monitoring sites in operation. Data is being gathered and evaluated, and details of the performance of wind generators are being collected worldwide from manufacturers, utilities and other groups. Late this year, I expect to receive recommendations from the wind energy team on the desirability of proceeding with the construction of a demonstration wind power facility.

On photovoltaics, the Government has, with the Federal Government, already undertaken a joint evaluation of larger systems of this type as part of a Japanese sponsored project. This study has indicated that the economics of such systems are very poor at this time. However, the State is assisting Dunlite to develop a low voltage photovoltaic lighting system for both local and Asian markets. The State has installed a co-generation unit at the Queen Victoria Hospital to evaluate and demonstrate small scale units. We have also held discussions with large industry on co-generation, but it must be said that potential in this area in South Australia is very limited. In addition, the benefits are uncertain when it is considered that the fuel would be natural gas. I do not think that I need expand on that topic, because members will understand why I have referred to it.

Demand management is also being addressed. The utilities are working with the Department of Mines and Energy on a demand management program, and major initiatives

are being evaluated. A data collection program is under way and ETSA's load switching device (which incidentally is being manufactured in South Australia) will be tested this financial year. Mr Gilfillan also mentioned energy efficient appliances and a number of other energy conservation matters.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The Government is currently considering legislation similar to that introduced in New South Wales and Victoria, but more of that anon.

Finally, matters such as tariff structures and buy-back rates are being addressed by the working party to review energy pricing and tariff structures, which is due to report to me shortly. If Mr Gilfillan is setting out to become the State's guru on energy matters, then quite clearly he is starting a fair distance behind scratch, if his recent remarks are any indication of the performance we can expect from him.

The SPEAKER: Order! In view of the Minister's exposition on photovoltaics, it is probably appropriate that I should now call the member for Light.

STATE OF ECONOMY

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: In view of today's grim news about the State economy, with unemployment of 4 700, employment down 4 500 and the quarterly survey by the Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the State Bank referring to a loss of confidence in the economy, does the Premier stand by the statement he made on 15 November last year, 'Treasurer Keating's economic policies are correct', and a further statement in his election policy speech, 'Our recovery is a reality. It is all coming together. South Australia is up and running'?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I accept the spirit in which the question is offered. I would be the last to accuse the member for Light of trying to put down the State or knock it in some way, although his question comes perilously close to it. In August 1986 I do not think it is necessary for me to canvass the major economic problems that Australia has suffered from particularly over the last six months. The problems have been quite devastating, and anyone who has any connection with the rural industry knows, for instance, that, despite the fact that the so-called J curve effect is working and has been demonstrated to work, we have increased exports, and all those predictions are coming true. I am amazed that some members opposite claim a connection with people on the land and their problems. For a start, they obviously have no understanding of rural economics. It is about time they consulted with John Elliott and a few others in this world and tried to learn a little.

Despite this, the prices are so abysmal that we could increase the volume vastly and still not be any better off. There is no question that in relation to agricultural products, particularly grain, and in relation to coal, iron ore and most metals, with the exception of gold, our prices have fallen devastatingly.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I invite the honourable member not to shout his prejudices but to look at the facts. The labour costs in this country have, in fact, gone down in real terms. We are far more competitive worldwide than we have ever been. Most of the nations we compete with do not have as high a cost structure as we have. We have to face the fact that the Australian trading problem at the moment is a desperate one which requires every Australian's understanding and cooperation to do something about it.

Solving the problem does not depend on a minority of about 34 per cent, at the last count, whose job it is, apparently, to try to compound the problem and create division.

Having spoken briefly about Australia, I hasten to add that, of course, South Australia is suffering, too. Have we not shown on past occasions that the nature of our economy is such that we are often in the front line in certain key industries—automotive manufacturing being one of them—in terms of both employment and the impact of a drop in sales? That is why in the whole period we have been in office this Government has worked very hard to diversify South Australia's economic base. There has never been greater attention to employment in our tourism, hospitality and service industries, because they are such high employers; there has never been more attention to high technology and in those other areas where we have made major strides.

In all those areas of restructuring, such as motor vehicle components, and so on, my Government has taken a lead. That is why our manufacturing employment has held up better in difficult times than it ever has in South Australia's previous history. That is not to say it is good: we are suffering, too, and the best thing South Australians can do is not drop their bundle, as members opposite want to do, but make sure that we work together to build on that diversity and those strengths which the Government has identified as priorities. With a bit of cooperation, South Australia will surmount this economic crisis without a doubt.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has no wish to again call the Leader of the Opposition to order. The honourable member for Albert Park.

VOLUNTEERS IN NATIONAL PARKS

Mr HAMILTON: Before directing my question to the Minister for Environment and Planning and with your indulgence, Mr Speaker, and that of the House, I know all members of the House would like to extend their congratulations to the member for Henley Beach on his fiftieth birthday today. I hope his celebrations are not so noisy as to breach the Noise Control Act! Does the Minister for Environment and Planning support the use of volunteers in national parks? Are volunteers, in fact, used in parks and, if they are, to what extent have they been used?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I rather thought this might have been the first question from the Opposition today, because last evening we were treated to some vague and unsubstantiated allegations and some *non sequiturs* as to the influence of the trade union movement on me in relation to this matter. I challenged the Opposition spokesperson to ask me a question today, but she has not done so. I have taken some pains to obtain for members a picture of the very comprehensive way in which some volunteers are used in our parks system.

South Australia is regarded as the leading State in Australia in its promotion and usage of volunteers in parks. There are two principal ways that volunteers are used in our parks—through groups known as Friends of Parks and through the scheme Volunteers in Parks. The Public Service Association and the Federated Miscellaneous Workers Union were both involved with NPWS staff in setting out guidelines for the establishment of Volunteers in Parks and Friends of Parks.

The first Friends of Parks groups began in the time of the former Government, as did voluntary projects. The scheme, then in its infancy, has grown enormously to the extent that other States frequently seek advice from South

Australia on its community support schemes. There are now 20 Friends of Parks groups established, most of them in the past three years. At present there are approximately 620 members of Friends of Parks. Some of the parks, such as Fort Glanville, Old Government House, Offshore Islands, Kyeema (the Children's Forest) and Belair, have groups of school children and adults continually doing voluntary work to support the paid staff, so much so that statistics on this continual work are hard to keep.

In addition to the 20 friends groups, there were about 75 voluntary groups which helped in our parks in 1985, producing 800 'person days' of work by over 1 000 people. In 1986, the figures are considerably higher, with schools, scouts and guides, hunting organisations, cave groups, conservationists, fishermen, historical groups, farmers, town residents and disabled people all lending support. This work has been unquestionably supported and assisted by the above unions with which liaison occurs constantly, and simple guidelines are adhered to. In five years, these unions have not disallowed one project, although they have been good enough to offer guidelines towards a successful blend of volunteers and paid staff.

Some examples of voluntary work carried out by volunteers in parks and friends of parks groups are: revegetation, weed control, walking trails, history trails, restoration of historical buildings and cultural sites, koala counts, wildlife monitoring, bird banding, litter collection, direct native flora seed scattering and collection, office work, photo points, cave cleaning, waterfowl nesting boxes, typing and telephone work, information hosts, providing public open days, 'Adopt a valley' or 'Adopt an animal enclosure', 'Adopt a trail', and so on.

One exciting voluntary concept that I announced was the Campground Hosts Scheme—the first in any Australian park—whereby retired caravan owners live on-site at national parks camp grounds and look after the visitors and the area, under supervision of the nearest ranger. This has caused great interest and will be extended this summer.

In May, I publicly launched the first project in South Australia by the Australian Trust for Conservation Volunteers, a Ballarat based group which works within schools to organise camping work bees in parks. South Australia has also a good track record in the use of handicapped/disabled people to contribute in our parks. I have also launched two new consultative committees in the past few months, making 14 altogether.

A recent concept has been the acceptance of adult overseas students who we have placed in our parks for up to one year's voluntary work as a means of gaining experience in our park techniques. There are two such people starting in the coming weeks—one from Denmark, one from Scotland. South Australia is certainly leading the field in this area and has the utmost support and cooperation from the trade unions and the park staff.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: It is interesting to note that the ground has now changed. Members opposite were not interested in this before, and they would not do anything about it. I said at the beginning that South Australia leads the way. This was highlighted when Mr Dene Cordes earned a Churchill Fellowship in 1985 to go to the United States, Canada, Europe and Scandinavia, researching community support for national parks. He found that South Australia was already well advanced in full in comparison with world standards, when the ratio of population volunteers was compared. It is interesting to note that Mr Cordes carried with him a letter of introduction from the Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council, Mr John Lesses.

GRAND PRIX GOLD PASSES

Mr INGERSON: Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport explain the circumstances in which he has apparently sold two complimentary Grand Prix gold passes and in return received payment of \$360 by cheque made out to him personally? I have in my possession two passes that fit the description given. They are marked 'guest', and record that no payment was made for the original allocation. The Opposition has been approached by the holder of these passes, who has told us they were sold through a third party who required payment by cheque made out personally to Mr Kym Mayes. At the time of the approach to buy these tickets, the purchaser was not aware that they were marked 'guest'.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I have followed what I understood was the requirement in regard to the purchase of gold pass tickets for myself and for my family. I have made out a cheque personally to the Grand Prix office and purchased the tickets at the going market price for myself and for my family. In relation to that, I think my brother-in-law is involved with his friends in the purchase. That was understood—that I have followed the requirements of the Grand Prix office. I have nothing else to add other than I thought I had followed the set procedure. In fact, I understand that I followed the procedure established by the public. I have nothing more to say. I cannot explain what the member for Bragg is driving at, nor the criticism that he raises as a consequence.

NEW ZEALAND AIR TRAVEL

Mr RANN: My question is directed to the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Tourism in another place. Will the Minister of Tourism inquire of Air New Zealand, the Commonwealth and the New Zealand Minister of Tourism about the possibility of providing for a direct weekly Air New Zealand flight from Christchurch to Adelaide and return? It has been put to me by members of the tourist industry, both here and from New Zealand, that direct Adelaide/Christchurch flights would be viable. This House would be aware that there are at present two return flights per week by Qantas connecting Adelaide and the North Island city of Auckland, but no direct link with Adelaide's sister city in the South Island, Christchurch.

I have been advised that the large number of American and Japanese tourists visiting the South Island's alpine region through and out of Christchurch are being denied access to South Australia except by choosing more expensive and indirect routes through Auckland and Eastern States cities. I have been told that Air New Zealand aggressively promotes a New Zealand/Australia package in North America and Japan. However, South Australia is missing out on the benefits of this 'down-under' triangle because of the absence of a direct Adelaide/Christchurch connection. It has been put to me that we are also missing out on a substantial number of South Island tourists, even though South Australia's profile in New Zealand has increased substantially with our Grand Prix, Jubilee 150, our Festival of Arts and, of course, our Casino, which is of special interest to New Zealanders, who have no casino of their own.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I will be delighted to refer the honourable member's question to my colleague the Minister of Tourism. I am well aware of the interest of New Zealanders in South Australia and of South Australians in New Zealand. I believe reciprocal trade is available in both locations. The rights that Air New Zealand has in Australia

and the rights that Qantas has in New Zealand are well known. The two airlines work together very effectively. I am sure that, if the Minister accepts the recommendations of the honourable member, it will be only to the benefit of South Australian tourism and all those tourists throughout the world who have a duty in my mind to come here and see how well we do things.

CEREAL GRAIN CRISIS

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Will the Minister of Agriculture divert from existing staff sufficient skilled personnel to form a task force to combat the cereal grain crisis looming in South Australia and direct that unit, as a matter of urgency, to step up research into alternative grain legume varieties for which produce there is reportedly a huge ready market in South East Asia, China and India? There is evidence on the Government record of precedent in this form of arranging emergency personnel diversion, certainly in the case of fire, flood and akin disasters. However, to liken this request to a truly rural precedent I cite a case in the mid 1970s when a blue green aphid plague threatened South Australia's pastures and almost wiped out our then widely used Hunter River lucerne variety. Such a task force was then quickly enlisted by the Government, and from that swift action a potential wipe out and rural economic disaster was headed off.

The Minister acknowledged in an address to the Rural Media Association on Monday of this week the critical situation confronting our own South Australian wheat farmers in the face of recent United States cereal wheat subsidies for sales into our traditional and vital markets of China and Russia. At that media luncheon the Minister said that his department was 'looking' at the issue. However, it has been put to me that positive action of a previously proven kind by the Minister is urgently required.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the member for Alexandra for his question. Given my recent trip overseas it is quite relevant to be able to answer that question in the House, because it is quite apparent (although on our visit we concentrated on horticultural products) that particularly in South-East Asia there is a large market for stock feeds of the type referred to by the honourable member. The department is concentrating some effort in looking at these alternative areas not only from a marketing point of view but also for research within the department as part of its normal program.

In the next budget period I hope that we can look at devoting resources towards not only research in these areas but also in terms of the market. I suppose that predominantly, market research should be done by the industry and the bodies that represent farmers and rural producers in this country. However, I am sure it is a role of both State and Federal Governments to look at encouraging and supporting market exploration so that we can penetrate and find new outlets for our products. I think, in particular, legumes is one area we can concentrate on. I know that there is quite a deal of interest in the South Australian rural community as well as overseas for our product.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: We haven't got the varieties. That is the question.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The honourable member is saying that we do not have the varieties. That is where the department can play a major part in research. Presently, we are devoting some effort to the provision of the market and an officer is currently overseas assessing grain legume prospects. I accept the point raised by the honourable member.

The market information will assist us in determining and identifying what efforts we need to put into developing the markets and the commodity in Australia. Finally, it was obvious to me, and I am sure it was obvious to the officers who accompanied me on my recent trip, that we need to have people who can identify what the overseas market requires, in particular, the commodity, the quality, the style in which it is delivered, the packaging and the manner in which it is provided to the overseas market. It is important to have officers from within both the industry and the Government feeding back to rural producers in this State information about the type of commodity that is needed overseas and how it should be presented. I share the member for Alexandra's interest, and I am sure that the department has accepted what he says, because I have raised this with them, as have other members of the rural community, both through farmer representatives and in the media.

PARENTS AND STUDENTS IN SCHOOLS

Mr KLUNDER: Will the Minister of Education give a progress report on the Year of Parents and Students in Schools? It is now half way through 1986, the Year of Parents and Students in Schools, and a number of people, including one school council in my electorate, have expressed interest in a progress report, particularly in connection with information gathered during the hotline phone-in held earlier this year.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question, because this Year of Parents and Students in Schools has raised a great deal of interest in the community. Indeed, it has already brought to light the degree of commitment and interest that there is in our schools by not only parents but a wide cross-section of the community. In my visits to some 70 schools this year I have witnessed the commitment and involvement of parents.

There are 1 100 official Jubilee 150 functions being conducted in schools throughout this State. That indicates the level of commitment in our schools to the community and the activities of those communities. Recently when I was at Robe for the school centenary I was advised of the involvement of the school in the Jubilee celebrations. Some 10 000 people came to Robe that weekend and the primary school, of fewer than 100 students, was the focal point in organising the activities for the historic re-enactments.

There have been a number of other important activities. The first was a public audit of the Education Department through the telephone hotline when 1 205 callers phoned over those three days. In the main they were parents, we were advised, of some 3 000 schoolchildren who raised a diversity of views about what schools should provide. Indeed, some 60 different views were put over that weekend. This indicates the high expectations that South Australians have in our education system—expectations, I am pleased to say, that this Government will meet and meet well.

It was very pleasing to see that nearly half of the callers were from country areas. Indeed, I had many complaints from people living in the country that they could not get through on the telephones and that they were continually jammed in the toll-free lines. There is a very strong commitment in country areas to the involvement of parents and students in our schools. The Government is concerned to work in partnership with parents, staff and students to build on the already high level of community involvement in our schools. Steps are being taken to develop policies as a result of what we are learning this year to establish parent

and student participation in decision-making in the education system.

Recently a State conference on community participation was held, and that was sponsored as being part of this year. A number of structures are being developed in the Education Department to provide for the greater involvement of parents and students. I have asked all senior officers of the Education Department to meet with schools and parents, wherever possible, and to listen to what those school communities have to say about our education system.

I have also instructed the non-teaching staff of our department—the clerical and Public Service administrative officers—to ensure that they spend some time visiting schools and talking to staff, students and parents—those they serve in the department—so that they can better understand what is happening in our schools. That is an area in which I have tried to give leadership in my visits to schools throughout the State since I have been Minister.

We have provided support for the State Council of Students and will continue to do so, and encourage the lively and creative role that students can play in our education process. The key aim of PASS is to promote community awareness and encourage parents to take an active interest in our schools. Evidence is that communication between the school and the home benefits students and enhances the education environment for the children for whom we all share a great responsibility. I assure members that I will be encouraging that, not only in this year of PASS, but in the future.

TWO TIME ZONES

Mr BLACKER: In view of the Deputy Premier's statements, reported on 22 and 23 April, made while he was Acting Premier in the absence of the Premier in China, will he state when the committee of the various interest groups, namely, industry, unions, farming organisations, and travel organisations, will be established to consider with the Government the merits and demerits of the two time zone plan for South Australia? Secondly, what will be the terms of reference of that committee? Thirdly, does the Government appreciate that the wide ramifications of the two time zones have an even greater implication than daylight saving, which at that time warranted a referendum? Finally, will the Government hold a referendum into the two time zone plan in South Australia?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: No, the Government will not be holding a referendum. The Government has established a unit that is busy consulting with all relevant interests with a view to making a recommendation to the Government in short order so that, if legislation is required, it can proceed this session. I have indicated all along some of the interests that obviously would have to be consulted, particularly in relation to the two time zone. The city of Port Lincoln is an obvious one because, in the event of a two time zone being adopted, there would be a question as to whether Port Lincoln would want to identify with the eastern part of the State, because it has an aeroplane link to Adelaide, or with its agricultural hinterland to the north, in whose interests such a decision could be made. Employer groups from time to time have raised their voices in request of the adoption of Eastern Standard Time and I am aware that, if that were to happen on top of daylight saving without the zoning of the State, it would increase the problems faced by people in the Far West. Obviously, there has to be consultation in that respect.

Finally, the unions, as the established representatives of the work force, would have to be involved in these consul-

tations. That is not something that has happened in my department: it is something that has happened and is continuing to happen within the Premier's Department. I expect that they would be in a position to report to the Government shortly and, if it is necessary to bring legislation to Parliament, that would happen soon after.

LONSDALE MOTOR RACETRACK

Mr ROBERTSON: Is the Minister for Environment and Planning in a position to reveal to the House the result of a recent application to the State Planning Commission by the Noarlunga City Council to relocate the Lonsdale motor racetrack to a position much closer to the residential area of Hallett Cove? Noarlunga council took the lead in providing a noisy recreation facility on the former Lonsdale rubbish dump some years ago, and I am advised that people, especially young people, from a number of council areas use the facility. I am also assured that the three clubs involved—the go-cart club, the motocross club and the mini-trail club—were grateful for that operational base.

The dump has now been consolidated and council is anxious to sell the land for light industrial purposes. Council has therefore applied to the Planning Commission for permission to relocate the track closer to Hallett Cove. In the interim Hallett Cove has become much more fully developed and I am informed that even in its present position the noise, dust and fumes from the track cause people from Hallett Cove, especially those in Columbia Crescent, considerable distress—so much so that many residents have put their homes on the market and have left the district. To avoid further distress to these people, particularly those in Columbia Crescent, I ask the Minister to provide the House with any information that he may have on the subject.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The South Australian Planning Commission met this week and entertained the application from the city of Noarlunga. I was informed by the Chairman of the commission yesterday, who met with me on another matter, that the application had been denied by the commission. I therefore assume that the existing track will either continue to be used or the council may wish to consider a further proposition and place it before the commission. As the honourable member would know, the commission is an independent body, and it has its function to carry out. I do not think that I am in a position to comment one way or another on the merits of the decision taken. It has been taken and Noarlunga council will have to reconsider its position on this matter.

ONKAPARINGA RIVER

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the Minister for Environment and Planning advise whether the quality study on the Onkaparinga River, which was commenced some 18 months ago, has been completed? If so, what are the results of that study and which recommendations have been adopted by the Government? If it has not been completed, I would like to know why.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: No specific recommendations have been placed before the Government as a result of that study. As to the rest of the question, I will get a considered reply for the honourable member.

RACING CODES

Mr FERGUSON: Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport outline to the House whether he has any evidence

with which to support the article in today's *News* relating to alleged rigging of horse racing, trotting and dog racing events?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for his question. I am disappointed that the *News* has now run this heading based on the the information that it has available to it. It seems fundamentally from a Victorian source who has some information about the Victorian scene and alleges that these practices are being followed in South Australia. It is important to note, of course, that controlling bodies have the responsibility of running in South Australia the harness, racing and greyhound codes. Those bodies are responsible for and charged with the management and administration of those codes, and they have the very same responsibility of managing claims such as those which are being made in the *News* today and which refer in particular to the Victorian person who has been making them.

At the outset, I state that I have no information which supports those allegations. Nothing has been brought to my notice or attention that would in any way support those allegations. In regard to the management of the industry, from my recent discussions (and it is only two days since the Premier and I met with the Chairman and Executive Officer of the SAJC) and the daily contact that departmental officers and I have with people in the industry, I can say that nothing has been brought to my attention to support these very strong and damaging allegations. I should draw on that point as a final comment. It would appear that this can have a very detrimental effect, and each journalist has a responsibility when making this type of allegation, certainly bearing in mind a heading of this size and the inference contained in the article about the management of the codes within this State. It does reflect on the industry.

The racing, harness and greyhounds codes are major industries in this State. In total, over \$1 billion is involved in the industry as a whole. When one is making such strong allegations about such an important industry, one must be very sure of one's facts. I draw that matter to the attention of the House and the community as a whole. Finally, I must say that I have no information to substantiate this statement in the *News*. However, I have asked the department to take up the matter with the respective management codes within the industries, and I will receive a report from those codes in relation to these allegations.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: THEBARTON COUNCIL

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The statement was made by my colleague the Minister of Local Government in another place this afternoon. It is in the first person, as I have not had time to edit it appropriately. It is as follows:

On Tuesday I was asked a series of questions by the Hon. Mr Gilfillan relating to the termination by the Thebarton corporation of the contract of employment of its Chief Executive Officer, Mr John Hansen. The Mayor of Thebarton, Mr John Lindner, has provided me with a copy of a confidential report prepared by J.E.G. Raggatt and Associates Pty Ltd, management consultants, on matter relative to the role and performance of senior council officers, which I have had examined by officers of my Department.

The report was commissioned by the corporation in March of this year. The brief given to the consultants was inquire into complaints concerning the Municipal Engineer. The brief was subsequently expanded on the 22 April 1986 to incorporate comment on all senior council officers. The consultants investigated, and have commented in detail in the report on some 21 matters

involving irregularities in the manner in which the town clerk, the deputy town clerk, the municipal engineer, and the administration manager have carried out their duties. The council, on the basis of the report, instituted procedures to terminate the appointment of the town clerk and reprimanded the deputy town clerk, the municipal engineer and the administration manager. The matter of the reprimands was reported in the *Advertiser* of 26 July 1986.

The contract of employment of the town clerk was terminated as at midnight on Tuesday 5 August. There is no action which I may take in relation to the termination of the contract of employment of the town clerk; that was a decision which the council by law was empowered to take, and the officer concerned has avenues of appeal at law against that decision open to him. The responsibility for the proper management of the affairs of the council, under the Local Government Act, is vested in the elected members of the council.

As Minister of Local Government I am empowered to cause an investigation to be made where I have reason to believe that the council, that is the elected body, has failed to discharge a statutory responsibility or an irregularity has occurred in the conduct of the council's affairs. The existence of divisions among the elected members of the council or the taking of action against an officer of the council, with which one may or may not agree, are not in themselves grounds for the Minister to authorise an investigation into the affairs of the council, while it is still able to function as a decision making body.

With respect to the matters raised by the honourable member relating to the deputy town clerk, I am advised that this officer was appointed on the recommendation of J.E.G. Raggatt and Associates Pty Ltd and at this time he does not hold a certificate of registration as a chief executive officer. A council may appoint a person who does not have the necessary qualifications to act in the office of chief executive officer for a period of up to three months; beyond that time the consent of the Minister must be obtained.

Yesterday I received a letter from the Mayor of Thebarton, asking whether I could provide him with a list of retired town clerks, who may be interested in acting in that position which he might place before the council. I will be happy to provide that information. With respect to the allegations of fraud on the part of the deputy town clerk, I will ask the council to take legal advice on these allegations and to act on that advice. I consider that no further action is warranted at this time.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to apply, out of Consolidated Account, the sum of \$650 million for the Public Service of the State for the financial year ending on 30 June 1987. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides \$650 million to enable the Public Service to carry out its normal functions until assent is received to the Appropriation Bill. Members will recall that it is usual for the Government to introduce two Supply Bills each year. The earlier Bill was for \$475 million and was designed to cover expenditure for about the first two months of the year. The Bill now before the House is for \$650 million, which is expected to be sufficient to cover expenditure until early November, by which time debate on the Appropriation Bill is expected to be complete and assent received.

Members will notice that the amount of this Bill represents an increase of \$165 million on the second Supply Bill for last year. Approximately \$83 million of the increase concerns debt servicing costs payable to SAFA. Of this amount \$9 million is due to a change in the timing of payments and a further \$6 million is due to borrowings from SAFA in 1985-86. The remaining \$68 million has arisen through SAFA assuming the debt obligations of the Government to the Commonwealth under the financial agreement. As part of this new arrangement the Govern-

ment is required to make interest payments to SAFA from the recurrent side of the Consolidated Account which require appropriation. Previously these payments were made direct to the Commonwealth and were covered by special appropriation authority. Consequently, there was no need for them to be covered by the Supply Bill. In other words, the great bulk of this increase does not represent an overall increase in total interest costs being met from Consolidated Account.

A further \$37 million is required for the rural adjustment scheme, the vine pull scheme and other rural assistance schemes administered by the Department of Agriculture. These payments did not have to be made during the Supply period last year.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the issue and application of up to \$650 million. Clause 3 imposes limitations on the issue and application of this amount.

Mr OLSEN secured the adjournment of the debate.

GOVERNMENT FINANCING AUTHORITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Government Financing Authority Act 1982. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: 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 purpose of this Bill is to amend the Government Financing Authority Act, 1982. That Act established the South Australian Government Financing Authority, which became operational early in 1983. The authority has become known within the Government and in the financial markets as 'SAFA' and I shall use that handy acronym in this speech.

The first three annual reports of SAFA which have set out details of its philosophies, management, operations and results in considerable detail have been tabled in this House. The fourth report will be tabled with the budget when it is brought down shortly. I do not wish to go into that detail now. But I do wish to place on record, in brief and summarised terms, why the Government regards SAFA as one of the prime examples of how public enterprise organisations can serve the general interests of the community and at the same time operate in a commercially successful manner.

In balance sheet terms SAFA is now the largest corporate body—public or private—in this State, with assets totalling \$5.5 billion at June 1985 and which will be over \$7 billion when the accounts are published for June 1986. It achieved a total operating surplus of \$83 million in 1984-85, of which \$35 million was paid as a contribution to Consolidated Revenue. The 1985-86 figures will again show substantial growth. All States now have central finance agencies, though they differ in scope and structure. SAFA is the largest of these organisations, not just in absolute but in relative terms. It is by far the most profitable. Its reputation in the professional financial markets, both domestically and internationally, is high. It has been given the highest possible rating—triple A—by Australian Ratings Ltd. Amongst its attributes, SAFA has the best gearing—that is, the ration of

capital to debt—of any major financial organisation in Australia.

One of SAFA's central functions is to provide loan funds to the Government and to semi-government authorities. This is being done in a way which is administratively smooth and simple, and which all of the numerous semi-government borrowers in the State find acceptable. In addition to its activities which are directly related to public sector finances SAFA also engages in a range of commercial transactions which yield surpluses which can be used, in effect, to reduce the net interest costs of the State. All this, and more, has been achieved without any undue risk-taking. SAFA's investment guidelines are conservative, and quite appropriately so. It has no exposures through borrowings in foreign currencies.

Turning to the Bill now before the House, I would emphasise that it would in no way alter the fundamental structure, role or character of SAFA. It is largely in the nature of a 'tidying up' exercise, designed to correct various weaknesses—mostly of a minor nature—which have been revealed by experience and/or by Crown Law advice on the interpretation of parts of the principal Act.

The amendments fall into several categories. Clauses 2, 3 and 8 are designed to improve the decision making procedures of the authority. The most important of these is the provision in clause 2 to increase from four to six the number of members of the board. This will, amongst other things, facilitate the appointment to the board of people from the private sector which the Government sees as significant in the terms of bringing the best balance and range of expertise to the Board.

Clause 3 adjusts the quorum provisions to allow for the increase in numbers of members and inserts a new provision which would enable the authority to make decisions other than at a meeting. This will facilitate decision making in what can be very rapidly changing circumstances in financial markets. Clause 8 makes a change in procedural detail in that certificates which may now be given by the Treasurer under section 24 may be given instead by the Chairman of the authority (who is, by virtue of section 6, the Under Treasurer).

Clause 4 adds to the functions and powers of the authority. The functions of the Authority are defined in section 11 of the Act, as it stands, in terms of the development of borrowing and investment programs for semi-government authorities and such other activities relating to the finances of the Government or authorities as may be approved by the Treasurer. Clause 4 broadens this by referring to 'such other financial activities as are determined by the Treasurer to be in the interests of the State'. This would permit the authority to engage in transactions which, while not directly affecting the finances of the Government or its authorities, are in the interests of the State in a broader sense. Let me give one practical example of this. It was considered desirable, and because of a bank guarantee clearly prudent, for the authority to lend to a nursing home pending the receipt of a Commonwealth grant. This was outside the authority's powers and a more cumbersome method of assisting had to be found.

I would also draw particular attention to the power granted by clause 4 to purchase shares or to form companies. When the original legislation was drafted, it was believed that the general and incidental powers given to the authority under section 11 extended to these activities. However, Crown Law advice has indicated that this may not be the case. Express powers are therefore desirable. These powers, along with all others, can only be exercised subject to the Treas-

urer's approval and direction. This ensures accountability and consistency with overall Government policy.

Clause 5 takes account of the creation, subsequent to passage of the original legislation, of the Local Government Finance Authority of South Australia by exempting it from the powers of compulsion given to the Treasurer under section 16 of the existing Act. As the LGFA is established as a separate body to engage in financial activities on behalf of local government, the Government has agreed with local government representatives that it would be inappropriate if the Government were able to compel it to use of the services of the South Australian Government Financing Authority. I should add that, in practice, SAFA and LGFA work very closely and productively together.

Clause 6 is purely technical. Advice given by Crown Law casts doubt on whether section 17 of the existing Act, which enables funds at Treasury to be deposited with SAFA, was as comprehensive as was intended. The phrase which is proposed to be added clarifies the situation. Clause 7 amends section 23 of the principal Act which deals with liability to taxation. Under this section, SAFA, and instruments to which it is a party, are liable to all State taxes, duties and imposts, but there is provision for the Treasurer to grant exemptions by notice in the gazette. Such a notice has been given, exempting SAFA and instruments to which it is a party from stamp duty.

There have been a number of individual financing transactions which SAFA has entered into involving several parties and a variety of documents, some of which have been between the other parties, although still relating to the SAFA transaction. In respect of those documents to which SAFA is not a party, stamp duty has been payable and, in order for the transaction to remain attractive to the other parties, the Government has undertaken to meet this expense. This has led to distortions in stamp duty receipts on the Consolidated Account and to the refund and remissions expenditure line.

Clause 7 extends this provision to enable the exemption from State taxes of documents which are related to transactions to which SAFA is a party. Such an exemption would not affect the taxation revenues of the State adversely. As already explained, the Government or SAFA, not the other parties, would otherwise pay the duty—either directly or indirectly through an adjustment to the pricing of the transaction—or, alternatively, the transaction would not be proceeded with by the other parties on account of their liability for stamp duty. As other semi-government authorities encounter similar situations from time to time, clause 7 also enables the Treasurer to grant similar exemptions to other semi-government authorities proclaimed under the Act, as well as SAFA itself.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 6 of the principal Act to provide that the Government Financing Authority is constituted by a minimum of three members and a maximum of six members, as the Governor determines. Clause 3 amends section 8 of the principal Act which provides for meetings and decisions of the Authority. The amendment provides that where the Authority consists of three members, two members constitute a quorum and, where the Authority consists of more than three members, three members constitute a quorum. It further provides that a decision may be made, otherwise than at a meeting, by an absolute majority of members and that a record must be kept of any such decision.

Clause 4 amends section 11 of the principal Act. The amendment broadens the functions of the Authority by allowing it to engage in any financial activities determined by the Treasurer to be in the interests of the State. The

amendment also makes it clear that the Authority has the following powers: to lend to any person, to deal in shares, to appoint an attorney, to enter into contracts of indemnity, to enter into partnerships and joint ventures and to form companies. Clause 5 amends section 16 of the principal Act to ensure that the Treasurer cannot require the Local Government Finance Authority to exclusively borrow moneys from or deposit moneys with the Authority.

Clause 6 amends section 17 of the principal Act to make it clear that moneys that may be issued and applied only under the authority of an Act of Parliament may be deposited with the Authority. Clause 7 expands the scope of section 23 of the principal Act which allows the Treasurer to exempt the authority or instruments to which the authority is a party from a tax, duty or other impost. The amendment encompasses, within this power, instruments to which a semi-government authority is a party and instruments which arise from or are connected with a transaction to which the Authority or a semi-government authority is a party. Clause 8 substitutes section 24 of the principal Act. The new section provides that a certificate issued by the chairman of the Authority certifying that a decision of the Authority or anything done by the Authority was made or done in accordance with the Act shall be accepted as proof of the matter in the absence of proof to the contrary?

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

AGENT-GENERAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Agent-General Act 1901. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: 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 Agent-General Act provides for a fixed term of appointment for Agents-General for South Australia in the United Kingdom. Section 6 of the Act provides that 'every person appointed as Agent-General shall cease to hold office at the end of five years after the date on which his appointment takes effect'. Under the Act the Governor may suspend or remove the Agent-General from office, but use of such a power would normally be restricted to removal in the case of misdemeanour or substantial deficiency in performance.

The nature of the representation which the State requires in the United Kingdom has changed significantly over the years. In contemporary terms there is much less requirement for a long-term diplomatic and formal representative role than has traditionally been associated with the office. It is increasingly necessary for South Australia's representation to reflect current requirements in such areas as finance, trade, investment and tourism promotion as well as on general governmental matters. Appointments for five year terms restrict the flexibility of the Government of the day in adapting the representation to meet current requirements. In addition, a number of persons who may be ideal for the post may be reluctant to commit themselves for such an extended period.

While it has been possible on some occasions for the Government and the Agent-General to agree to resignations

on mutually agreeable conditions (which have sometimes involved appointment to other posts), there would be practical benefit in amending the Act to permit appointment for terms of up to five years. This will permit younger persons and others very actively involved in business, professional or other careers to be considered for appointment. As emphases in the requirement for representation change, for example from immigration and trade matters to investment or tourism promotion, greater scope will be provided in securing the right skills and experience in the person appointed to be Agent-General. The amendment proposes that there should be terms up to a maximum of five years, the specific term to be negotiated in each case. Extensions of term are not to be precluded.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 6 of the principal Act. The effect of the amendment is to enable a person to be appointed as Agent-General for a term, not exceeding five years, specified in the instrument of appointment.

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (RURAL AND OTHER FINANCE) ACT

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Advances to Settlers Act 1930, the Loans for Fencing and Water Piping Act 1938, and the Student Hostels (Advances) Act 1961. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: 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 Advances to Settlers Act 1930, the Loans for Fencing and Water Piping Act 1938 and the Student Hostel (Advances) Act 1961 were enacted to provide loans for special purposes to particular categories of borrowers. The State Bank administers the Acts as agent for the Government.

Prior to the merger of the State Bank with the Savings Bank, the Chairmen of the banks advised the Government that very little use had been made of the Acts in recent times. The pre-merger boards of the two banks recommended that the Government agree to a discontinuation of new lending under the Acts so that the new State Bank could avoid the necessity to establish special administrative systems to deal with those special loans.

The State Bank is represented by a wide network of branches throughout the State, and administers a lending policy aimed at encouraging development of the State's rural and other resources. The bank will be able to provide adequate support from its own resources in the area covered by these Acts. Therefore it would be more appropriate to consider applications which might come within the ambit of the Acts as general banking propositions.

Similar conclusions were reached in relation to the Rural Financing Acts by a committee which looked into rural finance legislation in 1981. The committee comprised representatives of the Department of Agriculture, Treasury, the State Bank and the United Farmers and Stockowners Association.

The General Secretary of the association has confirmed his support for the action now proposed providing adequate

support for the action now proposed in the area covered by the Acts is available from the State Bank or elsewhere. As mentioned earlier, assurances have been received from the State Bank in that regard. The proposed amendments will prevent new lending under the Acts as from 30 June 1986. The bank will continue as the Government's agent in the administration of the existing loans.

Clause 1 is formal. Clauses 2, 3 and 4 amend the Advances to Settlers Act 1930, the Loans for Fencing and Water Piping Act 1938, and the Student Hostels (Advances) Act 1961, respectively. The amendments do two things. Firstly, any money held in a fund under the Acts at the moment and all repayments and recoveries of loans or advances in the future are to be credited to the Consolidated Account. Secondly, no further advances or loans are to be made under the Acts after 30 June 1986. The Acts will remain in operation for the purpose of administering existing advances and loans.

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

PLANNING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The issues raised in this Bill have been the subject of considerable Parliamentary attention over the past two years. The Government has sought on a number of occasions to overcome problems arising from judicial interpretation of certain provisions of the Planning Act 1982. Section 56 of the Planning Act, the so called 'existing use' provision, has been in suspension since late in 1984, and once again the Government is seeking to ensure planning controls strike an appropriate balance between the rights of an individual to continue an existing activity, and the right of the community to ensure that some attention can be given to any expansion or further development of that existing activity.

The debate on section 56 first started in mid 1983, when the Planning Appeal Tribunal ruled, on a number of occasions, that planning controls had no application to further development of land, provided no change in land use occurred. This led the then existing Planning Act Review Committee to recommend in its published report in November of that year the repeal of section 56(1)(a). That committee foresaw the problems which could arise from allowing continued expansion of an existing activity, irrespective of the impact of that expansion. The committee proposed repeal of the provision, on the grounds that, unlike its predecessor, the Planning and Development Act, the Planning Act itself does not control land use per se, but only changes in use.

Accordingly the Planning Act is not relevant to continued use of land, but becomes relevant only when further development is proposed. Section 56 (1) (a) is simply not necessary to protect a continued use of land. In January 1984, during the public comment period for the Planning Act Review Committee Report, the District Court ruled that the controls on clearance of native vegetation did not apply to a farmer clearing land for continued use of the land for

farming purposes. Following that judgment, the Government became alarmed at the apparent wide reaching effect, in both urban and rural areas, of a lack of control over expansion of existing uses.

In April 1984, Parliament passed an amendment to allow suspension of section 56 (1) (a) should an appeal to the Supreme Court against the District Court judgment be unsuccessful. While the Supreme Court found in favour of maintaining planning controls, and thus obviated the need for proclamation of the suspension provision, a subsequent appeal to the High Court resulted in a judgment in November 1984, which reaffirmed that the Planning Act did not allow control over any development associated with continuation of an existing activity. In the light of that judgment the Government immediately suspended section 56 (1) (a). As the High Court had also indicated that section 56 (1) (b), a transitional provision, also had the effect of rendering any changes to planning controls impotent Parliament agreed to suspend this provision also.

During 1985, the vegetation clearance question was examined by a select committee, and in August 1985, in association with the passage through Parliament of the Native Vegetation Management Act, the Government once again sought to overcome the problems associated with section 56 (1) (a) and (b). In response to the Government's Bill, however, the Opposition and Democrats joined together to establish a select committee to inquire into the whole question of existing use rights. While the select committee was dissolved with the prorogation of Parliament for the December 1985 election, no attempt was made to re-establish the enquiry by means of a select committee. The Government has now, once again, come to Parliament with a Bill seeking to overcome the difficulties associated with section 56 (1). This Bill is important not only in its content, but in its timing, as the current suspension will lapse on 31 August, 1986.

Essentially, the Bill seeks to do three things. Firstly, the Bill aims to repeal the existing use provision in section 56 (1) (a). It is now clear that uncontrolled expansion of any existing activity can create many problems. The Government's view is, and always has been, that the right to continue an existing activity should be protected, but any expansion or further development should be subject to the normal planning rules. The Government is aware that there are many concerns about planning controls being used to block technological change or upgrading of existing facilities. In response, I point out that the definition of development under the Act already excludes from any planning control, replacement of existing buildings, or work within buildings. Upgrading and refurbishment can accordingly take place irrespective of the fate of section 56. As for the fears associated with protection of the right to continue, the Act as structured, has no relevance to continued use of land, as is evidenced by the fact that the provisions of section 56 (1) (a) have been suspended since November 1984, without, to my knowledge, any dire effect.

Secondly, the Bill seeks to overcome problems associated with the High Court's interpretation of section 56 (1) (b). That provision was intended to allow a development to proceed or continue where the developer had obtained all necessary approvals, and perhaps even signed contracts for work to commence, and where a last minute change in the planning rules could have frustrated the development. The High Court, however, interpreted section 56 (1) (b) in such a way as to render exempt from control any development which could have occurred, without approval, at some time in the past. This effectively undermined the provisions of the Act which enabled the control provisions in the Devel-

opment Plan to be varied. Accordingly, the Bill, in a new section 56, provides protection for development approved or commenced prior to a change in the planning rules in the Act or Development Plan.

The third aim of the Bill is associated with a desire to achieve consistency in the layout of legislation. Current drafting practice now places transitional provisions in schedules to an Act. Accordingly, clauses 2, 3, 4, 5 and 7 of the Bill simply transfer existing transitional material in the Act, to a schedule under a new section 74. All this material simply duplicates current provisions, with the exception of the new clauses 3, 4 and 5 of the new schedule. These clauses clarify the transitional arrangements for approvals granted under the old Act, and ensure that old approvals lapse after a period equivalent to or longer than the period for which an approval would be valid if issued under the Planning Act.

Clause 1 is formal. Clauses 2 and 3 repeal sections 3 and 5 of the principal Act respectively. These changes are part of the process of statute law revision. Acts in modern form do not include a provision setting out the arrangement of the Act. Instead a summary of provisions is included at the front of the Act. The principal Act, when republished will be in this form. Clause 7 of the Bill replaces the substance of section 5 in a schedule at the end of the Act. It is current practice to place transitional provisions in a schedule. Clauses 4 and 5 remove transitional provisions from sections 20 and 55 of the principal Act. The section 20 provision is redundant and is not repeated. Subsection (9) of section 55 will now appear as clause 9 of the schedule.

Clause 6 replaces section 56 of the principal Act. The new section provides for matters presently covered by section 56 (1) (b). New subclause (3) protects a person who has not commenced development when an amendment occurs but who has obtained all statutory approvals within three years before the amendment. Clause 7 enacts a transitional schedule which replaces the substance of section 5 except for section 5(3). This provision has now done its work. Clauses 3, 4 and 5 of the schedule are new. These clauses provide for the validity of planning authorisations under the repealed Act and the period during which planning authorisations remain in operation.

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

RIVER TORRENS (LINEAR PARK) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the River Torrens (Linear Park) Act 1981. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time:

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill extends the expiry date of the River Torrens (Linear Park) Act 1981 from 31 December 1986 to 31 December 1989. This will permit land acquisitions under the Act to continue until the end of 1989 in line with the revised date of completion of the establishment of the Linear Park along the River Torrens.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 4 of the Act by striking out the existing expiry date and substituting the new expiry date of 31 December 1989.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

ROSEWORTHY AGRICULTURE COLLEGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Employment and Further Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Roseworthy Agricultural College Act 1973. Read a first time.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: 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 is one of a package of three Bills which seeks to introduce consistency in the ways in which the various institutions of higher education deal with real property. The package provides that Roseworthy Agricultural College, the South Australian College of Advanced Education and the South Australian Institute of Technology may not sell, mortgage, charge or otherwise dispose of real property except with the written consent of the Minister. However, the restrictions will not apply where the property is leased for a term not exceeding 21 years at the best rental available. This brings these institutions into line with the University of Adelaide and Flinders University except that, in recognition of the Governor's special relationship with the universities, the university Acts require the approval of the Governor rather than the Minister to dealings in real property.

The practical effect for Roseworthy Agricultural College will be to remove its presently unfettered right to deal in real property. This is desirable since much of that property has been and will continue to be acquired using public funds. It is appropriate that the college refer to the Government in dealing with it.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 5 of the principal Act which provides for the continuation of the Roseworthy Agricultural College and gives the college certain powers. The unfettered power to deal with real property is amended to require the written consent of the Minister to all dealings in real property other than leasing for a term not exceeding 21 years at the best rental available.

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

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN COLLEGE OF ADVANCED EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Employment and Further Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the South Australian College of Advanced Education Act 1982. Read a first time.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: 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 is one of a package of three Bills which seeks to introduce consistency in the ways in which the various institutions of higher education deal with real property. The package provides that Roseworthy Agricultural College, the South Australian College of Advanced Education and the South Australian Institute of Technology may not sell, mortgage, charge or otherwise dispose of real property except with the written consent of the Minister. However, the restriction will not apply where the property is leased for a term not exceeding 21 years at the best rental available. This brings these institutions into line with the University of Adelaide and Flinders University, except that, in recognition of the Governor's special relationship with the universities, the university Acts require the approval of the Governor rather than the Minister to dealings in real property.

The practical effect for the South Australian College of Advanced Education will be to allow it to enter into the specified type of leasing arrangement without reference to the Minister as is presently required.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 4 of the principal Act which provides for the establishment of the South Australian College of Advanced Education and gives the college certain powers. The power to deal with real property which is subject to the Minister's consent is amended to provide that the Minister's consent is not required to the leasing of real property for a term not exceeding 21 years of the best rental available.

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

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Employment and Further Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the South Australian Institute of Technology Act 1972. Read a first time.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: 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 is one of a package of three Bills which seeks to introduce consistency in the ways in which the various institutions of higher education deal with real property. The package provides that Roseworthy Agricultural College, the South Australian College of Advanced Education and the South Australian Institute of Technology may not sell, mortgage, charge or otherwise dispose of real property except with the written consent of the Minister. However, the restriction will not apply where the property is leased for a term not exceeding 21 years at the best rental available. This brings these institutions into line with the University of Adelaide and Flinders University except that, in recognition of the Governor's special relationship with the universities, the university Acts require the approval of the Governor rather than the Minister to dealings in real property.

The practical effect for the South Australian Institute of Technology will be to remove its presently unfettered right

to deal in real property. This is desirable since much of that property has been and will continue to be acquired using public funds. It is appropriate that the Council of the institute refer to the Government in dealing with it.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 6 of the principal Act which provides for the continuation of the Council of the South Australian Institute of Technology and gives the Council certain powers. The unfettered power to deal with real property is amended to require the written consent of the Minister to all dealings in real property other than leasing for a term not exceeding 21 years at the best rental available.

Mr LEWIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Constitution Act 1934. Read a first time.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: 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.

The SPEAKER: Is leave granted?

Mr LEWIS: No. This is a Constitutional matter.

The SPEAKER: Leave is not granted. The honourable Minister of Education.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: This short Bill repeals and re-enacts, in an amended form, the provision of the Constitution Act (section 67) which empowers the Governor to appoint a Minister to act in place of another Minister during the temporary absence of the latter Minister. The amendment has two principal objects. First, it alters the present method of appointment. Section 67 presently provides for an appointment to be made by commission under the public seal of the State. This seems excessively formal and cumbersome. The Bill does not reproduce these formal requirements; this means that in future it will be possible to make an appointment by a less formal instrument signed by the Governor in Executive Council. Notice of the appointment will be published in the *Gazette*.

Secondly, the Bill allows for greater flexibility in the nature of an acting appointment. The present provision had its origin in 1873 (Act No. 16 of 1873). The intervening 113 years have seen great changes in methods of travel, and in the nature of ministerial responsibilities. Ministers of the present day frequently have to travel to destinations outside this State for comparatively short periods—often at very short notice. It is important that appropriate mechanisms should exist to prevent the work of government grinding to a halt during these absences. The Bill accordingly enables the Governor to appoint a Minister to act in the place of another at any time when the principal Minister is unavailable to carry out the duties of his or her office. I seek leave to have the explanation of the provisions in the Bill inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

The SPEAKER: Is leave granted?

Mr LEWIS: No.

The SPEAKER: Leave is not granted. The Minister of Education.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 45 by adding a provision that corresponds to the present section 67 (3). Section 45 (1) provides that a member of Parliament must not accept an office of profit from the Crown. New subsec-

tion (1a) makes it clear that this does not apply to the acceptance of ministerial office or the acceptance by a Minister of an appointment to act in the place of another Minister.

Clause 3 repeals section 67 and substitutes a new section. Subsection (1) provides that the Governor may appoint a Minister to act in the office of another Minister. Subsection (2) provides that an appointment may authorise the appointee to act for a specified period or a period terminating when a specified event occurs or whenever the Minister is unavailable to perform official duties. Subsection (3) provides that a Minister, while acting in the office of another Minister, has all the powers, functions and duties of the other Minister. Subsection (4) states that notice of an appointment under the section shall be published in the *Gazette*. Subsection (5) is an aid to proof and provides that, if it appears, in any legal proceedings, that a Minister has acted in the office of another Minister, the acting Minister shall be deemed to have acted pursuant to an appointment under this section in the absence of proof to the contrary.

Mr S.J. BAKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

(Continued from page 176.)

Mr GREGORY (Florey): This is the sixth debate on the Address in Reply to His Excellency's speech to which I have listened during my short time as a member of this House. On this occasion, His Excellency's speech set forth a sound program for the State in difficult times for Australia in general and for South Australia in particular. A program of economic responsibility instituted by the Bannon Labor Government over the years 1982 to 1985, as well as in the earlier Parliament this year, laid the foundation for action that overcame the results of the financial irresponsibility of the Tonkin Liberal Government, a Government that left the Government and the Parliament of South Australia with a record deficit and the State nearly bankrupt. Careful control of expenditure, however, has rectified that position, and this Government has overcome the difficulties left to it as a result of irresponsible action by the Tonkin Government.

I wish to deal with two of the important matters dealt with in His Excellency's speech, both of which have elicited considerable comment from members opposite. The first of these to which I wish to refer concerns workers compensation. Members opposite rejected the workers compensation legislation that was dealt with by Parliament earlier this year and, in doing so, cited three grounds for their opposition. Members opposite said, first, that the legislation provided for a single workers compensation authority; secondly, that the benefits to be provided for workers were too great; and, thirdly, that the cost of such benefits to the employers was too great.

I wish to examine those three contentions. The need for improved workers compensation legislation in South Australia is so great that, if the Government's Bill is not passed, there will not be a secondary industry left in this State. The Labor Government wishes to effect certain improvements in the present workers compensation provisions. First, members on this side desire to preserve the benefits of the existing legislation, such benefits being availed of by 85 per

cent of those workers who are injured on the job. Secondly, the Labor Government desires to create a rehabilitation system that puts people back into work and not out onto the human scrap heap as the current system does. Thirdly, this Government wishes to reduce the cost of workers compensation to the employer. If the Government's proposals are implemented, all three of these objectives will be achieved.

I understand that an employer who has been forced to seek insurance from another insurer because his previous insurer had ceased to operate in the workers compensation field has found that the premium required has risen from \$600 000 to \$1.6 million, even though there has been no dramatic change in the injury rate. However, an attempt by the insurance companies to procure workers compensation business had led to low premiums, and these are now being replaced by high premiums to make up for the previous shortfall. In Victoria, the total premium bill for the same type of company employing the same number of employees would be \$160 000. That illustrates the large difference in cost to employers between the neighbouring States and the lower premium bill would considerably benefit South Australian employers if the Labor Government's proposals were introduced here.

In this State we are confronted by an employers association which has had to have three reports to give it what it wants. To justify their position, members opposite will embrace any report no matter how dodgy it is. They do not care for the interests of South Australia or for the well-being of the South Australian worker. One has only had to listen to the debate in this House over the past few days to appreciate that point. This morning, the member for Eyre told us that the farmers had established South Australia. He did not refer to the hours and hours of work being done under dangerous conditions by South Australian workers, and he made little or no mention of the hours of work done by the women who lived with their menfolk and helped develop this State through its agricultural and secondary industries.

If the Labor Government can succeed in improving the present workers compensation legislation, South Australia will have an effective rehabilitation system. Until the present lump sum payment method is replaced, we will have legions of unemployed people who have been injured at work and paid workers compensation. Because of that, the employers will not employ such workers because the insurance companies that provide workers compensation cover will refuse to insure those people or will charge such a high premium to do so that the employers will refuse to pay that amount.

The example of the increased cost of workers compensation insurance to which I referred earlier is only one of many that has been quoted by employers faced with the high cost of insuring their workers against injury at present in this State. Every month that the passing of the Government's Bill is delayed is costing South Australian employers literally millions of dollars. Such delay is also costing the workers jobs.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr GREGORY: If we were to listen to the mindless idiot who represents Mitcham and speaks for the Opposition on industrial relations—

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I believe that those comments are unparliamentary, and I ask that the honourable member withdraw them.

The SPEAKER: It is not crystal clear to the Chair without some reflection whether the phrase 'mindless idiot' is unpar-

liamentary; however, it is certainly undesirable and I therefore call on the member for Florey to retract the phrase.

Mr GREGORY: Mr Speaker, I withdraw those remarks. Yesterday I listened to the aspiring Minister of Labour refer to unions as 'putrid unions'.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr GREGORY: You just get the *Hansard* and read it and just keep quiet and behave yourself. I am referring to the *Oxford Dictionary* where it states that 'putrid' means 'decomposed, rotten, foul, noxious, corrupt, of poor quality and very unpleasant'. That is what the member for Mitcham said last night. I was sitting here, and I heard him.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr GREGORY: The aspiring Minister of Labour is saying that he hopes to be able to lead South Australia one day (heaven forbid, if he ever does), yet he insults the organisations which represent the interests of the 600 000 working people of South Australia.

When I referred to his state of mind a while ago, I was also referring to some of the things that the honourable member's Party has been talking about. We have had the spectacle of a member in another Parliament saying that the Liberal Party should enrol unionists into a Liberal faction to take over the unions. If one were to look at the statistical evidence of the number of people who work in South Australia and the number of people in unions, there would have to be people in unions who are members of the Liberal Party, and certainly people who are supporters of the Liberal Party. No-one can run away from that. It would be very interesting to see these factions formed by the Liberal Party leading the trade unions when we have shadow Ministers aspiring to run the State referring to the unions as 'putrid'. As I said earlier, by that the honourable member means 'decomposed, rotten, foul, noxious, corrupt, of poor quality and very unpleasant'.

I have been involved in a number of unions, and I have seen them in action, and I can say that the people who are Liberal sympathisers—and in some cases members of the Liberal Party—are not frightened to lead strikes against an employer if they can get more money out of the boss, because they work on the same principle as the people on this side: if you have the strength and can get the money, you go and get it, and are not frightened to line up and get it. Do not think that, if the suggestions of a member from another place were followed, suddenly the unions will see light and reasonableness, because we will have trade unionists who follow the creed of the people opposite—to get it while the going is good and blow the consequences and the effect on other people.

Also the Governor's speech referred to proposed changes to the Occupational Safety, Health and Welfare Act, which will address the incidence of injury which occurs in the workplace. In the past few years we have had an Act which, when it was introduced, provided a fairly comprehensive attack on injury in the workplace. We believe that this proposed legislation currently being considered by people involved in industry will confront the incidence of injury at the workplace. It will mobilise workers—the first, second, third and whatever other levels of management in the workplace—in an effort to reduce the incidence of traumatic injury, and in the long-term the incidence of injury caused by work practices which are either toxic or carcinogenic. Currently there is insufficient effort involving all the workers and management in enterprise. Indeed, on many occasions, these past practices have left people in positions where they are potential accident injury statistics.

Over a period of time the legislation will change all that as workers and management are trained to recognise unsafe

conditions and to take action to remove those unsafe practices from the workplace. I will never forget listening in this House to the member for Goyder admit that he had asked the previous Minister of Labour for a relaxation of the application of regulations of the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Code in country areas so that they could reduce costs. The honourable member could not understand, and he does not understand, and I fear he never will understand what can happen in a workplace where there are potential injuries. If the standards are relaxed, that potential increases alarmingly. I believe, from the attitude exhibited by some people opposite, that those comments and attitudes are shared by a number of people on the other side; they just do not care about the 600 000 workers in South Australia.

I want to take issue with members opposite on two counts. One is for the provision for employers convicted of certain offences in the proposed legislation to be gaoled. The people on the other side are calling constantly for increased gaol terms for persons convicted of serious crimes such as murder, manslaughter, sexual crimes, and drunken drivers who are unfortunate enough to kill a person in an accident. What is so different about an employer who constantly refuses to comply with the regulations of the industrial safety, health and welfare legislation—at the moment the penalties are quite light—and serious injury occurs. I cannot see the difference and I believe that such employers, if convicted of serious and continual neglect, should be given penalties that include gaol terms.

The people opposite have two rules: one for workers and one for themselves, their supporters and the bosses. The people opposite do not know and do not understand because it is not their class of people or friends who are being killed, maimed, injured or incapacitated by industrial disease. The amazing thing is that there are provisions for employers to be gaoled if they breach certain Acts in this Parliament. One such Act is the Radiation Protection Control Act of 1982, which provides for a penalty of up to five years gaol for non-compliance with its provisions. That Act was introduced by the member for Coles when she was Minister of Health. The gaol term is quite clear and quite definite. What is so different today from 1982, when the member for Coles introduced that Bill into the House?

Why should not it apply to employers who do not care and insist that their workers continue to work in dangerous conditions? I can recall as a young child being taken to Cheltenham Cemetery by my grandparents on one or two occasions each year so that they could clean and visit the graves of their parents. Of interest during these visits was for my grandfather to introduce me to many of the people he knew and explain to me what they used to do in working around the Port Adelaide area. I came to appreciate that my grandfather, who was just over 60 years of age, was lucky to be alive. Most of the people he pointed out to me were under the age of 50 years. Most people died as a result of malnutrition caused by long absences from work because of the economic situation at that time and because of the dangerous working conditions.

The imprisonment provisions affect only the maverick employer. I would be surprised if there was one such sentence in a year. The responsible employer will not be affected and will have nothing to fear from the provisions within the legislation. I agree with the responsible employers who operate large establishments in this State and who say that, if the penalties are quite severe (including gaol terms) for employers who are criminally negligent because of lack of safety in their workshops, they should suffer the extreme penalty of imprisonment. I refer also to the rabid opposition to the 'stop the job' proposal. Members opposite do not

understand what happens in the workplace. With the exception of the former member for Todd I do not think that any member opposite has ever worked in a large establishment and can really understand what can happen and what workplace safety is about. They have not been there and would not have seen employers instruct workers to continue to use, say, a crane as the crane boom bends over almost touching the ground in an endeavour to meet the object it is trying to lift, because it is over the maximum safety load.

Employers know that engineers build safety factors into mechanical structures, yet they rely on that safety factor to avoid hiring a larger crane. They just tell their workers to get on with the job and threaten them by saying, 'If you do not get on with it, you are finished, you are out the gate.' That happens in many places. I refer to a recent example in the Riverland, where an employer in a winery sacked a worker who was required by the employer to enter and clean out a wine tank. The worker, because of the size of the tank, the size of the hole and, I believe, his size, wanted two people outside the tank watching in case he got into difficulty and needed assistance to get out. That is not an unrealistic expectation. I suppose some people might ask, 'What can happen in a confined space?' Very few people have worked in a confined space where getting out can be extremely difficult.

I can remember standing on North Terrace as ambulances passed by carrying the bodies of dead youths from Wiles chromium plating plant in Waymouth Street. I am not sure whether two or three died, but one after the other they entered the tank to rescue their collapsed workmates. Unfortunately, at that time we did not have regulations requiring someone to be outside a tank watching; there was no requirement for testing to ensure that the conditions were safe; and there was no requirement for lifelines to pull out collapsed workers. Whenever a worker is injured, his workmates, by instinct, will go straight in and not bother about the consequences and sometimes, as a result, tragedies grow.

I think it is very important for workers to have the right to stop the job if they believe their workplace is dangerous. Danger can mean many things. I can recall, as a union organiser, having my entire union membership standing out on the front road of a particular establishment at one time while I talked to the management about a foreman who would not allow kickboards to be erected around scaffolding over 20 feet high. The foreman could not appreciate what we were on about. When I explained this to the manager he asked me, 'What is the problem?' I said, 'How often in your experience at work have you known things to fall off scaffolding and platforms?' He said, 'Frequently.' I said, 'What would a kickboard do?' He said, 'It would stop it from happening.' I said, 'That is why we are on strike—the stupid foreman will not allow us to erect kickboards.' He said, 'Get back to work and I will fix up that foreman.' That is the problem facing workers. It happens at low levels of management. Quite often the senior level is horrified to find out what is happening in the workplace.

I have known a worker to be dismissed because an employer said he was intoxicated. When we fronted up in the morning to represent the intoxicated employee it was disclosed that he did not drink. The employee had exhibited all the signs of intoxication because he inhaled toluene fumes which, if burnt, produces phosgene gas (which some people will know as mustard gas, and which was used ineffectively against the enemy in the First World War. On many occasions the wind changed and sometimes those spraying the gas suffered the most damage). The toluene had been put in half a 44 gallon drum. It was supposed to

have been placed in a proper bath, with proper ventilation, so that people were not affected by the fumes.

Safety agreements operate in this State to allow workers to stop the job if they believe the workplace is unsafe. There was no stopping the job at the place I just mentioned because there was no reason to stop the job. The work involves a complex manufacturing process, but there is a cooperative approach to occupational safety at that establishment—not the conflict approach that members opposite seem to delight in. Cooperation ensures that safety is paramount. It is not a matter of reducing standards, as sought by the member for Goyder. I can recall being in the library on one occasion and listening to an Opposition speaker in another place complaining about the cost of painting a fixed flagpole by the then PBD employees who had erected scaffolding around the pole. The cost was in the region of \$400. The member complained that a quote from a contractor for \$160 had not been accepted. The contractor planned to use a ladder. Those familiar with the height of the flagpole to be painted would realise that there was a danger of the ladder slipping and the worker falling off. Worse still, because of the weight against the flagpole, it could have broken and the worker could have been impaled. That was a lack of understanding and knowledge. I wish that those members opposite who talk about these matters had some experience in these areas.

I will make some other comments about the constant attack on unions by members opposite. I have listened to the member for Mitcham and other members opposite constantly attacking trade unions as though all the economic ills in this country are their fault and suggesting that if, somehow or other, we could curb the role of the trade unions, everything would be all right.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

MR GREGORY: The member for Mitcham seems to want to talk all the time; he had an opportunity last night but sat down. If he wants to talk, he should take his opportunity to get up and speak.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

MR GREGORY: I want to make it quite clear that we should consider the mess we have in this country. It has little to do with the trade union movement; it has a fair bit to do with what is called forward planning. It is something that Bob Menzies and Malcolm Fraser were not too keen on. The Vernon report and the Jackson report, if significantly implemented, would have changed our economic mix in this country, particularly in regard to manufacturing industry. I do not remember too much about the Vernon report and Menzies, but I do remember about Fraser and the Jackson report. I recall the Federal Leader for the Liberal Party racing off in an election campaign starting with resource projects of \$29 million and, at the end of the campaign, that figure being run up to \$60 million. At that time there was a conscious decision not to attend to the problems then being exhibited in manufacturing industry but to go into the commodity industry: primary resources. Agriculture was standing up well at the time, but the decision was to get into iron ore, coal and natural gas exports.

I remember the colossal figures being quoted about the Rundle shale deposit. I recall being approached by people from employer circles wanting accelerated courses for training welders, boilermakers and fitters for the work in this resource area. However, the problem was that the decision makers at that time hitched themselves to about 20 per cent of the world market. The other 80 per cent of world traders were in manufacturing industry. We never addressed the problems we had here; never sought out industries in which we could do well.

I am not talking about something that is new, not something that researchers have just found out about. The theories about the decline of industry and what can happen have been around for a long time. They show how industry of a particular type can expand and then, after it reaches its maximum use and penetration, starts to decline. I give the example of steam-engines. When they were first introduced in 1810 boilers were made of cast iron or sheet iron and weighed about 1 000 kilograms per horsepower produced. Fifty years later (1860) steel was introduced and there were significant reductions in weight. By 1900 the ratio was about one tenth of what it had been in 1810. We have now reached the stage, in 1980, where it is 14 horsepower per 1 000 kilograms. Well might the member for Mitcham laugh. This indicates that for every horsepower used we are using a lot less steel. That means we need a lot less iron ore, coal and electricity. That is why hitching on to resources as the salvation for this country was wrong. What should have happened is that there should have been a change in attitude.

Mr S.J. Baker: The unions won't even let it out of the country.

Mr GREGORY: I would listen to and appreciate the interjection about the unions if unionists had been on the boards when the decisions were made about what companies would do in Australia. If that were so perhaps the ravings and rantings of the member for Mitcham might be credible. Until unions are on those boards they cannot be blamed for decision-making. BHP is a classic example of a company that nearly went under in its steel-making division because it forgot to put money into the development of its company over a period of time while it was buying into resources. The Australian Government had to help it out. Through reinvestment, it is now back in a position where it can compete on the world market for steel.

The member for Mitcham should know and understand that. If he wants to blame unions he should have them on the boards; then perhaps he can blame them for making the decisions and for all the trouble. Blaming the unions is easy and we do not have to explain anything at all, just hawk it around. However, the real problems are not being attacked.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Gayler): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): The Address in Reply is an opportunity for members to assess the situation that exists in the State and how it has progressed, or otherwise, since the last session of Parliament. Unfortunately, we are now confronted with a Federal Government that has introduced a form of taxation which I do not believe anyone on the opposite side of the House can really support if they are honest—that is, the fringe benefits tax and the destructive capacity of that tax on all sections of industry and commerce in Australia, particularly South Australia. We have a situation that puts this State in a position far worse than that of many of the other States, and that is reflected in the motor vehicle industry. So much for what the Federal Government has done in the interests of Australia!

Having commented about the attitude of the Federal Government and what it is doing to the overall economy of Australia, I wish now to look at what the State Labor Government has done to this State since the last session of Parliament and refer to some State taxes and charges that have been increased in the past 12 months. Since the State election some 475 individual State charges have been increased. This includes 50 charges under the Motor Vehicles Act classified as direct State taxation.

It is worthwhile looking at a few of the 475 increases to which I have referred. Under the National Parks and Wildlife Act shack site rentals rose by 40 per cent; under the Occupational Therapists Act registration fees rose by 100 per cent; under the Sewage Act plumbers registration fees rose by 25 per cent; under the Waterworks Act plumbers registration fees rose by 50 per cent; under the Water Resources Act meter testing fees rose by some 200 per cent; under the Electrical Workers and Contractors Licensing Act examination fees rose by 100 per cent; under the Crown Lands Act various fees for land grants and Crown leases increased by up to 64 per cent; under the Pastoral Act there was an increase in 15 fees by up to 64 per cent for pastoral leases.

Going further, we find that under the Psychological Practices Act registration fees rose by 100 per cent and renewals by 50 per cent; and under the Chiropractors Act registration fees rose by 100 per cent and renewals by 67 per cent. Under the Road Traffic Act there were 21 new fees, plus increases in other fees of up to 50 per cent. We then move to the Fisheries Act and find that fees under general regulations increased by between 57 per cent and 80 per cent; under the Marine Scale Fisheries Regulations fees increased by 21 per cent; under the Restricted Marine Scale Fisheries Regulations fees increased by 21 per cent; and under the Lakes and Coorong Fisheries Regulations fees increased by 17 per cent. So the list goes on.

This gives a clear indication not only of the disastrous situation that the Federal Government has created but how it has been dramatically compounded by the State Government at a time when we are under severe restrictions in relation to the economy. It is only fair and reasonable that if the salaries and wages of the public at large, and those operating in the private sector—wage earners—have to be contained within very minimal increases, then increases in State charges should be kept in the same bracket. I have often said that a case can be argued that increases, so long as they are within the inflation rate, are justifiable. The sort of figures that I have been quoting are way in excess of the inflation rate—in many instances two or three times and in some instances 10 and 20 times that rate.

If we look at some of the more outstanding increases and charges we once again come back to the Fisheries Act. If we look at the western zone abalone fishery regulation fees, we see that they are up some 20.9 per cent, but during the period of the Bannon Government the charges for that fishery have increased by 457.7 per cent. The same applies to the central abalone fishery where, during the period of the Bannon Government, the charges have increased some 254 per cent, with an increase this year of some 30.6 per cent. The same applies in the southern abalone fishery, where the regulations have been altered so that the charge is up by some 65.3 per cent. In that fishery we find that during the term of the Bannon Government we have had an increase of some 287.9 per cent. How on earth can people out there in the real world who are trying to be productive and to generate the necessary wealth to enable the State and the nation to continue and be competitive on the world scene be expected to compete when confronted with increases of this magnitude?

There is no way that we can be competitive on the world market with increases of that magnitude while at the same time, in many instances, we have falling values for the products and crops that we are producing. If we continue down this path we will have fewer and fewer people prepared to remain productive. The number of people who are opting out find that they are far better off financially if they

retire from the work place or industry than remaining in it, being productive and running at a loss.

The fruit growing industry is possibly a glorious example of exactly that: many of the growers are determined to remain within the industry and, in so doing, provide a number of jobs for people in South Australia at a loss. If those persons were to retire from the industry, sell their properties for what they could get for them and invest that money, they would be financially better off at the end of the year but, in so doing, be absolutely non-productive. It is a crazy situation and, as long as that situation persists, Australia and South Australia will continue down the path that it is going and the economic situation will become worse day by day.

The policies that exist, particularly within the Federal Government at this stage, are solidly endorsed by the Premier of South Australia, who clearly reiterated his position in the House over the past two days of not being prepared to support the Premier of Western Australia in an approach to Canberra to try to do something about the crazy taxes that it is imposing. Once again the Premier stated that he fully supported the position laid down by the Federal Treasurer, Mr Keating. If that attitude of the present State Government prevails in South Australia there is little hope of our improving the situation that currently exists.

I welcome this afternoon the Premier's statement in relation to the World Three Day Event in which he made perfectly clear that he was completely locked into that event. That is spelt out in the letter that he wrote to Mr Fricker on 2 May 1984 in which he stated:

My Government, together with the South Australian Jubilee 150 Board, has pledged its utmost support, and is committed to funding the championships.

In a letter dated 23 November 1983 to the Secretary-General of the Federation Equestre Internationale, the Premier stated:

My Government, together with the South Australian Jubilee 150 Board, has committed itself to funding this proposed World Three Day Event championship.

No doubt exists that the Government was clearly committed to funding the World Three Day Event. The credibility of not only South Australia but also of the Government and the Premier has been seriously affected by the debacle that has gone on for the past few weeks in relation to the financial situation of the World Three Day Event. There is no doubt that the Government was totally committed to that project. The fact that the competitors to this time have not received their prize money is absolutely staggering. This really does come back to a credibility situation, whereby the Premier himself and the State are under a cloud, because the attitude that will exist in the Northern Hemisphere regarding South Australia's liability is certainly shot to pieces. That is a great pity for this State. Certainly the event was a major success, as the Premier stated. The Premier knew from the word go that he had no alternative but to see that the financial commitments of that event were honoured. It is a pity that he has left it so late in the day to actually do something about it.

Yesterday the member for Adelaide asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education whether he had seen in the *Sunday Mail* of 18 May this year an article which quoted the Leader of the Opposition as saying that fruit was being left on trees in the Riverland because growers could not get pickers. It is a pity that the member for Adelaide and the Minister of Further Education did not take the opportunity to go up to the Riverland and obtain first hand information on the subject. The last fruit harvest

in the Riverland was an absolute nightmare for growers with falling prices, particularly in relation to wine grapes. Unless those grapes were delivered to the winery on the day stipulated by the winery, there was little chance of their being supplied the next day.

Growers, having had the cost of trying to produce that crop for 12 months, either supply the grapes on the day stipulated or the winery will say, in many cases, 'Keep them; other people will supply them.' If growers get those grapes picked, they are lucky to break even, with the prices being paid; it is a disastrous situation. However, they are still providing work and productivity, and, even if the grape grower or citrus grower does not get a great deal out of it, there is a tremendous flow-on through the processing industries—marketing, merchandising, and so on. I venture to state that each grower, vineyard or citrus orchard in turn probably provides 100 to 150 jobs as a result of the productivity that was generated from that one property.

If the Minister says that the Leader of the Opposition was overstating the situation or was irresponsible, I suggest that he go to the Riverland, call a public meeting of growers and ask for their view on the matter. If it was not for the fact that a significant proportion of the grapes in the Riverland were harvested by machine during the recent vintage, I venture to state that a lot more of the grapes would still be rotting on the vines, and that is a tragedy. The work is there and, while a lot of people are prepared to do that type of work, there are also a lot of people in the community who just refuse to do it.

This is hard and dirty work, but it is genuine, honest work. Over the years I have certainly done my share of grape and citrus picking and all types of harvesting jobs. There is nothing wrong with it because it is good, honest work. But, it is a tragedy to see crops left on the vines and trees when the economy of this State and nation as a whole is in such a devastating plight.

In relation to that subject, members opposite may recall that some nine to 12 months ago I raised with the Premier the problem of pensioners working as seasonal workers, particularly within the fruit industry. The Federal Government made a move which now stops pensioners from earning through seasonal work, in a matter of a few weeks, their allowed amount on top of their annual pension. If they exceed the weekly amount that they can earn, pensioners are taxed and lose the benefits of their pension. So, this action has taken numerous pensioners out of that work force. It is money which they need and which they were able to obtain in that area. Their employment was essential to the fruit industry. It is a source of manpower that is now denied the labour intensive industries such as the fruit industry because of the action of the Federal Government.

When I raised this matter in this House a few months ago, the Premier acknowledged that something ought to be done about it. Unfortunately, nothing has been done about it. I do not know what the Premier has done to try to have that decision reversed. It is clearly obvious that this decision has been made by academic theorists in Canberra who have absolutely no understanding of the work place. The member for Florey spoke of members on this side not having an understanding of the work place. I can assure the honourable member that I have spent more than my share of time out there in the work place doing grape picking, citrus picking and those sorts of jobs over the years. I am well aware of what it is, and, what is more, I still do it as soon as I get back to the Riverland because of the difficulties that are experienced in many instances of being able to get

the crop picked. So, the work is there: there is no doubt about that. I urge the Minister who made the comments yesterday to go up to the Riverland and have a public meeting. He will then find that the statement he made yesterday is very inaccurate.

I now take this opportunity to refer to one or two comments that the Minister of Agriculture made while he was overseas. I refer to a statement which is reported in the 23 July issue of the *Loxton News*. The article states:

Speaking from London on Monday, Mr Mayes said that Sainsbury's was in urgent need of top quality horticultural produce and wanted consignments from Australia starting in May 1987.

'If South Australia can produce the right quality in large volumes with reliability, then there is a readymade market for citrus, table grapes and other fruits and vegetables. If our producers can meet these requirements, we can create and maintain high volume sales to one of the biggest chain stores in the world,' he said.

'Our producers must grasp this opportunity to firmly establish themselves in a major world market. South Australian horticultural producers will need to swing into top gear to capitalise on this marvellous export opportunity,' the Minister added.

I believe that many in the industry have been aware of this situation for a long time, and the comment that he made in relation to top quality is really one of the important factors. At the moment we are talking about trying to expand the table grape industry. There is a tremendous potential for table grapes as an export industry from South Australia in particular. Unfortunately, within the Department of Agriculture in South Australia, we do not have a single expert in the field of table grape production. I understand that the Victorian Department of Agriculture has three such experts, and consequently this is of tremendous advantage to the producers in that State.

I have been a grape producer all my life, but, when it comes to the table grape industry and the production of premium quality table grapes, I would be the first to admit that I do not know the first thing about it. It is a highly specialised industry that needs a great deal of expertise. The point made by the Minister that we need to produce premium quality is precisely correct. Very few grapegrowers in the industry know the first thing about producing premium table grapes. I was going to ask the Minister a question if I had the opportunity. I suggest that within the manpower constraints of the Minister's department a position be reallocated to employ a table grape specialist.

We have in South Australia a few table grape producers who have developed a highly efficient industry, but, if other growers who have had no experience in the table grape industry endeavour to move into that field without the assistance of a specialist adviser, an enormous number of mistakes will be made, and they will be very costly. I urge the Government to seriously review the manpower situation within the department and try to reallocate a position so that a table grape advisory expert can be appointed. I believe that this would go a long way to enhancing our ability to become an important part of Australia's table grape exporting industry. As it stands at the moment, Victoria will leave us for dead because it has the expertise and we do not, and it will totally capitalise on this situation.

I now wish to refer briefly to the present situation within the Murray-Darling Basin. Once again we have a statement from Senator Evans, the Commonwealth Minister responsible for the Murray-Darling system, who says that he will now establish a community forum. That will be an adjunct to the ministerial council the establishment of which he announced almost 12 months ago. However, as far as I am aware, the ministerial council has not yet contributed anything to the betterment of the Murray-Darling system. Now, the Minister is talking about expanding that, so we can now have a community forum.

I believe that opportunity exists for the community to make their point of view known to the Government. I have no real objection to this proceeding. However, the real problem is being ignored. There is no doubt in my mind that many problems relating to the Murray-Darling system are, and have been for a long time, well known to the River Murray Commission. Indeed, the former Minister of Water Resources would be well aware of that. The Commission is an efficient body and the creation of the ministerial council in one respect is little more than window dressing, because the River Murray Commissioners are the direct representatives of the Premiers of the three States, as well as the Commonwealth Minister for Resources and Energy.

So, in fact the River Murray Commissioners are acting virtually under the instructions of the Governments of the three States and the Commonwealth. Since the Commonwealth Minister made his announcement just prior to the most recent State election, we have not seen any activity from the so-called ministerial council. It has been very much a blind to put off the evil day on which the money must be found for the River Murray Commission to do the job.

The former Minister of Water Resources will be well aware that an important project in South Australia (the Lock 2, Lock 3 groundwater interception scheme) was mooted in 1981 or 1982, when consultants acknowledged that, with the necessary capital works and interception by tube wells and diversion to an evaporation basin, we could effectively remove from the river, or stop the entry of, up to 60 000 tonnes of salt a year, which would be a significant contribution to reducing the overall salinity load in South Australia. However, that was first mooted five years ago and, although there has been little activity in that direction, it could be another five years before anything constructive is done about it. I wholeheartedly support the comment made in the *Murray Pioneer*, in an editorial of Tuesday 29 July, headed 'Time for action and not more talks'. Surely, that is the case.

The River Murray Commission is well versed in this matter. It knows the type of capital works that must be undertaken but, until the Commonwealth and State Governments provide the necessary resources to let the commission get on with that work, we will see a continual decline in the quality of water in South Australia. The Commonwealth Government clearly acknowledges (and has done so on a number of occasions) that the Murray-Darling system is worth about \$10 000 million annually to the economy of Australia and, if the Governments are not prepared to put back \$50 million a year over the next 10 years, that is a national disgrace that should be publicised across Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Albert Park.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I support the motion. Once again, I offer my condolences to the families of the late Bert Hawke and my predecessor Charlie Harrison. I raised this matter previously, and I will not canvass it again. Over the past few days I have listened intently to the contributions, and I note that there has been no mention of the disaster that has struck New South Wales. It would be remiss of this Parliament if we did not refer to what has happened in that State, particularly when we consider the enormous bill, in excess of \$100 million, that will face those people, the family tragedies, the deaths, and so on.

I believe that this State Parliament should send messages to the New South Wales people expressing our sadness at what has taken place. It was not so many years ago—in fact

in 1983—that South Australia experienced similar disasters from the fires in the Adelaide Hills and the floods around Gawler. I hope that that message is conveyed from the Speaker and the Department of the Premier and Cabinet to the people of New South Wales.

The wheat subsidy war between the EEC and the United States has been referred to in the past few days. If we go back through history, we see that there can be disastrous effects. I predict that, if this matter is not resolved very quickly (and I am not a pessimist by nature) and if these trade wars increase, this country will suffer more than any other country in the Western world. I hope that those matters are resolved quickly. Justice Murphy was also referred to, and I will canvass that issue later.

I really take exception to the hypocritical attitude of some members opposite. They justifiably stand up in this place, as I have done, and express concern about abuses over the telephone to members' wives and families. Members must do their job properly, and we take exception to our family being on the receiving end. I can understand that. But what I do not cop and will not cop in this place as long as I am here is the hypocritical attitude and the professed views of members opposite about their christian ethics when they get stuck into Justice Murphy. They want to hound Justice Murphy out of office, one reason being that he is and has been a great reformist judge.

Justice Murphy has made many enemies amongst the wealthy, the tax avoiders and their political mouthpieces, and this is the root cause of the outrageous persecution of one of the most reformist judges this country has ever seen. I am absolutely appalled at the lengths to which some people will go to hound a person of his calibre. I condemn that sort of attitude. We all know the circumstances of Mr Justice Murphy's health, but some people are not prepared to relent even though he has two feet in the grave. They want to hound him while he has one ounce of breath in his body, and that is to be condemned. Certainly, I believe I speak for all members on this side.

I have listened to some of the outrageous statements made by members opposite when they talk about the Community Employment Program. They do not mention the benefits that accrue to the community from that program. The CEP has involved 93 000 jobs on almost 17 000 projects in Australia and more than \$1 billion of Federal Government funding. Although 46 per cent of those ex-CEP participants now have permanent jobs, six months after leaving the program, we have members opposite who continually knock this scheme. Nothing is perfect, and from time to time some of their criticisms may be valid, but what scheme does not have some flaw in it?

Special emphasis has also been given through those programs to disadvantaged groups in our community. As the member for Albert Park, I know that a large amount of money has been poured into the western suburbs through the CEP scheme, and the funding provided by our Federal colleagues has assisted the community in many areas. We see the hypocritical attitude of members opposite, who bleat about the problems of the unemployed. However, the Federal Government has given priority to assisting those long-term unemployed, and that Government is to be congratulated.

Not being one to back away from a fight, I listened with a great deal of interest to a comment the member for Morphett made about the pressures of single parents, and I do not disagree. There are many problems with single parents in our community. The honourable member described how some women, because of the pressures of single parenthood, hit out at and strike their children. I do not

disagree with that view, but what I do disagree with is that such people are now starting to go to DCW officers whereas they were not doing that a few years ago. That is an outrageous statement. I could go back many years, when we were in Opposition, to a time when I could not get funding through DCW to help people in my electorate. I refused to go to a number of State functions because I felt so strongly about that matter. Therefore, I do not want the member for Morphett making pious statements about his concern for the unemployed and the single parents in the community. His comments were sheer politicking at its worst.

Another matter concerns me as a trade unionist—and I still belong to the trade union movement: I noted with a great deal of interest in the *Advertiser* on 14 July an article headed 'Liberals weigh up electoral chances', one paragraph stated:

The Government's proposed industrial safety, health and welfare legislation also would be an additional cost.

I want to expand on that because what is not mentioned by members opposite is the incidence of industrial dispute *vis-a-vis* the time lost through industrial accidents in this country. In the *Advertiser* of 13 May an article appears, headed 'Strike figures jolt Liberals' policy', stating:

The Federal Opposition's industrial relations policy was given a statistical jolt yesterday by figures showing working days lost through strikes were at their lowest level for almost 19 years.

Yet members opposite still have the gall to come in here and buck at the trade union movement at every given opportunity. The figures showed that 1 208 700 working days were lost in the year to January 1986, the lowest for a 12 month period since the 12 months to April 1969. It is quite true that the Opposition's policy is based squarely on confrontation with the trade union movement. To support that proposition, I refer to an article that appeared in the *Advertiser* on 2 July 1986, as follows:

The Federal Government should consider sending in the armed forces to break the strike by waterside workers, the Acting Leader of the Opposition, Mr Brown, said yesterday.

What an incredible situation—bring in the troops! I do not agree with bringing in troops to break any industrial dispute. That is my view, and I hold very strongly to it, as do I believe all members on this side. Another illustration of the attitude of these conservative, pompous clowns opposite is a statement by their federal colleague Mr Everingham, the bloke who had to get out of the Northern Territory because the heat was getting to him (in more ways than one). In an article in the *Advertiser* on 5 April, he was reported to have questioned the 'excesses of affirmative action, positive discrimination, anti-sexist, racist and ageist, income distribution, consumer conscious, non-competitive, non-smoking and artificially sweetened utopian society which has been all the rage in the past decade or so'. On the question of repetitive strain injury, he buckets those people who have been unfortunate enough to sustain this injury.

Before getting on to that matter, however, I want to go back to the question of industrial accidents, industrial diseases and disputes in South Australia in 1984. It makes very interesting reading. With industrial accidents, the number of cases in South Australia was 10 299, the number of weeks lost totalled 61 360, and the number of weeks lost per worker involved totalled six. With industrial diseases, the number of cases totalled 962, the number of weeks lost totalled 11 479 and the number of weeks lost per worker involved totalled 12.5. With industrial accidents and diseases, the number of cases totalled 11 261, the total number of weeks lost totalled 72 839 and the number of weeks lost per worker involved totalled 6.5.

In terms of industrial disputes, the number of workers involved totalled 12 400, the number of weeks lost totalled

4 380, and the number of days lost per worker involved totalled 1.8. The number of cases of repetitive strain injury totalled 1 009, the total number of weeks lost was 10 114, and the number of weeks lost per worker involved totalled 10.

There are many and varied reasons why we have industrial disputes, but one reason why we have many industrial disputes involves the question of safety. This matter has been addressed on numerous occasions since I have been in this Parliament, not only by myself but by many of my colleagues. I was a union official for many years, and, when a colleague is run over and killed in a shunting accident, is it any wonder that the blokes on the job say, 'Enough is enough' and walk off the job? Can anyone deny them that course of action? Of course they cannot, and I certainly would not.

Any worker is entitled to stand up and defend his right to sell his labour in a proper and safe environment, yet members opposite are very quick to bucket the trade union movement and those members of the trade union movement who have the 'temerity' to stand up and demand that they protect their own lives and income for their wives and children. I am happy to say in this place that I was involved in many industrial disputes, not only when I was a rank and file member of my union but, indeed, as a union official, to try to get better working and safety conditions for the members I represented in the industry in which I worked for so many years. It is also rather interesting to read in the Department of Labour bimonthly newsletter called *Work Place* of 4 April 1985 an article headed 'Employers Fail Fire Health Quiz', as follows:

A five-woman team which spent six months inspecting shops, offices and warehouses in the City, North Adelaide and Greenhill Road has reported 'widespread' lack of knowledge about safety legislation. The 50-page report reveals that a substantial number of occupiers and employers were unaware of their responsibility to take all reasonable precautions to ensure the health and safety of their employees.

- Twelve per cent of premises surveyed did not comply with safety code regulations for fire extinguishers and fire-safety officers.
- Six per cent did not meet first aid equipment requirements.
- Almost half the employers were not aware of their obligation to provide staff with a written safety-and-health policy outline.
- And 78 per cent of employers were not aware of the need to report an injury where the person was away from work for three days or more.

Let us have no more of the nonsense, garbage and drivel that we get from members opposite when they talk about the cost to this country in terms of industrial disputation. During the past few days, I have not heard in this debate the question of industrial safety—the right of workers to work in a safe environment.

Mr S.J. Baker: Wait for the Bill.

Mr HAMILTON: That is a cop out, and the honourable member knows it. If the member for Mitcham thinks he can snow me with his silver tongue, he has another think coming. I have been around the traps for too long, to be sold on the garbage coming from the little boys in short pants on the other side of the Chamber. One reason why workers are demanding better conditions is the slack attitude of members opposite and the people they represent. They do not give a damn about the workers who get hurt. For example, I refer to Lang Hancock, who had workers die from asbestosis. Lang Hancock said, 'A few people die, so what? People get killed out on the roads—tough luck.' I will say that it is tough luck, until you have to go out and see the families and visit the people in hospital who have been injured, who are suffering and dying because of the lack of industrial safety. I do not want any more of that

garbage fed to me by members opposite. I feel very strongly about this matter, as the House can see. It is not a matter to be laughed at, as far as I am concerned; it is deadly serious (and that is not meant as a pun).

I refer to repetitive strain injury, and I have had experience of this in my office. There were 1 009 cases of repetitive strain injury in South Australia in 1983-84. Many government offices and members of Parliament, in my view, have a lot to answer for in terms of the way they work their own staff—and I include myself in that. Members of Parliament are very demanding in the work they require from their staff. Very few members in this place, if any, could say that their secretaries do not do a magnificent job. I place on record the fact that mine does. Politicians have a lot to answer for because of the lack of proper equipment and the effect that has on their staff, although that is being addressed, albeit belatedly, in terms of our electorate offices.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Indeed, I make my position quite clear. I believe that Governments of all persuasions have much to answer for in terms of repetitive strain injury and its effect. I cannot wear some of the garbage peddled around by Opposition members and their interstate colleagues in terms of how their staff members are affected by repetitive strain injury. I know from personal experience, because a member of my staff has been off work for over 12 months. That woman would not have a lazy bone in her body and she has worked unpaid for many hours. In my view she should receive almost the same salary as a member of Parliament because of the amount of work she does. We sit here in this Chamber listening to boring debates while our secretaries are handling the mundane tasks in our electorate offices and working long hours without complaining.

I return to the question of working health and safety. While some members can be frivolous about this matter, certainly I am not. The article published by the United Trades and Labor Council in April 1986 gives some indication—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: There is the bigotry of the member for Mitcham. The honourable member will not learn anything. He thinks that the trade union movement consists of rabbits and that it has no idea about industrial health and welfare. I venture to suggest that, if he had the guts to go to Trades Hall and confront some of the people there, such as the Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council, he might be enlightened. Indeed, if he had the guts to go to a Trades and Labor Council meeting to hear some of the views or go around to some of the trade union shops, he could see whether or not those people are prepared to talk to him. Perhaps one of the reasons that they may not want to talk to him would be his blinkered attitude.

I return to the need to provide proper safe working conditions. Safe working instructions, training and supervision are most important, and it is the right of the worker to protect his own working environment. On the wharves the waterside workers have vigilance officers who have the power to walk around and, when they see an unsafe working condition, they can say, 'That is it: stop work until the matter is sorted out.' I fully support that view. Over many years I have seen employees and their representatives go to management and say, 'We have a problem.' The reply has been, 'Okay, mate, we will fix it up. Don't get too uptight about it.' Within a few hours or a few days, an employee is severely injured, or perhaps even killed. Suddenly, like a bolt from the blue, the employers have people there trying to solve the problem, but it is too late for the injured

employee. From my experience in the railway industry I know the sorts of problems that I came across many year ago under a Labor Government, in my capacity as a union official. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Lands): I move: That the House do now adjourn.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): The first matter I raise relates to the explanation given to the House today by the Minister of Recreation and Sport concerning his purchase of Grand Prix tickets. To say the least, the circumstances relating to the sale of those tickets are strange. The Opposition was approached by a person, who was acting on behalf of the holder of the tickets. We were informed that the holder had been seeking the two gold pass tickets for some time. Finally, she was told that she could purchase two passes by making out a cheque for \$360 to Mr Kym Mayes. When she finally received the passes, she was mystified when she discovered that they were marked 'guest pass', indicating that the person to whom they were originally allocated had apparently not paid anything for them. That is what was indicated on the passes; no price had been paid for them. It was on this basis that the Opposition was approached.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Maybe the Opposition has learnt a little from Government members about naming firms and others in this House. The Opposition has been given a copy of the original cheque that was made out for the tickets. It is marked 'payable to Kym Mayes, the sum of \$360', the price of two gold passes. It was banked at the Goodwood branch of the State Bank on 22 May and it was paid into account No. 149504440. I understand that the Minister has banking business with the State Bank and that that bank is in his electorate.

The questions I think require answering are these. How many tickets did the Minister receive marked 'guest' with no price? Under what arrangements did he receive these tickets? I am not aware of any special allocation made to Ministers or members of Parliament. Indeed, the Premier made a point last year of emphasising that his Ministers would pay for their tickets. To whom did the Minister give the tickets he received? What has been done with those tickets since then? How is it that a sum of \$360 has been paid in a cheque made out personally to the Minister for two gold passes marked 'guest' but allocated at no price? Until the Minister answers these questions Parliament and the public cannot be satisfied that he has acted with propriety.

The fact is that gold passes for the Grand Prix have been in big demand. The public needs to have confidence that they have been allocated fairly and without favour. If it is the case that special arrangements were made for the Minister, then that is unfair. If it is the case that the Minister received complimentary tickets and then sold them, then that is far more serious. I understand that the media has been shown a cheque butt by the Minister which shows he paid \$900 for five tickets. However, if these are the tickets now in question, why did the Minister accept, in return for his cheque, tickets marked to indicate that no payment had been made for them? What does this mean to the Grand Prix accounting if payment is made for tickets which are marked as being allocated at no price?

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Let the Minister answer if it is simple. In any case, the fact that the Minister has produced a cheque butt for five tickets does not mean that he did not receive more tickets. Parliament deserves more than the abuse that the Minister is attempting to dish up outside the House over this matter. I have put that on the record and I hope we receive satisfactory answers either from the Minister or anyone else who can get to the bottom of the matter.

I will now raise other matters of concern to my constituents. I have received the following letter:

Dear Sir,

May I express my concern about the driving licence fees, namely, the five-year term. Others I have spoken to, including a person from the Ombudsman's Department, have similar ideas and so therefore I am writing to you with a few points you may care to consider.

1. The fee is quoted at \$12 per year when in fact it is not. It is \$60 for five years, which is an entirely different thing. If a person goes into a shop and asks the price of a simple item and is quoted at say 50c or whatever, he is entitled to take one at 50c, not obliged to take five for \$2.50. This is clearly a case of misrepresentation which would not be upheld legally or morally anywhere but in a Government department.

2. Many people will find it hard to pay \$60 instead of \$12 for a driving licence. Why should they have to? No-one else collects or gets paid for anything five years in advance.

3. How can the present Government spend the revenue of a future Government five years away?

4. If this situation is allowed, where will it stop (rental on phones, meter charges for power, etc.)—clearly contrary to all business practice.

5. What happens to interest on money for five years? If a person is unfortunate enough to be using borrowed money they will be paying a lot more than \$12 per year. I will leave you to work out the benefit to Government funds when the number of licences in South Australia is considered.

6. What happens if for any reason a person does not want a licence for five years? I realise that there are other ways of having this matter looked at, talk-back programs and so on, but I thought I would contact you first.

I hope that Government departments take note of what members say in this place, otherwise we might as well pack up and go home. My constituent came to me because, he thought that if I, as a member of Parliament, asked questions they would be deserving of an answer. I trust that someone in the Department of Transport goes through *Hansard*, and, in due course, provides me with an answer to my constituent's queries.

Another matter I want to raise concerns the question of land valuations. One of my constituents came to me with a schedule of land valuations for the Harrogate area, in the Adelaide Hills. He also showed me the previous schedule. There was no rhyme or reason in the percentage increases for that whole range of properties. He objected to his valuation and said that, on all the evidence available, the valuation had to be phoney. He contacted the appropriate officer and got back a letter, a copy of which I have and which says, in effect—and I will paraphrase it—'Yes, we think you have got a point. We have put yours down and put your neighbour's up.' It is incredible that Government departments should act like this.

As I understand it, the people responsible for valuations do not look at properties any more; they simply sit at a desk and work out what they think the valuation ought to be. I think that they have aerial maps, but what they gather from them I do not know. I have the schedule of valuations for that district, as supplied by my constituent.

Mrs Appleby: Do you know where he lives?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, Harrogate. We have mentioned the name several times now.

Mrs Appleby interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is obvious that the honourable member has an infallible memory and has never forgotten anything in her life. She is very lucky indeed. I have the schedule of valuations for this district showing the percentage increases across those properties and there is no rhyme or reason whatsoever in those valuations. I think that members opposite who have properties—and a number of them do; if one looks at the declaration of pecuniary interests one sees that we have a number of substantial capitalists sitting opposite who have quite significant property holdings—unless they are singled out for special treatment, will find their valuations rather strange, if they are anything like those in my electorate. I received my valuation quite recently and, along with many others, I intend to appeal. To get such a schedule of valuations and then be told that, because somebody complains, the neighbour's valuation goes up is, in my judgment, quite disgraceful.

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

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Gilles): I want to utilise the time allotted to me in this adjournment debate to set the record straight in relation to the performance of the Labor Government in recreation and sport. Yesterday I noted in the *Adelaide News* on page 64 an article headed 'SA Sport Bungling—Mayes must "come clean"—Ingerson'. The article claims that the State Government is bungling the future of South Australian sport. This report is attributed to the shadow recreation and sport spokesman, Mr Graham Ingerson. I am sorry that he is not in the House at the moment, but I hope that he will take heed of what I am about to say. Indeed, there was not only the article in the *News*: he compounded his ignorance yesterday afternoon in his Address in Reply speech. To make matters worse, the article, I believe, contains wild and unsubstantiated accusations in relation to the Labor Party's record over the four years since 1982.

One would have thought that the member for Bragg would have learnt a lesson from the results of the recent State election because Opposition members, in particular the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Bragg, were the most vocal proponents of knocking every sporting project proposed or achieved by the State Labor Government. But they did not learn the lesson. They got the greatest political bath in the history of South Australia because they were seen by the community at large as a knocking, cringing, whingeing, carping group of people and they are again falling for the same trick. I would have thought that they would have been more positive.

I want to give some advice to the member for Bragg, because I believe he needs it. First, it is the Opposition's job not only to oppose but also to propose certain aspects of policy. One would expect that it would have learnt its lesson, but it obviously has not going by the remarks of the honourable member in the House yesterday and, indeed, from the remarks attributed to him in the article in yesterday's *News*. I might even repeat the comment made by the Leader of the Opposition, not to be negative but to be positive: in fact, to use his phrase, 'Let's have a few concrete commitments'. That is not likely to be the case.

I want to set the record straight because from 1979 to 1982 there was not one significant achievement by the Tonkin Liberal Government in the area of sport. In fact, I think one could write the achievements on the back of a bus ticket.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Adelaide Airport—

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I am talking about the areas of recreation and sport.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: That may be claimed by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Lewis: Grand Prix.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: We are referring to recreation and sport, which, in the days of the Tonkin Government, was not even a department—it was a division of the Department of Transport, with a budget of about \$3.8 million. Last year the budget for recreation and sport was \$13 million. When the Liberal Government left office it was also committed to building an aquatic centre in Hindley Street which would have cost at least \$15 million. There are other aspects of sport and recreation, for instance, the racing industry was in dire financial trouble and was on its knees. The first thing that the Bannan Government did in 1982, when elected to office, and when I was Minister was give priority to recreation and sport. I am sure that that priority will be carried through by the present Minister. The Department of Recreation and Sport was created in its own right for the first time. We said about providing, within the limitation of funds, sporting facilities both for leading athletes and various other sporting bodies.

Let me give a few examples of the facilities that were completed in those three years: The softball diamond at West Beach; the sports administration centre in Sturt Street, which provided office accommodation for a variety of 'minor' sports; the outdoor skating arena at Angle Park; the international lawn bowling green at Salisbury; the aquatic centre at North Adelaide; and all-weather courts for the Lawn Tennis Association at Memorial Drive. There was also a multitude of grants to other recreation and sporting organisations for improvement of their facilities. The Sports Institute budget was \$180 000 when the Liberal Party left office in 1982. Last year it was \$650 000.

Mr Groom: Do you think they were genuine on sport and recreation?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: No, I do not, and I think the record proves that. So, it ill-behoves the shadow Minister of Recreation and Sport (the member for Bragg) to cast aspersions on the record of this Government. He hangs his hat on the number of proposals that are in the pipeline, but he lacks understanding of just what is necessary to bring those projects to fruition. I am glad that now with only three minutes to go my colleague the member for Bragg has appeared in the Chamber. I remind the honourable member that the projects are on the drawing board.

The projects that he described as being fiascos—a word that he used repeatedly in his speech yesterday—are nothing of the sort. If the honourable member can be patient and if the public is patient those projects will come to fruition. It will not help matters if the Opposition continually criticises and whinges about every project. Sport ought to be non-political, and both the Government and the Opposition should work together on these matters, with more being achieved in that way. I do not know if the member for Bragg heard my remarks, but, as I said earlier, that it would be beneficial for the member for Bragg, his Party and sport in general if the honourable member ensured that in future he did not make those wild and general accusations.

Mr Ingerson: They are right, though.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: They are not right. If they were right and could be substantiated, it would be different. Another thing that I resent (and I am sure that the departmental officers do also) is the honourable member's criticism of those departmental officers. The honourable member criticised them in his remarks to the House yesterday. I think he called them henchmen of the Minister. I think that

was the term he used. I do not think that helps the situation, either. Only some 60 people work in the Department of Recreation and Sport, and from my experience of working with those people I think they are capable and efficient members of the Public Service. I do not think that they should have been subjected to the criticism that was heaped on them yesterday in the remarks of the member for Bragg and in the article to which I referred earlier. The last paragraph of that article stated:

Mr Ingerson said he believed that sport was bogged down in South Australia by bureaucracy.

Nothing could be further from the truth—it is a small department. He went on to say:

I do not see the need to have a department the size of South Australia's recreation and sport section, which is encroaching on areas in which it should not be involved.

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

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): From time to time members rise in this place to disclose publicly matters that they believe concern their constituents. Since coming to this place in 1973, I recall the times when members from both sides of the House have felt the need to disclose information about companies that they have described in various ways—some shaky, some unstable, some shonky, and so on. I believe that those members have in most, if not all, cases made disclosures in this Parliament with a view to genuinely warning their constituents. This afternoon I have reason to tell the House about a matter which has been drawn to my attention and in relation to which I have certain information in my possession. The company in question is identified as being WA Pines Pty Ltd, its administrative office being situated at 190 Canning Highway, East Fremantle.

This company, formed in the mid-70s, issued a prospectus by way of agency delivery to a significant number of South Australians in order to attract investment in the venture. The venture was identified in broad terms to those prospective investors. In good faith, a significant number of people, as I have indicated, have been involved and a very large sum of money has been transferred from this State to the State mentioned for the purposes of getting this pine plantation exercise up and running. It has come to my attention and has been confirmed this afternoon in conversation with certain authorities in Western Australia that there is a very real financial problem surrounding that business. Despite efforts pending listing on the second board of the Stock Exchange in Western Australia, the opportunity for dividend has not yet arisen for its investors, nor is there any real evidence available to suggest that it will be listed, nor in fact is there any real evidence to suggest that investors will get back any, let alone all, of their original investment and/or any dividend on that investment. To date, there have been no dividends paid to any of the investors, despite the indication given by the promotion group and their agents that it would be forthcoming.

Many South Australians have been approached and indeed they have submitted significant funding to this venture. That makes it not only appropriate but also obligatory to reveal certain of those facts. The company is not legally broke. It has not been put into the hands of receivers, although the signs are that that action is pending if not imminent. I had this matter drawn to my attention by a constituent of mine who has furnished me with the certificates of ownership citing the details of his investment in the Silver Lands property under the canopy of the company mentioned, and I have in my possession a further newsletter

put out by the company as part of its 1986 issue indicating that more money is required in order to recover any of the original investment.

So, in short, the people who have put money into this company are caught between two vicious tides, as I see it. They have put their money in and, if they do not put more money in as invited by the company in its current financial position, then the company, as confirmed by its manager to me on the telephone this afternoon, has the opportunity of simply going to the Bankruptcy Court and effectively going out of business and automatically owning the land and/or its residue, and none of the investors will receive a cent. That would be extremely disappointing if it occurred, but I suggest with due respect that the risk of that occurring now is very real.

I simply take this opportunity to put on the record the details, albeit scant for obvious reasons, so that the matter, by ordinary means, might be circulated as a warning both to those persons who have entered the venture and have become investors in WA Pines Pty Ltd, of Western Australia, and more especially to those who may be considering, by invitation of the company, pouring more money into the venture—to pour more good money after bad, some might say. I do not want to unduly or unreasonably or disrespectfully refer to the company in any way other than the terms that I have outlined here today. The circular letter that has gone to all investors in recent days soliciting their further investment is headed 'WA Pines to go public'. Under the subheading 'Great news for all investors!' it is stated:

At last the group is in the position to be able to restructure and start to change all investors to shareholders.

It also states that there are easy transfers of the shares and dividends every year. The annual report will be available, shareholders will own the land, all shareholders will be equal and details of the board of directors as proposed are outlined.

On the surface, it appears to be an attractive and professionally produced brochure but, when one studies its content (and I speak only for myself), one sees that it is a misleading if not false document, on face value. In that respect and certainly in that context, I warn anyone who might have been involved in this venture financially or might be considering further involvement financially to contact their broker, accountant or, if considered necessary by the individual, a solicitor to take professional advice before going further into this activity. I make no apologies for being somewhat vague in my reference to this situation, but I believe it is fair that a company be given every reasonable opportunity to recover from what might be described by some as a hopeless situation. On the other hand, it is also fair that the large number of South Australian investors are also warned.

I want to put on record that, following receipt of the material to which I referred, contact has been made with certain authorities in the country for the purpose of verifying the allegations put to me by concerned constituents. After following through two telephone numbers that were recorded in the Western Australian directory, I found a third number and this evening I was successful in contacting the current manager of WA Pines Pty Ltd, a Mr David Swaine. Mr Swaine, of course, went out of his way to urge me to be cautious in any comment that I may feel obliged to make in the Parliament and/or in any other place, and that is understandable in the interests of his own personal involvement in this venture.

Motion carried.

At 5.28 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 12 August at 2 p.m.