

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 17 September 1986

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

### MILLION MINUTES OF PEACE

The House observed one minute's silence in acknowledgment of the International Year of Peace.

### PETITION: VEHICLE LIMITS

A petition signed by 103 residents of South Australia praying that the House would oppose any measure which would increase existing limits for heavy road vehicles was presented by Mr Hamilton.

Petition received.

### PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister of State Development and Technology (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*  
Equal Opportunity. Commissioner for—Report, 1984-85.

## QUESTION TIME

### THIRD PARTY INSURANCE

**Mr OLSEN:** Will the Premier say whether premiums will have to rise by 40 per cent just to cover the existing deficit in the State Government Insurance Commission compulsory third party motor vehicle insurance fund and what action the Government will take to curtail an even higher deficit that is expected at the end of this financial year? Since June 1982, the accumulated loss in the SGIC's third party fund has blown out from \$200 000 to \$119.7 million. But, what is worse, this financial year the loss is expected to be massive. I have been informed that if immediate action is not taken, the loss on this year's operations would be \$160 million—almost double what it was last year. It would increase the accumulated deficit in the fund to almost \$300 million.

To demonstrate the potential impact on motorists, I understand it would require a 40 per cent increase in premiums—from \$202 to \$280—just to wipe out the existing deficit without taking into account the further very serious deterioration this financial year. When I raised in this House, on 28 August last year, the massive loss being built up in this fund, the Government took no action. A report has been before the Government since last December outlining the action necessary to ensure that compulsory third party motor vehicle insurance is correctly funded. As the Government has had 10 months to make up its mind, and in view of the alarming situation now revealed by the Auditor-General's Report, I ask the Premier to indicate to the House what the Government intends to do.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I suggest that the Leader of the Opposition do his homework and not just pick up the morning's *Advertiser* and think, 'What question shall I ask today? Here is a good one—I will base it on what I read.' I will answer the question by reference to a press statement

from my colleague the Minister of Transport on 16 June 1986. The Leader asked what action we were taking. It was all spelt out on 16 June. I wish the Leader had done his homework and a bit of research into what is going on before jumping in. The Government has had a report before it.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The Government has adopted 12 recommendations from that report already. I will briefly put them on the record because honourable members obviously need a bit of education here. They are as follows:

1. The discount rate used by the courts in calculating the present value of moneys be set at 5 per cent or such other figure as prescribed.
2. Manager's fees be abolished.
3. The payment of awards for nervous shock be limited.
4. No payments for solatium or consortium be allowed.
5. Benefit limitations be placed on small claims.
6. Compulsory exchange of medical reports be introduced.
7. SGIC's rights to recover be clarified in illegal use and drink driving situations.
8. A minimum contribution (15 per cent) be applied when seat belts are not worn other than by exempted persons.
9. Passengers be liable, in certain circumstances, for contributory negligence where they know the driver has been drinking.
10. A restriction be placed on the meaning of 'arising out of the use of a vehicle'.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Members opposite do not like this. The final two recommendations were:

11. Discussions be held between the Attorney-General, the Chief Justice and the Senior Judge with a view to mandatory use of pre-trial conferences.

12. A driver excess of \$200 to be introduced for drivers at fault.

In addition we are also looking at the pain and suffering element of settlements, and legislation is under preparation and will be introduced into this place. That announcement has already been made.

Finally, I might add that the Leader of the Opposition draws attention to the deficit in the CTP account of SGIC at the moment, and the amount is less than \$100 million. It is a large amount of money—an actuarial deficit. I point out that in the case of some other States, in particular New South Wales and Victoria, we are talking about deficits of the order of \$1 000 million—a billion dollars! In fact, our CTP fund is one of the best managed in the country—

*Mr Olsen interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** —and the actions the Government is taking will certainly keep it that way.

### MILK PRICES

**Mr HAMILTON:** Can the Minister of Agriculture advise whether the Government is considering altering the present pricing structure for the sale of milk? I have received representations from constituents who have expressed opposing views on this very important issue. On the one hand, milk vendors are saying that any reduction in the price of milk will have a detrimental effect on their business, while, conversely, constituents who buy milk from the supermarket are saying that the reduction in the price of milk will certainly assist their families. During a time of constraint, and bearing in mind the situation that pertains in Victoria, I ask the Minister whether the Government is considering making any alteration to the pricing of milk in this State.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I thank the member for Albert Park for his question. Of course, this is of great interest to most members and it certainly impacts on consumers as well as vendors and producers. The Kerin package for the

dairy industry must be monitored closely over the next few months to ascertain how that package operates in relation to the local market situation on manufactured products and the export incentive, which is part of the package that the Federal Minister for Primary Industry has prepared.

At this stage the Government has no plans to change the pricing structure. By way of background information for members, the Metropolitan Milk Board, which is a statutory authority, is empowered under the Milk Supply Act to fix the price paid to producers, wholesalers and retailers for milk produced and sold in an area that extends from Gawler to south of Aldinga, and including areas such as Elizabeth and Belair. The Act provides for a fairly regulated pricing mechanism. This pertains to the provision of a service to the community and also a return to the producers, manufacturers and handlers of white milk.

At the moment the situation as we see it is that there is overwhelming support for delivery to homes of fresh milk. I know that various radio surveys conducted by a couple of the local stations quite recently showed a ratio of about nine to one in favour of the continuation of vendor supply. I know that that has probably prompted the honourable member's question to me. That of course means that there is a mark-up applicable to the retailer in the shop, as a consequence of those people who purchase their milk from the shop and not from the vendor who delivers it to the front door.

Prices charged in this State are carefully monitored by the Milk Board. The structure of costs that are paid to the producer is assessed by the Milk Board on a regular basis, samples are taken of the production costs, and estimates are made of what is a reasonable return on the cost of production to the producer, and to that is added the price to the wholesaler and then to the retailer. I can say that the price for a litre of fresh milk being delivered to Adelaide homes is the lowest of any mainland State. Our price is 72c, and I think the nearest price interstate is 76c.

That situation is one that can be supported by the Government in view of the price structure, as compared with interstate situations. However, given what is happening in Victoria, the Government cannot ignore the proposals that are afoot in that State. We are waiting to see what the review into the Victorian situation brings forward. I must say that any responsible Government must keep the situation under review, and we will do that. In the meantime, in reply to the honourable member, and other members who have raised this with me, I can say that the pricing structure will be maintained and that, certainly, part of that structure will be the support of the vendor supplying fresh milk to the doorsteps of homes in metropolitan Adelaide.

### THIRD PARTY INSURANCE

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** My question is to the Premier and is supplementary to that asked by the Leader. Can the Premier say whether there will be another rise in compulsory third party motor vehicle insurance premiums to cover the massive escalation in the deficit of the State Government Insurance Commission fund?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The Deputy Leader of the Opposition surely understands the procedure by which these determinations are made. There is in fact a Third Party Insurance Premiums Committee that makes regular, periodical assessments of the appropriate level of premiums and effectively makes a determination. That determination is automatically given effect by law unless the Government intervenes to prevent it in some way. One of the reasons

we are in the problem we are in because of intervention by the then Tonkin Government in an increase some years ago. It is noted that the reference in the Auditor-General's Report mentions deficits which have been happening over the past four years. The fact is that failure to adjust premiums eventually shows up in future years and it is interesting that the Opposition—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** We can tell from their interjections that I am quite right. They are a bit uncomfortable about this. I am not asking members to believe me on this; I am asking them to refer to the report made by the SGIC which makes that quite clear and points out that it is in the difficulties it is in because of that direction from the previous Government. It is there, in black and white, in the report. The Third Party Premiums Committee obviously will have to keep the matter under consideration, but it is the Government's intention—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:** You have been there for nearly—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in view of the fact that he just continued to interject when I had called the House to order, an action which is tantamount to defiance of the Chair and which the Chair has previously indicated will not be tolerated.

**The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:** I am a bit hard of hearing.

**The SPEAKER:** I call on the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to retract that interjection.

**The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:** I am not a bit hard of hearing.

**The SPEAKER:** The Chair considers that that method of retraction is not an appropriate one and falls into the category that the Chair considers as being tantamount to defiance and contempt towards the Chair.

**The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:** Tell me, Mr Speaker, what you want me to say, and I will say it.

**The SPEAKER:** The Chair requires the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to withdraw the words that were uttered.

**The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:** I withdraw the words, 'I am hard of hearing.'

**An honourable member:** Why don't you stand up?

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I withdraw the words, 'I am hard of hearing.'

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I will not worsen the situation by doing other than continuing to answer the question, although it is quite clear the discomfort the Opposition feels—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call on Government backbenchers to not further inflame the situation.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** It is quite clear that members of the Opposition, by a barrage of interjections, want to avoid listening to the facts, realising how discomfited they are by the ridiculous and badly researched questions they are asking. Let me continue by saying that it is quite clear that deficits of this order cannot be wiped out overnight, nor should the full burden of those deficits, which are actuarial deficits—in other words, that accrue over time—be put on today's participants in the compulsory third party scheme. However, remedial action must be taken and reasonable adjustments to premiums will occur, but I repeat that there is no cause to panic in the situation in South Australia.

The Government has under contemplation or in action measures which will ensure that some control is kept on

these premiums. It will be up to the Third Party Premiums Committee to consider what is the appropriate level and, having made that determination, it will have effect. The latest increase, which was announced by the Minister on behalf of the committee on 16 June, operated from 31 July. So, it is not likely that there will be an immediate pronouncement simply on the basis of the end of year results of SGIC.

### EQUAL OPPORTUNITY ACT

**Ms LENEHAN:** Will the Minister of State Development and Technology, representing the Attorney-General in another place, investigate the possibility of amending the Equal Opportunity Act of 1985 to make it unlawful to discriminate against any person on the grounds of age, with certain exceptions, in the areas of education, employment and the provision of accommodation, goods and services? I have been informed that the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity's Office has, in the 12 month period to the end of June 1986, received 84 complaints of discrimination based purely on the grounds of age. As there are no legislative provisions covering discrimination on the basis of chronological age—

**Mr S.J. Baker:** What are you going to do: establish a granny apprentice scheme?

**Ms LENEHAN:** —the office is unable to help or to offer any assistance to these people. It has been further put to me that this statistic is in fact the tip of the iceberg and that significant numbers of people, particularly in the younger and older age groups, are suffering from discrimination in the areas that I have listed based solely on the stereotypical assumptions relating to people's needs and abilities and their chronological age. I ask the Minister to amend the Equal Opportunity Act.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** On behalf of my colleague the Minister of Education, who represents the Attorney-General in the other place, I am happy to forward the question by the member for Mawson. I am pleased to forward it, because I believe that the point raised by the honourable member is a very important one indeed and that it is well and truly time that we give serious consideration to what will be done to remove the discriminatory impediments that exist on the basis of age. I know that it is also a matter of concern for the member for Hayward, who has raised this matter on a number of occasions.

In that context, the seriousness of this matter being as it is, I was dismayed to hear a few moments ago by way of interjection, when the member for Mawson was asking her question, the member for Mitcham asking, 'What are you going to do: establish a granny apprentice scheme?' I think that that is an outrageous derogatory statement by the member for Mitcham. I believe that every person in this community has rights with respect to training and employment opportunities and that they should not be so derisively treated as the member for Mitcham treated them by way of interjection.

The issue is important and I am eager to see the response that the Attorney-General in another place brings down on this matter, because I think it is timely that this State and this country consider where we are going in relation to a matter where, for example, in the United States legislation has already been enacted in a number of States making discrimination on the basis of age an illegal act.

### GOVERNMENT BORROWINGS

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Is the Premier prepared to make available to the Auditor-General details of the South

Australian Government Financing Authority's plan to finance borrowings of \$100 million through a deferred annuity? In his annual report, tabled yesterday, the Auditor-General has again warned about the need for care in using SAFA funds to underpin longer-term budget strategy. This is the third successive report in which Mr Sheridan has suggested to the Government that it should proceed with caution.

In view of the Auditor-General's concern, and the Premier's refusal yesterday to divulge to the House details about the new deferred annuity scheme in which SAFA has become involved, I ask the Premier if he is prepared to provide details of the scheme to the Auditor-General so that he will be in a position to advise the House, by way of an interim report, on SAFA's involvement in deferred annuities.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The Auditor-General is the auditor of SAFA's accounts and his report is appended to those accounts in the annual report which I tabled yesterday. It is not for me to act as some sort of intermediary between the Auditor-General and his function of auditing SAFA. In relation to the comment that he made, I might also add that those comments, which appear in the Auditor-General's Report, have already been heeded. If the member for Light had taken the trouble to read it, he would know that at the end of this last financial year SAFA has created a general reserve fund of \$75 million, the purpose of which is to provide for the buffer effect about which the Auditor-General is talking. So, what he has said has been taken into account and action has been taken.

As to this transaction of which the Opposition seeks to make so much, again I am not quite clear precisely what transaction it is and it certainly would not be my policy to comment on commercial in-confidence matters, nor do I think the Opposition should be trying to do so. However, it is interesting that it loves to try to minimise the financial viability and the ability to generate profits of SAFA.

In relation to any schemes that SAFA undertakes, particularly in this deferred annuity area, I can assure the House that the Loan Council was apprised of it and that any action taken was within the confines of the Loan Council global limits. Therefore, it does not call into question any of the matters raised by the Opposition.

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** Senator Walsh says he knows nothing about the scheme.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the member for Light and the Leader of the Opposition to order.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Not only do I call the member for Light to order for the second time in a matter of seconds but also I am obliged to call the Premier to order.

### HEXAGON ENGINEERING

**Mr M.J. EVANS:** Will the Minister for Environment and Planning give an undertaking that he will enforce the order which he made under the Noise Control Act in respect of Hexagon Engineering of Salisbury, and will he give an assurance that the present exemption period of three months will not be extended?

Some four weeks ago, the Minister granted the company an exemption under the Act for a period of three months to operate during the normal working hours of each week day. The order specified that there was to be no noise audible beyond the boundary of the factory during the

evenings or at the weekends. Local residents advised me that they accepted this compromise, since it allowed the factory time to make other arrangements while allowing them reasonable peace and quiet at night and at the weekend.

Unfortunately, the factory has chosen largely to disregard the notice, and I am advised by local residents that the order has been breached on 24 of the approximately 28 days since it was issued. Repeated requests to the Minister's office have not yet resulted in any effective action to have the order enforced, and residents are concerned that the Government may also extend the term of the original three months exemption during the day given the apparent lack of action to date to enforce the existing terms of the order.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** Following complaints from local residents, an order was made in relation to this industry, which then applied for an exemption and was granted a three-month exemption. It was indicated then that no further exemption would be available. I am aware informally of the desire of the company to obtain an extension, but no request for an exemption has been delivered to me or, as far as I am aware, to my department. As the honourable member indicates, there have been complaints about breaches of the order, and they are being investigated. The order will be enforced.

I point out to the honourable member and the House, however, that the only practical way in which the order can be enforced is through the courts, and that to go before the courts one must ensure that one has a case—that there is a case for the defendant to answer. Therefore, my people are busy investigating this matter to determine the best way of ensuring that the order is enforced. I also make the point (for whoever wants to take it) that those who may be interested in an extension of the exemption are doing their cause no good by breaching the order, if indeed such breaches are taking place. I am certainly prepared to give the honourable member the assurance that he requests.

### FESTIVAL CENTRE PLAZA

**Mr BECKER:** Will the Premier explain why he misled the House on 27 August about structural and safety problems at the Festival Centre Plaza, and is he prepared to give the public an assurance that the plaza is safe to use? In reply to a question by the Deputy Leader on 27 August, the Premier said there had been no marked escalation in the estimate of \$3.2 million that he gave in September 1984 for repairing the plaza. However, information provided to me yesterday in reply to a question on notice shows that, two days before the Premier gave this answer, Cabinet had referred the project to the Public Works Standing Committee, meaning that the Premier must have been aware of the cost escalation, with the completed cost now put at \$10.7 million.

The Premier also said on 27 August that there was no immediate danger associated with the deterioration of the plaza, yet the information provided yesterday refers to 'serious deterioration of the supporting structure', to pieces of concrete up to several kilograms in weight breaking away and falling to the lower plaza, and to short-term as well as long-term safety problems associated with the plaza. As it appears the Premier has been reluctant to come clean about problems associated with the plaza, and because it is used by hundreds of people every week, is he now prepared to give an assurance that the plaza is safe for public use?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Yes, I am, and I think that it is disgraceful that the Opposition seeks to alarm the public

in this way regarding what is an important venue for so many events and activities. Were there any question of the plaza's being unsafe in the short term, we would obviously close it tomorrow. The reason why we are spending money on a repair project which has been progressively taking place is in order to avoid those dangers. If the honourable member had quoted my full answer, I went on to say that if something was not done about the plaza there could be dangers but, in terms of immediate danger to the public and on the best advice that we can judge, there is none. If any shows up, obviously those parts of the plaza will be attended to or any other remedial action will be taken. Meanwhile, we are getting on with the repair job.

I did not mislead the House, either. There has been far too great a tendency to pick up estimates of cost made at the beginning or at the announcement of some project, to forget about the intervening time and the way in which inflation and other factors have changed the monetary values of those estimates, to fail to look at whether a project has changed in its nature or scope and then to use that as an example of blow-out or cost escalation. That is what the Deputy Leader was doing, and that is what I was responding to. The full project will go before the Public Works Standing Committee. In fact, as I understand it, the honourable member is quoting from material put before that committee, and I am not sure that that is in order.

*Mr Becker interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Well, perhaps he is in order in so doing. The point that I am making is that the matter is before that committee and the committee will thoroughly explore it and make an assessment. We are taking the opportunity, because of the need to make these major repairs to the plaza, also to do something about its aesthetics. For many years the plaza has been criticised in relation to certain of its features, including its accessibility and the difficulty the public has in relating to parts of it. Those matters are being addressed in the repair, and that will cost extra money. However, if we do that as part of this overall necessary cost of repair, it will cost much less than it might otherwise. We will take that opportunity, and that will add to the estimate of cost about which the Deputy Leader is talking, but that is because we are taking specific action unconnected with the particular need to repair the structure of the plaza.

### RIVERLAND EMPLOYMENT

**Mr DUGAN:** Is the Minister of Employment and Further Education aware of the efforts being made by the St James Community Care Committee in Waikerie to advise young people of the consequences of employment as fruit pickers in the Riverland? Further, is his department providing support to this practical venture to ensure that young jobless people are not lured to the Riverland on further fruitless exercises? On 6 August in this House, in reply to another question about claims from the Leader of the Opposition that the jobless will not work, the Minister gave details of the efforts being made by three young Adelaide youths to explore the opportunities that existed in the Riverland.

In that reply, the Minister referred to the letter written by the St James Community Care Committee to the Leader of the Opposition setting out the committee's concerns about the allegations made by him. During the following week, on 13 August, the Leader claimed that he had been misrepresented and in turn quoted a letter from a grower organisation in the Riverland expressing concern about the

availability of labour. It is obvious from the letter quoted by the Leader that there are jobs in the Riverland. It is equally obvious from the Minister's reply that there are young people who want such jobs and who would prefer to have them rather than being on the dole. Is the Minister or his department involved in or aware of any efforts that are being made to ensure that these job opportunities are linked up with those people who obviously want to take them?

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** The St James Community Care Committee—the Waikerie Intercare Centre—has in fact done some impressive work in this regard. Members recall the previous question referred to by the member for Adelaide and the fact that on that occasion I quoted from the letter to the Leader of the Opposition stating its opinion about the press statements attributed to the Leader of the Opposition. It is interesting to note that the following day the member for Chaffey chose to get quite steamed up about that and never once made any reference to the comments made by the Waikerie Intercare Centre but, in fact, he was effectively challenging every statement it had made in its letter to the Leader of the Opposition.

That group is not just simply prepared to make statements about criticisms of the Leader of the Opposition. It has done something much more positive than that—it has actually tried to marry up the job opportunities that do from time to time exist in the Riverland with those who want to seek those job opportunities. There are people who want to seek such opportunities, and that is the important point to be remembered. The group has produced a 20 minute video tape which shows interviews with a grower and a professional picker and also examines the opportunities that might exist for young people from the city to go up there and pick fruit.

It is quite a detailed video and goes into a number of aspects of the whole issue, seeking to put into real perspective the situation that exists. It attempts to dispel the belief that there are lots of jobs available for young people to go up and grab at the earliest opportunity without having any resources of their own. Instead, it examines not only what is required in terms of transport and being able to look after oneself up there but also what is required in terms of accommodation and other support, such as food and the like. The video also examines the picking process and indicates that anyone who would be a picker in the Riverland needs to have a certain understanding of the job with respect to the fruit being picked and to the damage that can be caused to the fruit by inappropriate picking methods, as well as appreciating the productivity that is needed, and knowing how much fruit would have to be picked to earn a reasonable living. The tape canvasses all those issues.

*The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** The member for Chaffey says, 'What absolute nonsense.' He is having a go at the Waikerie Intercare Centre again. He must have something deep against them, and I would like to know what it is. This group went out and produced the videotape with limited resources. In fact, the cost was \$11.85 for the videotape and \$120 for editing. It proposes to go on and produce other videotapes on the collection and picking of other products such as grapes and vegetable crops, and at that stage it may be seeking support. To date we have not received a formal request for financial support but if received it will be referred to the appropriate funding sources within my Ministry.

The response of the member for Chaffey is to call a public meeting up there. Those young people in the city who have had expectations raised by the Leader of the Opposition have to have such expectations put into a realistic perspec-

tive. That will not be done through a public meeting in the Riverland but by some means of communicating the information to those young people in the city who are listening to comments like those made by the Leader of the Opposition. It is true that opportunities do exist. It is also true that unrealistic expectations can lead to young people going up there and finding that they are left without resources, with no job to go to and having to rely on charity to get back to town. It is not a figment of someone's imagination, nor a fairy tale: that is what happened, if members recall my answer in the earlier occasion.

*The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** The member for Chaffey said, 'Why don't you go up there?' Some young people did go up there in response to the Leader of the Opposition and were abandoned up there.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** The video endeavours to show in a realistic way the opportunities that exist up there so that young people in the city will be able to realistically assess whether they can meet these job opportunities.

*The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** The member for Chaffey asks, 'Why don't you go up there?' I regularly go up there and recently met with representatives of the Riverland community, and I intend to continue going up there in future. However, that is not the question at hand. The question is to try to provide job opportunities to be filled by those young people most desperately looking for work.

#### STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY

**Mr INGERSON:** My question is to the Minister of Transport. In view of the further serious deterioration in the financial position—

*The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I suggest that the member for Chaffey extend the courtesy to the member for Bragg to allow him to ask his question in peace. The honourable member for Bragg.

**Mr INGERSON:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. In view of the further serious deterioration in the financial position of the State Transport Authority, as revealed in the Auditor-General's Report, tabled in this place yesterday, will the Minister of Transport say when the Government will initiate its promised inquiry into the STA and, further, will the Minister ensure that it is a full and independent inquiry into all aspects of the State Transport Authority's financial operations?

The Auditor-General's Report revealed that, despite fare increases of more than 70 per cent over the last three years, the STA's operating deficit has continued to blow out. Last financial year, taxpayers contributed just over \$101 million to meet the operating losses of the authority over and above the amount paid in fares. This contribution from consolidated revenue has increased by more than 36 per cent since this Government came to office. Every time a person takes a ride on a bus, train or tram the STA incurs a loss of \$1.51, which taxpayers must make up. The burden that the STA now places on all taxpayers demands that the Government take urgent action. I ask the Minister to indicate when his promised inquiry will begin and to give an assurance that it will cover all aspects of the STA's financial operations.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I thank the honourable member for his question. It is true that the growth in the

subsidy required from the Government to sustain the operations of the State Transport Authority is a matter of some concern, not only to the Government but to the community. In fact, there has been a 6 per cent increase in the subsidy in real terms over and above the rate of inflation. That is something that the Government is addressing. I might point out that it has not just suddenly happened. That trend has been obvious for a number of years. Secondly, I should point out that the Government is committed to the provision of the best possible public transport and I would hope that members opposite, if in government, would also be committed to that. It is essential that people in the community who do not have access to alternative forms of transport are able to take advantage of the facilities that the city provides.

On the other hand, it is a well known fact that sooner or later public transport systems must be proven to be viable in terms of the subsidy that the community is prepared to pay. There is some evidence to suggest that that point has been reached in South Australia. I have given a commitment in other forums to a major inquiry into the operations of the STA that will cover levels of service, the areas that the STA will service, the fare structure and matters pertaining to industrial performance, rostering, etc. Two investigations are already under way. The report from one of those investigations, concerning rostering, which is a very essential part of the cost factors that apply to the STA, will be with me within a few weeks.

**Mr S.J. Baker:** A very sensitive area.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** Yes, a very sensitive area, as the member for Mitcham has pointed out, and a very important one. It is a pity that his colleague the very Minister of Transport is not as aware of what is happening in the STA as is the member for Mitcham. Secondly, an investigation into the industrial structure and performance within the STA is being undertaken. Those inquiries are now in place. Considerable work has been done to prepare the brief for a major inquiry into the STA. I have pointed out before, and I repeat, that, when giving a brief to consultants to look at a statutory body of the size of the STA, having regard to the very important role that the STA plays in the life of a city like Adelaide, one needs to be able to give to the consultants the appropriate brief so that they know the questions that need to be looked at and that they are aware of the needs of the community.

That brief is in the process of being completed. In the meantime, this Government has asked the STA to monitor very carefully its own operations. The STA this year will, of its own volition, implement a number of economies. In addition, I will be meeting with the Chairman of the STA this afternoon—just to show how appropriate the question is—to talk through a number of other economies that are in the pipeline. We are concerned to control the increase in the subsidy that the taxpayer in South Australia is required to provide to the STA.

Let me point out, so that members opposite are clear, that the fare box returns somewhere between 25 per cent and 30 per cent of the total operating costs of the STA. So, in any normal year, if fares were to be increased at the rate of inflation, we would still be falling 60 per cent to 70 per cent behind in real terms in meeting the overall cost. Aspects other than the fare box returns need to be looked at. These other aspects, certainly in debt servicing and operational costs, the majority of which are in wages, are critical. These matters need to be looked at sensitively and in the best interests of the community. We have a problem, but we are addressing it. When I am in a position to announce the

details of the major inquiry and who will be the consultants, that information will be made public.

## ROAD SAFETY CAMPAIGN

**Mr TYLER:** My question is also to the Minister of Transport. Will the South Australian Government approach Formula One racing car drivers inviting them to participate in a road safety campaign during and after this year's Australian Formula One Grand Prix? I am sure all members will agree that we have a very high number of people dying on South Australian roads at the moment and, accordingly, it has been put to me that a road safety campaign involving Grand Prix drivers would be most beneficial around Grand Prix time, since the last three months of the year are notorious for road deaths.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I thank the member for his question, and I am pleased to inform him and the House that already the Road Safety Division has had consultations with Dr Hemmerling, the Executive Director of the Australian Formula One Grand Prix office, seeking to arrange for Formula One drivers to make road safety statements that can be promulgated during or after the Grand Prix. Dr Hemmerling has been in contact with the drivers' agents, the first contact having been made during the Austrian Grand Prix, and those negotiations are continuing. For the benefit of all members, I point out that, prior to the Grand Prix, an education program will be implemented to advise and educate people about the increase in traffic that inevitably will occur at such a major event Prix, and consequent road safety problems that accompany it. That program will be put in place.

I am sure we will receive the enthusiastic support of the media in South Australia, and I look forward to that with confidence. At least one leading radio station has been prepared to co-sponsor a road safety program for a fortnight immediately preceding the Grand Prix, and I believe that that will have an impact. We will be bringing forward the traditional anti drink driving Christmas campaign to start immediately the Grand Prix is completed.

The member stated that the last three months are traditionally the worst three months in the calendar year. That is not strictly true. If one looks at the statistics, there is very marginally an increase in the rate of accidents and fatalities in the last three months. There is something that I want to say, and I think that it really ought to be said as strongly as possible.

**The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:** And as quickly as possible.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** Even on a matter as important as road safety when one is addressing the fatalities and the rate of accidents in South Australia, members opposite want me to sit down; they want to do nothing other than interject and try to divert me from what I am saying to the House. No matter what we as a Government do and what all those organisations such as the RAA, MTA, SGIC, etc., that have an interest in road safety do in terms of publicising the risks on the road, the fact is that over 80 per cent of the accidents that occur in South Australia have an element of driver responsibility. Of course, some of these are related to drink driving and others are related just to carelessness.

No matter what is done, the people of South Australia and members of this House should understand that the bottom line is a responsible attitude towards driving by the driving community in South Australia. An individual who seeks a driver's licence to drive on our roads has an overwhelming responsibility not only to himself, but also, more

particularly, to other road users, whether they be motorists, cyclists or pedestrians. I think that, the sooner the driving community in South Australia comes to terms with that fact and acts more responsibly, the sooner we will have an even greater reduction in the number of road accidents in South Australia which, at the moment, is unsatisfactorily high.

Nevertheless, over the years legislation, particularly relating to seat belts, random breath tests and now the child restraints, will impact upon the rate of accidents as well as the fatality rate in South Australia. Legislation and campaigns alone cannot reduce the accident and fatality rates to the levels at which we would like to see them. That remains the responsibility of individual drivers in South Australia.

Irresponsible and dangerous driving are socially unacceptable and should be treated as such, just like all other dangerous acts that are perpetrated by unthinking and uncaring members of the community. This is an important issue and we will do what we can to ensure adequate road safety publicity by those people involved in the Grand Prix and, if I am in a position to advise the House as to the success of the negotiations, I will do so.

#### SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TIMBER CORPORATION

**Mr OSWALD:** Can the Minister of Agriculture explain why \$1.5 million in share losses was written off by the South Australian Timber Corporation on account of O.R. Beddison Pty Limited—a Government owned plywood manufacturer—and who repaid or wrote off loans amounting to \$3.5 million between the Timber Corporation and O.R. Beddison? In his report for the year ended 30 June the Auditor-General indicated his continued concern in relation to the operations of the South Australian Timber Corporation. As at 30 June the accumulated deficit of the South Australian Timber Corporation increased to \$2.3 million, \$1.5 million of which resulted in shares written off by O.R. Beddison Pty Limited. In addition, the notes to the accounts reveal that loans to O.R. Beddison were reduced by \$3.5 million during the year.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** As much as I would enjoy answering the honourable member's question, I think he has the wrong Minister. I refer the question to my colleague the Minister of Forests.

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** I can shed a little light on the honourable member's question. In regard to this matter I have read the Auditor-General's comments, but I will probably have to get some detailed information as to the sale of those shares. I am not *au fait* with that situation. That company was established earlier this year. The Auditor-General commented that a commercial operation involved in new products needs time to develop those products and establish markets. The Timber Corporation has expressed confidence in these ventures, and the Nangwarry section is operating very well at present. I also understand that the laminated veneer lumber production system is working exceptionally well and is starting to receive very good acceptance, particularly in the marketplace. I point out that the Government keeps a very close watch on all these investments. I have the utmost confidence in the forestry industry, the Woods and Forests Department and the senior management: they are trying to become more efficient in their operations, and other moves are being contemplated at present. I will obtain further details in relation to the shares.

#### Mr RON OWENS

**Mr GREGORY:** Will the Minister of Labour advise Parliament who appointed Mr Ron Owens, the Secretary of the Australian Building and Construction Workers Federation, to the Long Service Leave Board?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** The member for Mount Gambier asked a question yesterday and cast reflections on the worthiness or otherwise of Ron Owens to be a member of the Long Service Leave Board. I want to point out to the House that Ron Owens was appointed to that board on 16 September 1981 by the then Minister, Dean Brown.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** The question that was asked yesterday certainly reflects no credit whatsoever on the Opposition, and the way in which the member for Coles interjected indicates that she gets some kind of pleasure from calling people names under her breath. I also point out for the information of the House and the media who wish to follow up the story that I did not know yesterday the fee that Ron Owens and other members would be paid: it is \$1 305 per annum.

#### HUMAN SERVICES TASK FORCE

**Mr LEWIS:** Will the Minister representing the Minister of Local Government say whether the task force to identify service areas in which a substantial local government role will be encouraged and supported has been established, who are its members, and when did it report to the Government? Will the Minister make the report public? An article entitled 'Human Services Task Force' in the June issue of the Local Government Association publication called *Council and Community* stated that the Minister said:

The Bannockburn Government believes local government can play a more significant role in the human services field . . . The Government will, over the next few months, develop . . . a clear framework for the further development of South Australian councils in a wider range of human services . . . They [councils] have a strong administrative base and independent source of revenue . . .

Will the Minister say whether the task force has been established, who are its members, and whether the report will be made public?

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I thank the honourable member for his question. I will refer it to my colleague in another place, and bring down a report.

#### SUBMARINE TECHNOLOGY

**Mr RANN:** Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education outline what action has been taken by the Department of Technical and Further Education to upgrade South Australia's skills base to ensure that we have the right people to match the very specialised high technology needs of the \$2.6 billion submarine replacement project?

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** A number of things have happened in respect of the Department of TAFE in this area. They are a by-product of the amalgamation of the Ministries that I represent in the Cabinet bringing together the people within TAFE to liaise more closely than previously with those in the State development arena and the Department of Employment and Training arena. The Department of TAFE has been eager to contribute what it can to South Australia's posture in terms of winning this significant contract. That has led to the establishment of the committee within TAFE looking at the curriculum needs

and sending Dr Geoff Wood to Europe to meet those who are submitting tenders for the contract and to advise of the skills training capacity that exists in South Australia so that tenderers can use that in the arguments that they are putting in trying to win the tender.

Two issues are involved in training with regard to TAFE. The first concerns the training required for the construction phases of the submarine proposal. Clearly, TAFE already has courses in respect of most of the needs there or can quickly modify courses with respect to any new technologies that come along. We are well placed in that regard already. The European tenderers know that, and we believe that we have put that argument strongly to the Commonwealth Government as well. So, further information on that will depend on who is the successful contractor and on what location is chosen for the construction of the hull and the other parts of the submarine project.

However, the second part, which is equally if not more important, and which needs addressing, concerns the training requirements of those who will crew the new submarines or who will be personnel at bases where the submarines call and those who will be instructing such personnel and crew. That area has not been considered seriously by others, but TAFE is considering it closely. Dr Wood's visit to Europe canvassed that area in detail.

To show how important that is, a report that I have seen from Dr Wood indicates that 800 separate tasks are involved regarding instructors, base personnel or submarine crew, which would require training modules to be prepared for them. The department is examining the best way of preparing such training modules. It is doing this in a way that is sympathetic to the Royal Australian Navy training system documentation, so that ultimately the work that it will be doing in TAFE can be translated into the Royal Australian Navy and become part of its ongoing training program. It is exciting that we have a department that is so keenly aware of State development needs and the training opportunities that they include or need to be addressed.

### DAYLIGHT SAVING

**Mr BLACKER:** Will the Deputy Premier identify the individuals and organisations that have approached the Government with a request to introduce Eastern Standard Time, and will he table evidence of such approaches? Secondly, if the Green Triangle Committee is one of those organisations, does that committee comprise a majority of South Australian or Victorian business people? Further, will not change to Eastern Standard Time facilitate the transfer of business out of South Australia to Victoria at the expense of this State?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I will certainly have to reject the suggestion in the last part of the honourable member's question. He is correct in saying that the Green Triangle Committee does not contain a majority of business interests from this State. I would have to obtain detail as to the tabling of any letters, requests or information as to who contacted the Government. The honourable member will be aware that the task given to a couple of officers in the Premier's Department to round up this matter, following the amendment passed by Parliament last year on the possibility of splitting the State into time zones, is one that occupied some time, and many approaches were made by various individuals. I shall have to get that information for the honourable member.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker. Earlier this session, you, Sir, set out to make sure that

members made better use of Question Time. Will you therefore consult with the managers of the House to see whether we can make better use of Question Time so that members get a chance to ask a question? I believe that ministerial statements are now being made during Question Time.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The point raised by the honourable member is not a point of order. He could have raised this matter with the Chair privately. It concerns the arrangement of business between the Government and the Opposition. It is the intention of the Chair that it be left in that area.

### ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

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

That for the remainder of the session in relation to Appropriation Bill (No. 34)—

*Suspension of Standing Orders—*

(1) Standing Orders be so far suspended as would require the Bill to be considered in a Committee of the whole House.

*Consideration in Estimates Committees—*

(2) On completion of the second reading of the Bill, members may discuss grievances on a motion which shall be moved by a Minister—'That the House note grievances—on the passing of which, the proposed expenditures for the departments and services contained in the schedules to the Bill shall be referred to an Estimates Committee. Such referral shall be on motion moved by a Minister, of which notice has been given, and which shall include a timetable by which (subject to paragraph (4)) the Committee is to order its business.

(3) There shall be two Estimates Committees to be known as Estimates Committee A and Estimates Committee B which shall not vote on, but shall examine and report upon the proposed expenditures contained in the schedules. A Committee may ask for explanations from a Minister, assisted where necessary by officers in the provision of factual information, relating to the items of proposed expenditure. The report of a Committee may contain a resolution or expression of opinion of the Committee but shall not vary the amount of a proposed expenditure.

(4) The Speaker may, at the request of the Chairman of an Estimates Committee, with one day's notice, reallocate any proposed expenditures from one Committee to the other, or vary the timetable if, in his opinion, such reallocation or variation is necessary to facilitate the examination of the proposed expenditures.

*Members—*

(5) Subject to paragraph (10), each Estimates Committee shall consist of seven members including the Chairman.

(6) The members to serve on each Committee shall be nominated by the mover, but if any one member so demands they shall be elected by ballot.

(7) A member may be discharged from an Estimates Committee at any time, except when a division of the Committee is proceeding, immediately on delivering in writing to the Speaker or Clerk a request to be so discharged; provided that the member may nominate another member in substitution, such member indicating in the same notice his concurrence to serve.

(8) In the event of a vacancy occurring in the membership of an Estimates Committee, the Speaker may nominate a member in substitution but in so doing shall have regard to the composition of the Committee as elected by the House.

(9) An Estimates Committee may proceed to the despatch of business notwithstanding any vacancy in its membership.

*Chairmen—*

(10) The Chairman of—

(a) Estimates Committee A shall be the Chairman of Committees; and

(b) Estimates Committee B shall be nominated in writing by the Premier to the Speaker.

(11) Any member of the Committee shall take the Chair temporarily whenever requested so to do by the Chairman of the Committee during the sitting of that Committee.

*Quorum—*

(12) The quorum of an Estimates Committee shall be four, of whom one shall be the Chairman or Acting Chairman and, if at any time a quorum be not present, the Chairman shall suspend



the proceedings of the Committee until a quorum be present, or adjourn the Committee.

*Participation by Other Members—*

(13) Members of the House, not being members of the Committee, may participate, at the discretion of the Chairman, in the proceedings of the Committee, but shall not vote, move any motion or be counted for the purpose of a quorum.

*Sitting Times—*

(14) An Estimates Committee shall only meet in accordance with the timetable adopted by the House, or as varied by the Speaker. If a Committee is sitting on any day—

- (a) at 1 p.m., unless otherwise ordered, the sitting shall be suspended for one hour;
- (b) at 6 p.m., unless otherwise ordered, the sitting shall be suspended for one hour and a half; or
- (c) at 10 p.m., the sitting shall be adjourned.

*Proceedings of Estimates Committee—*

(15) Consideration of proposed expenditures in an Estimates Committee shall follow, as far as possible, the procedures observed in a Committee of the whole House.

*Naming of Member—*

(16) If any member persistently disrupts the business of an Estimates Committee the Chairman shall name such member and—

- (a) in the case of the member so named being a member of the Estimates Committee, shall suspend the sittings of the Estimates Committee until he has reported the offence to the House; or
- (b) in the case of the member so named not being a member of the Estimates Committee, shall order his withdrawal from the sittings of the Committee until he has reported the offence to the House.

and shall, as soon as practicable, advise the Speaker, who will give notice that the House is to meet at 9.30 a.m. on the next day.

*Disagreement with Chairman's Ruling—*

(17) If any objection is taken to a ruling or decision of the Chairman of an Estimates Committee, such objection must be taken at once and having been stated in writing, the Chairman shall, as soon as practicable, advise the Speaker, who shall give notice that the House is to meet at 9.30 a.m. on the next day; provided that the Estimates Committee may continue to meet, but shall not further examine the vote then under consideration.

*Meeting of House—*

(18) For the purposes of paragraphs (16) and (17), it shall be sufficient notice of a meeting of the House for the Speaker to cause notices thereof to be placed on the House notice boards before 10 p.m. on the day of the dispute.

(19) If the House meets pursuant to paragraphs (16) or (17), it shall, after the Speaker has read prayers, hear the report from the Chairman who requested the meeting and—

- (a) where a member has been named, proceed with the matter as if the naming had occurred in a Committee of the whole. For the purposes of any suspension of a member, the sittings of an Estimates Committee shall be considered as a sitting of the House; or
- (b) where a Chairman's ruling has been disagreed with, resolve the matter pursuant to Standing Order 164.

(20) Subsequent to any proceedings taken under paragraph (19), a motion may be proposed by a Minister to alter the timetable relating to that Estimates Committee's consideration of the proposed expenditures; such motion to be put forthwith, without debate, but no other business may be entered upon during the sitting.

*Hansard Report—*

(21) A *Hansard* report of Estimates Committee proceedings shall be circulated, in a manner similar to the House *Hansard*, as soon as practicable after completion of the Committee's proceedings.

*Report of an Estimates Committee—*

(22) A report of an Estimates Committee shall be presented by the Chairman of that Committee or a member of the Committee deputed by him and shall contain any resolutions or expressions of opinion of the Committee.

(23) On the reports from the Estimates Committees being presented, they may, subject to paragraph (24), be taken into consideration forthwith or a future day may be appointed for their consideration.

(24) In considering the reports from the Estimates Committees, a Minister shall move 'That the proposed expenditures referred to Estimates Committees A and B be agreed to (and that the resolutions or expressions of opinion agreed to by the Committees in relation thereto be noted)'.  
(25) An amendment moved to the question proposed in paragraph (24) shall not require a seconder.

(26) Upon the completion of consideration of reports of Estimates Committees A and B, the question shall be proposed and put forthwith without debate—'That the remainder of the Bill be agreed to'.

(27) When the Bill has been agreed to by the House, the third reading may be taken into consideration forthwith or made an Order of the Day for the next day of sitting.

*Time Limits—*

(28) The following time limits shall apply in relation to the following questions—

'That the House note grievances'.

One Minister and Leader of the Opposition or member deputed by him—30 minutes.

Any other member—10 minutes.

'That the proposed expenditures referred to Estimates Committees A and B be agreed to'.

One Minister and Leader of the Opposition or member deputed by him—Unlimited.

Any other member—30 minutes.

A copy of this motion has been circulated to members. The only change from that of last year concerns the request from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in relation to a minor amendment to paragraph 18 and that has been incorporated in the motion.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of Opposition):** The Opposition supports the motion.  
Motion carried.

## OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH, SAFETY AND WELFARE BILL

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Labour)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the health, safety and welfare of persons at work; to establish the South Australian Occupational Health and Safety Commission; to repeal the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act 1972; to make related amendments to the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1972, and the Mines and Works Inspection Act 1920; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** 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 S.J. Baker:** No.

**The SPEAKER:** Leave is not granted. The honourable Minister.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** In South Australia each year, 12 500 workers on average suffer injury and disease in the workplace. Of that number approximately 30 cases will prove to be fatal and some 1 600 workers will be rendered permanently disabled. The direct cost of this toll of injury and disease is staggering. The level of workers compensation premiums payable by employers in South Australia is currently in excess of \$170 million per annum. If account is also taken of the indirect costs which arise through such things as the loss of productivity and the costs of retraining, then it is estimated that the total cost is a massive \$600 million to \$700 million each year. On this basis the cost each week is in excess of \$10 million and as each hour ticks by it costs somewhere between \$300 000 and \$400 000. Over the period of the debate on this Bill the cost will have accrued to millions of dollars. In 1985, 365 000 days were lost in South Australia as a result of occupational injury and disease. This was 13 times greater than the time lost through industrial disputes over the same period.

This massive level of costs is totally unacceptable. However, as high as these costs are, they only tell one side of

the story. The cost in money terms is a very poor measure of the toll of human suffering, personal hardship, social trauma and family crisis which for workers are the bitter harvest of injury and disease in the workplace. In recognition of the enormity of this social, human and economic problem, the Government in 1983 established a tripartite steering committee on occupational safety, health and welfare to inquire into and make recommendations on a suitable legislative framework to improve the standard of occupational health and safety in this State. That committee was chaired by Dr John Mathews and included representatives from Government, employers, the United Trades and Labor Council and the Working Women's Centre Inc. The steering committee completed its report in 1984.

The committee examined the existing system in South Australia in some depth and found a number of major deficiencies. When the current Act was introduced in 1972 it was considered to be progressive legislation for its time. The 1972 legislation, however, was framed without any real concept of workers having any rights in matters of health and safety. Insufficient importance was attached to workplace consultation, and the value of a general tripartite framework in the administration of the Act was only given partial recognition.

One of the major problems with the current Act is its limited scope. For an industry to be brought under the Act it is necessary for it to be separately proclaimed. This is a cumbersome process and many industries have not yet been covered. There are also technical difficulties in the existing definition of 'worker' which make it difficult to capture subcontracting relationships. This has resulted in a very patchy coverage with only an estimated 60 per cent of the workforce having protection under the current Act.

The issue of tripartite involvement is one area which is poorly recognised under the current Act. The Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Board which is established under that Act is only empowered to make recommendations on occupational health and safety issues referred to it by the Minister. The board has no secretariat of its own, has no power to initiate its own investigations or to adopt a dynamic promotional role on occupational health and safety issues. I seek leave to have the remainder of the explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### Remainder of Explanation

A much more vigorous tripartite authority is clearly needed if regulations under the Act are to be developed in a timely way to meet the occupational health and safety problems thrown up by new technologies, substances and work practices.

The consultative mechanisms provided in the current Act can only be described as rudimentary. There are no provisions covering the establishment or role of safety committees. The election of worker safety representatives has been provided for but the legislation only grants them limited rights to consult with the employer and has accordingly been of little practical use. Indeed, the Mathews report stated in relation to these worker safety representative provisions that 'they might just as well never have been enacted'.

The right of workers to be provided with information on hazards in the workplace has been completely ignored. Provision does exist under the current Act, however, requiring employers to provide their workers with written details of safety arrangements and procedures in the workplace. Even this provision, which does not go anywhere near far enough,

has been an almost total failure. A major deficiency with the current Act is the total lack of proper penalties. The penalties under the Act were last revised in 1976. The maximum penalty for an employer who fails to exercise a general duty of care towards an employee is only \$500. The penalty for workers for their negligent acts is a mere \$25. These penalties are totally inadequate. As an example of their gross inadequacy, in 1984 a major multinational company was fined the paltry sum of \$250 for negligence which resulted in the death of a worker. Whilst such penalties exist it is not surprising that the law is treated with contempt.

In the face of these numerous and serious deficiencies with the current Act it is useful to outline the new theoretical base upon which this Bill has been constructed. First, in this Bill it is accepted as a basic premise that accidents and diseases do not necessarily or even usually occur because of 'apathy' or carelessness on the part of the workers, but instead arise in the main through unsafe and unhealthy systems, processes and tools of work. Accordingly, this Bill is focused on these underlying causes, and not solely on making workers (and employers) more 'aware' of hazards in the workplace.

Secondly, it is recognised that unsafe systems of work can be encouraged by economic forces, which favour cheaper commodities over those produced at higher cost, because making workplaces safer may initially involve added costs. Therefore, a minimum level of safety needs to be imposed by the law on all enterprises, to ensure that these responsibilities are not avoided.

Thirdly, the basic standards of safety and health secured by the law cannot be determined in a vacuum, but only as the outcome of a social process. In the case of standards to protect workers' health the role of technical experts is seen as providing the data that enables the health effects consequent upon a certain level of exposure to be predicted. Based on this risk assessment, a social process of evaluation can then take place to determine the level of risk that is acceptable. This latter social process should involve workers, employers and government on a tripartite basis.

Fourthly, although the provision of a safe and healthy workplace is a management responsibility, it is not a management prerogative. This means that workers need to be involved collectively, through their unions, in jointly determining with employers the work practices and procedures that define a safe and healthy workplace. This in turn means giving legal recognition to certain rights and powers of workers' health and safety representatives, to enable them to participate in this process effectively.

Fifthly, recognising the basic conflicts of interest that may exist between employers and workers over health and safety, a further aim of the Bill is to provide proper and effective forums for their resolution.

This Bill incorporates most of the recommendations contained in the Mathews report. Much debate has taken place since the release of that excellent report and many submissions have been received. The report and various drafts of this Bill have been considered in depth by the Industrial Relations Advisory Council. This Bill is the outcome of that process of extensive study, discussion and debate. This Bill is a comprehensive, enabling piece of legislation. Detailed regulations will be made under the Bill covering specific problems relating to specific industries. Existing regulations will be adapted so that they continue to apply under the new Act and over time will be modified and added to.

The Bill establishes the Occupational Health and Safety Commission. This is a 10 member tripartite body comprised of a chairperson, three employer and three union represen-

tatives, one expert in occupational health and safety matters, the Director of the Department of Labour and the Chairman of the South Australian Health Commission. The Commission will provide a source of strong independent advice to the Government on all aspects of occupational health and safety. It will be empowered to recommend regulations and codes of practice. It will commission research and establish inquiries into particular occupational health and safety problems.

The commission will operate with a relatively small secretariat and will be encouraged to utilise the expertise that exists within the community. It will liaise closely with the National Occupational Health and Safety Commission. The Bill sets out in some detail the duties of employers, self-employed persons and manufacturers and suppliers of plant and substances. It also provides for duties of employees.

Under the Bill employers will be required to ensure so far as is reasonably practicable that their workers are, while at work, safe from injury and risks to health. This duty of care extends to all things under the employer's control in the workplace. It applies to the use and maintenance of plant and machinery, the environmental conditions under which work is carried out, the substances used and the manner in which work is organised and performed. This general duty of care is limited by what is reasonably practicable. In practice this will mean that account must be taken of the seriousness of a hazard and the availability of methods for removing or minimising it.

The duty of workers has also been spelt out in detail. Workers are required to exercise reasonable care to protect the health and safety of themselves and other people. They are also under a duty not to interfere with anything provided in the interests of health and safety. The Bill provides inspectors with comprehensive powers to enable them to adequately enforce the measures contained under the Bill. However, the prime objective of this Bill is to put emphasis on workplace mechanisms which prevent hazards from arising, thus minimising the need for the Act to be enforced by inspectors.

In the event that prosecutions are necessary the Bill provides for realistic penalties which are designed to have a proper deterrent effect. Fines for negligent action by employers have been raised to \$50 000 and in cases of repeated offences employers will face fines of up to \$100 000. For serious cases where an employer has been recklessly indifferent, the penalty will be up to \$100 000 and/or imprisonment for a term of up to five years. These are severe penalties but they are necessary because of the seriousness of the problem that they seek to deter.

By including such penalties this Bill is not breaking new ground. The Radiation Protection and Control Act already contains penalties as a result of amendments made by the then Liberal Government, of up to \$50 000 and/or imprisonment for up to five years for serious acts of negligence which endanger the safety of workers. Whilst the deterrent effect of such penalties is important, overseas experience has shown that initiatives to improve health and safety at work have only had a limited chance of success where employees have been denied involvement in their development and implementation.

This Bill therefore seeks to provide for that close involvement in matters, which for workers can literally involve questions of life and death. This is primarily to be achieved by the election of health and safety representatives. These representatives will represent workers in all matters relating to occupational health and safety which may arise in their particular workplaces. Without doubt these particular proposals have raised the most controversy.

Under the Bill all workers will have a right to participate in the election of representatives. However, where the workforce is partly or wholly unionised the selection process has been designed so as not to undermine existing union structures. This is basic common sense. It has to be recognised that unions as representative organisations of workers have in the past played a key role in promoting safety in the workplace. This should continue to be encouraged and their legitimate role in this area has been recognised in the Bill. Worker safety representatives will be elected to represent the interests of workers in designated areas within a workplace.

The Bill provides mechanisms to determine these designated work groups which require negotiations between unions and employers in workplaces where unions have members, and negotiations between workers and employers in workplaces where there are no unions. Where agreement cannot be reached on designated work groups the assistance of the commission can be sought to resolve any such disputes by conciliation. Once the designated groups have been determined, the unions, the workers, or an officer of the commission, as the case may be, may conduct elections for representatives. Once selected, worker safety representatives will have a key role to play in assisting employers and workers to resolve health and safety issues.

Worker safety representatives will have the right to attend courses of training without loss of pay, will be enabled to inspect the workplace at any time and to receive relevant health and safety information. They will also have an important role in identifying and resolving issues which represent an immediate threat to the health or safety of any workers in their designated work group. This Bill provides that where any health and safety issues arise in a workplace, worker safety representatives will be required to attempt to resolve them directly with the employer through a set procedure which requires early and proper consultation.

Situations can arise where there is an immediate threat to the safety of workers. In these instances the Bill recognises the worker's common law right to cease work. In addition, and in order to make this common law right effective, the Bill will enable a worker safety representative to direct that work cease. In South Australia such powers to halt work already exist under Federal awards covering the wharves and the pulp and paper industry. Victoria has similar powers under its occupational health and safety legislation and in Queensland trade union employed worker safety inspectors have statutory powers to halt work in the coal and metalliferous mining industries.

The Bill provides that where work is halted as the result of a direction from a worker safety representative, the employer will be enabled to redeploy the employees involved in suitable alternative work. In addition, the Bill sets down the conditions under which employees are paid for any period during which work is not performed because of risks to their safety. Health and safety committees are also provided for in the Bill. They will have equal numbers of employee and employer representatives and will be required to take an overview of health and safety matters within a particular workplace and be responsible for longer-term policy issues.

The Bill contains detailed provisions for the settlement of disputes through a formal independent appeal process, in those cases where other intermediate steps provided for have failed to resolve the issues involved. Rights of appeal will be available in relation to such matters as designated work groups, the election of worker safety representatives, directions to halt work, and notices to remedy unsafe situ-

ations issued by either worker safety representatives or inspectors.

This Bill is of critical importance to improved health and safety in the workplace. Together with the Government's proposed changes to the workers compensation system the two reforms represent the most concerted attack on the problems of workplace accidents and disease that has ever been undertaken by any Government in this State. I commend the Bill to the House.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure.

Clause 3 sets out the chief objects of the Act.

Clause 4 contains the various definitions necessary for the purposes of the measure. Subclause (2) relates to contract workers and subclause (3) provides that the definition of 'worker' includes persons who perform work gratuitously in connection with a trade or business carried on by an employer. Subclause (4) provides that the concept of occupational health, safety and welfare includes considerations relating to the physiological and psychological needs and well-being of workers, the prevention of work-related injuries and work-related fatalities, the investigation of the causes of work-related injuries and work-related fatalities and the rehabilitation and training of injured workers.

Clause 5 allows for prescribed work or classes of work or prescribed workers or classes of workers to be excluded from the application of the Act. The Act will apply to work on all South Australian ships and to the Crown.

Clause 6 provides for non-derogation.

Clause 7 establishes the South Australian Occupational Health and Safety Commission.

Clause 8 provides for membership of the commission. It is proposed that the commission be constituted by 10 members, being a full-time member, the Director of the Department of Labour, the Chairman of the Health Commission (or his or her nominee), three members appointed on the recommendation of employer associations, three members appointed on the recommendation of the United Trades and Labor Council and one member who is experienced in the field of occupational health, safety and welfare.

Clause 9 provides that members of the commission may be appointed for up to five years. Provision is made for deputies, removal from office on prescribed grounds and vacancies.

Clause 10 provides that the full-time member of the commission is to be entitled to such salary and allowances as the Remuneration Tribunal may determine. The fees, allowances and expenses of other members of the commission will be determined by the Governor.

Clause 11 prescribes the procedures to be followed by the commission.

Clause 12 relates to the validity of acts or proceedings of the commission and the protection of members from personal liability when acting in good faith in the exercise or discharge, or purported exercise or discharge, of a power, duty or function.

Clause 13 requires a member to disclose any pecuniary or other personal interest in a matter before the commission.

Clause 14 prescribes the functions of the commission. The commission is to formulate and promote policies and strategies relating to occupational health, safety and welfare, provide reports to the Minister and make recommendations, issue and revise codes of practice, monitor and review the various aspects of occupational health, safety and welfare, promote education and public awareness in occupational health, safety and welfare and carry out research. The commission will be required to consult with interested parties and to make its recommendations in relation to regulations

and codes of practice available for public comment. The commission will be able to perform functions conferred by or under the laws of the Commonwealth, another State or a Territory, and will be required to consult with the National Occupational Health and Safety Commission.

Clause 15 requires the commission to ensure that in the performance of its functions racial, ethnic and linguistic diversity in the population of the State, and in the interests of both sexes and the disabled are taken into account.

Clause 16 contains a delegation power.

Clause 17 provides that the commission is subject to the general control and direction of the Minister.

Clause 18 relates to the staff of the commission.

Clause 19 prescribes the duties of an employer in relation to occupational health, safety and welfare. Subclause (1) provides that an employer shall, in respect of each of his or her workers, ensure so far as is reasonably practicable that the worker is, while at work, safe from injury and risks to health. Subclause (2) provides that a breach of a relevant code of practice is evidence of a breach of the statutory duty referred to in subclause (1). Subclause (3) prescribes various duties of employers in relation to monitoring the health and welfare of workers, the keeping of records, the provision of appropriate information and the appointment of health and safety consultants.

Clause 20 requires employers of prescribed classes to maintain formal policies in relation to occupational health, safety and welfare and to prepare appropriate policy statements.

Clause 21 prescribes the duties of workers in relation to occupational health and safety. A worker is to be required to take care to protect his or her own safety at work and to avoid adversely affecting the health or safety of another.

Clause 22 prescribes the duties of employers and the self-employed in relation to occupational health and safety.

Clause 23 prescribes the duties of occupiers of workplaces.

Clause 24 prescribes the duties of manufacturers, importers and suppliers of plant and substances that are to be used in the workplace. Plant and substances will need to be safe when used and when subjected to reasonably foreseeable forms of misuse. Appropriate testing will have to be undertaken and adequate safety information supplied.

Clause 25 makes it an offence for any person to damage or misuse any safety equipment or to place at risk the health or safety of another person while that person is at work.

Clause 26 is an interpretation clause for the purposes of Part IV.

Clause 27 provides for health and safety representatives to represent designated work groups. Provision is made for the formation of these work groups. Lists of work groups will be displayed at workplaces.

Clause 28 provides for the election of health and safety representatives. Every member of a work group will be entitled to vote at the election to appoint the health and safety representative.

Clause 29 provides for the election of deputy health and safety representatives.

Clause 30 provides that health and safety representatives are to hold office for two years. A person will cease to hold office if his or her term expires and he or she is not re-elected, the person ceases to belong to the relevant work group, the person resigns or the person is disqualified by a review committee. A health and safety representative will be liable to disqualification if he or she repeatedly fails to perform his or her duties or acts in a manner intended to cause harm to an employer or the business of an employer.

Clause 31 provides for the appointment of health and safety committees. These committees will facilitate coop-

eration between employers and workers in relation to occupational health, safety and welfare matters and assist in the resolution of disputes and the formulation of policies.

Clause 32 sets out the functions of health and safety representatives.

Clause 33 sets out the functions of health and safety committees.

Clause 34 sets out the responsibilities of employers to health and safety representatives. Employers will be required to consult with representatives and committees on occupational health and safety issues and to allow representatives to carry out their functions effectively.

Clause 35 provides for the resolution of certain disputes and empowers health and safety representatives to issue default notices in the event that a person is contravening the Act or the regulations or has contravened the Act or the regulations in circumstances that make it likely that the contravention will be repeated and the matter cannot be otherwise resolved. An employer or other person to whom a notice is issued may require an inspector to attend at the workplace.

Clause 36 is concerned with the situation where there is an immediate threat to the health or safety of a worker. It is proposed that the health and safety representative and the employer should consult in relation to any such threat and that the matter should be referred to a health and safety committee in the event that the representative and employer cannot resolve the issue themselves. Furthermore, in certain cases the health and safety representative may direct that work cease until adequate measures are taken to protect the worker.

Clause 37 provides for attendances by inspectors where a default notice has been issued or a cessation of work has occurred.

Clause 38 provides for the appointment of inspectors.

Clause 39 provides for identification certificates for inspectors.

Clause 40 prescribes the powers of entry and inspection under the Act. Inspectors will be required at the conclusion of an inspection to consult with all the parties on the issues arising from the inspection and make available any written report that is subsequently prepared. Inspectors will also be required to disclose the contents of any verbal discussions that follow an inspection.

Clause 41 provides for the issuing of improvement notices by inspectors.

Clause 42 provides for the issuing of prohibition notices where an inspector is of the opinion that there is an immediate risk to the health or safety of a worker.

Clause 43 provides for the disclosure of notices.

Clause 44 provides for the review of notices. An application for review will be made to the President of the Industrial Court, who will then constitute a review committee.

Clause 45 prescribes the powers of a review committee on a review.

Clause 46 ensures that workers are paid during a cessation of work in consequence of the issuing of an improvement notice or prohibition notice.

Clause 47 empowers an inspector to take action if a person fails to comply with an improvement notice or prohibition notice. The Crown will be able to cover the costs incurred in taking the action in a court of competent jurisdiction.

Clause 48 provides for the constitution of review committees.

Clause 49 establishes panels from which review committees are to be formed. It is proposed that each committee

consist of a Judge, or Industrial Magistrate (who shall preside), a person selected from a panel constituted after consultation with employer associations and a person selected from a panel constituted after consultation with the United Trades and Labor Council.

Clause 50 sets out the procedures to be followed by review committees.

Clause 51 provides for appeals to the Supreme Court on questions of law.

Clause 52 provides for the personal immunity of members of review committees.

Clause 53 provides for the personal immunity of inspectors and officers of the commission.

Clause 54 empowers the commission to require the production of information relating to occupational health, safety or welfare.

Clause 55 protects the confidentiality of information.

Clause 56 entitles an employer to reassign workers during a cessation or suspension of work.

Clause 57 provides for offences under the proposed Act. A person who commits an offence for which no penalty is specifically provided will be liable to a penalty of up to \$10 000.

Clause 58 creates a special offence in cases where a person is guilty of seriously endangering the health or safety of another.

Clause 59 provides for the punishment of continuing or repeated offences.

Clause 60 relates to offences by bodies corporate.

Clause 61 provides for the promulgation of codes of practice. These codes will provide guidance to employers, self-employed persons and workers in relation to occupational health, safety and welfare. They will be subject to approval by the Minister and published in the *Gazette*.

Clause 62 is an evidentiary provision.

Clause 63 provides for the publishing of annual reports by the commission and the Director of the Department of Labour. The commission's report will be required to contain prescribed information.

Clause 64 will allow the Chief Inspector, in appropriate circumstances, to modify the application of the regulations in relation to specified work, workplaces, plant, substances or processes. A right of review will exist.

Clause 65 provides for consultation with the commission on proposed regulations under the Act.

Clause 66 relates to the making of regulations.

Clause 67 provides for the repeal of the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act 1972.

Clause 68 provides for consequential amendments.

The first schedule expands on the regulation-making power.

The second schedule sets out the transitional provisions that are to apply.

The third schedule provides for the amendment of section 157 of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act in relation to discrimination against a person who has been a health and safety representative or a member of a committee or who has made a complaint in relation to a matter affecting health, safety or welfare. The schedule also contains consequential amendments to the Mines and Works Inspection Act 1920.

Mr BECKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

**DAIRY INDUSTRY ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

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

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

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

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

**The SPEAKER:** Is leave granted?

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** No.

**The SPEAKER:** Leave is not granted.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** The Australian dairy industry has experienced two years of declining returns, due to over-production and depressed export prices. Current marketing arrangements do not provide for production control at a national level. Dairy farms in South Australia are licensed under two Acts: those supplying the metropolitan area are licensed by the Metropolitan Milk Board under the Metropolitan Milk Supply Act 1946 as amended; those outside the metropolitan area, such as the South East or Port Lincoln, are licensed by the Department of Agriculture under the Dairy Industry Act 1928 as amended.

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

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

The amendments to the Dairy Industry Act will allow the Minister, on forming the opinion that the issue of further licences would render dairy farming uneconomic, to direct that no new dairy farm licences be issued. This will allow the Government to help reduce milk production in South Australia and improve the viability of existing dairy farms. The restrictions will not apply for renewals of existing licences, the transfer of licences following change of ownership or to a person transferring his licence to a new dairy farm.

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

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

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

Clause 4 inserts section 8a which provides that the Minister may direct that no further licences be issued for dairy farms when the Minister is of the opinion that the establishment of further dairy farms would result in lower returns to dairy farmers, rendering dairy farming uneconomic.

Subsection (2) of the proposed section provides that such a direction shall not affect an application for renewal of a dairy farm licence, transfer of a licence from one person to another, or an application by a holder of a licence to transfer from one property to another.

Subsection (3) of the proposed section provides that the Minister may revoke such a direction.

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

**METROPOLITAN MILK SUPPLY ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

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

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

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

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

Leave granted.

**Explanation of Bill**

It accompanies the Bill for amending the Dairy Industry Act and is designed to restrict the issue of new milk producers' licences under the Metropolitan Milk Supply Act. The amendments are therefore similar to those proposed for the Dairy Industry Act, thus ensuring uniformity of action under both Acts. This measure will allow the Metropolitan Milk Board to help reduce milk production and improve the viability of existing milk producers.

The Metropolitan Milk Supply Act and regulations are also being amended to increase penalties under the Act to \$2 500 and under the regulations to \$1 000. Existing penalties of \$200 and \$100 have not been increased since 1946. These amendments are therefore proposed to make the penalties more realistic and to increase the effectiveness of the Act.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**FRUIT AND PLANT PROTECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Agriculture)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Fruit and Plant Protection Act 1968. Read a first time.

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

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

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

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Bill

This short Bill is designed to complement amendments made to the Fruit and Plant Protection Act in 1985.

Those amendments provided that the declaration of quarantine stations, prohibited areas of the State and other matters would be effected by ministerial notice rather than proclamation. This method enables action to be taken swiftly in the event of a threat to South Australian agriculture, and for this reason, it has been decided to extend it to the declaration of pests and diseases under section 3 of the principal Act.

During the passage of those amendments mention was made of proposed subordinate legislation which would bring plant quarantine procedures in line with contemporary technical knowledge and trends in interstate commerce in fruit and plants. Accordingly, further provisions are contained in the Bill to enable subordinate legislation under the principal Act to operate by reference to a published standard or code, exempt persons or classes of persons from the provisions of the Act, and to apply generally or in specified circumstances.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for declaration by ministerial notice of diseases and pests, a matter presently dealt with by proclamation.

Clauses 3 and 4 insert provisions under which ministerial notices and regulations may be of general or limited application and may incorporate or refer to standards or codes of practice. Provision is made to enable exemptions to be made from the operation of ministerial notices. Regulations may be made providing exemptions from provisions of the principal Act, and conferring powers, functions or duties on the Minister, chief inspector or any other inspector.

Clause 5 provides for the insertion of a schedule of transitional provisions.

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

#### APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 September. Page 890.)

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** I rise to support the budget brought down by the Premier on 28 August. It is a responsible budget, given the fact that Commonwealth money to South Australia has been cut by 3.5 per cent in real terms. That is a major cut, because almost 46 per cent of the total State receipts come from the Commonwealth. The budget maintains the careful management of the State's finances that has occurred since the Bannon Government came to power in 1982.

Amongst the very positive aspects of the budget is the fact that the State's accumulated debt has been progressively reduced, payroll tax has been reduced and the exemption level has been increased from \$250 000 to \$270 000. A further \$2 million will be provided in concessions, and land tax concessions amount to \$11 million. Capital works programs have been expanded by 11.6 per cent to funding of \$1.119 billion. The \$11 million surplus in the 1985-86 budget

has helped to reduce the State's accumulated deficit. This has been achieved in difficult times, as referred to in the Premier's speech, when he said:

The budgets of all States are heavily dependent on factors which are largely beyond their control, in particular, Commonwealth Government funding and the effect of national and international trends. In these circumstances it is difficult to predict the future with any degree of accuracy. This will mean that recurrent operations of Government departments will be subject to further rigorous review throughout the coming financial year. The Government is determined to reallocate the existing financial resources that the State has had at its disposal to ensure that areas of greatest need can be given priority.

Clearly, that is a responsible attitude on the part of the Government. On the question of responsibility, some rather interesting comments were made at a dinner that I attended at the Hilton Hotel just over a fortnight ago. I had occasion to fill in at the Earthmoving Contractors Association of South Australia's annual dinner, which was attended by some 350 people. The Executive Director of that association, Mr Butterworth, made some rather interesting comments about the Federal Government. He went on to be very critical about the Liberal Party in South Australia and referred to the 'inept' Opposition in this State. I think that that has been highlighted time and again, particularly this year, by the attitude of the Opposition.

I must say, as an aside, that I was appalled at some of the comments made in this House yesterday. I am a compassionate person and I thought that some members opposite were of the same mould, but I was certainly disabused of that illusion by a member opposite whom I had previously respected. I refer to the member for Hanson's comments about the Prime Minister's past alcoholic problems. I am somewhat dismayed when people descend to the gutter and refer to people's past, as that is not my bag. I was sorely disillusioned about the member for Hanson and, while he may well laugh, people who think like that may well laugh at any disability, brought on by any number of reasons. I will leave it at that. Suffice to say that I was appalled at the honourable member's attitude.

Getting back to the budget, I refer to the establishment of the South Australian Government Financing Authority in 1983, under the Bannon Government. It has assisted in the effective running of the State's budget and finances. In particular, this year \$164 million has been contributed by SAFA. Despite the knocking by members opposite, SAFA has certainly contributed a great deal towards the State's budget. I hate to think what the magnitude of the State's problems would have been had the Bannon Government not had the foresight in 1983 to get involved and introduce SAFA in this State. I imagine that there would have been large reductions in many areas and, had money not been available through SAFA, there would have been drastic cuts in child-care services, hospitals, school and school ancillary services, nursing and education.

I would like to speak at great length on the budget, but because time is limited I will address myself to questions that pertain to my electorate. A major problem in the western suburbs that I have referred to on many occasions is that in relation to the needs of the aged in our community.

*Mr Peterson interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON:** I know that the member for Semaphore has taken a great deal of interest in this area, as have I and many other members representing residents of the western suburbs. Problems can be particularly distressing for elderly people who are looking for accommodation and cannot find it in nursing homes or for those who are forced out of their existing accommodation for whatever reason. Over the seven years that I have been a member in this place I have noted the sorts of problems that aged people

in our community experience. It may be that I have not heard all the speeches, but a matter that I have not heard addressed a great deal is the question of the problem of aged people in the ethnic community.

To highlight this, I remember that many years ago in 1948 as a young lad I was riding home from school and I saw a woman—I do not know what her native country was—on the side of the road in a hell of a state, screaming her lungs out because her child was having an epileptic fit. She was talking in her own tongue, and of course no-one could understand what she was saying. That had a profound impact on me and was something that I never forgot. This highlights the problems that exist in this day and age for many of the lonely, aged ethnic people in our community.

It is rather a large problem that may not have been given the publicity that it deserved. An article in the *Sunday Mail* of 6 April this year states:

Loneliness was the greatest problem for Australia's ethnic aged, a report has found. And often it is the cause of alcoholism and depression. The Institute of Multi-cultural Affairs report found that 15 per cent of migrants surveyed were lonely. Many became isolated because of minority status, financial difficulties, poor health, early retirement or because they were widowed. Even elderly migrants living within extended families often felt alone, the report said.

Of those who said they were lonely 'very often' 43 per cent lived in family households, 24 were married and 28 per cent lived alone. Birthplace was a major factor in cases where the elderly faced extreme isolation.

The report also found that by 2001 the number of aged migrants will more than double—from about half a million in 1981 to more than one million. A quarter of migrants in Australia will be 60 or over. The figures were based on the migration of 82 000 people a year.

The aged from non-English-speaking countries will become a substantial majority—62 per cent—of the overseas-born aged and nearly a quarter of the total aged population of Australia.

The article also mentioned that the ethnic aged consistently reported poorer health than the Australian born aged, and one would not have to be very bright to understand why this is so. Many of those people do not know how the system operates, do not have a great command of the English language, and have difficulty in being able to have their needs met.

Just recently, a centre to assist with these problems for the ethnic aged in the western suburbs of Adelaide was opened opposite the Woodville Town Hall. Many gaps have been identified, but many others need to be addressed in terms of these people in our community. As I have said, one was the identification of those in need. Many of us applaud when these facilities are opened, and it is fine to have them there, but unless we can contact those who are in need much of that money could be wasted. To that end, the workers from the Woodville Road centre go out and speak to ethnic people, to determine their needs, which are many and varied, particularly in terms of health, food, isolation, transport, help at home, and one that many of us take for granted—just doing a bit of gardening at home.

People who do not speak English or who do not have a person to whom they can relate would have a great deal of difficulty. For those who look after the ethnic aged there is the need for respite care. From speaking to Australian born people who have children with disabilities—and there are many within my electorate—I know that the need is great for those parents to have some respite, perhaps once a fortnight or a couple of times a month, to go away with their spouse and have a break so that they retain their sanity. This is another very difficult area particularly for those who look after the ethnic aged.

Accommodation is another area that needs to be addressed in the western suburbs, and the aged need to be informed of the increasing number of accommodation options. Often

the transition from one suburb to another can have quite traumatic effects on a person and, if a couple is involved, it can be compounded. I recall an elderly gentleman who was accommodated in a nursing home very close to my electorate office and who continually came to my office complaining about this new nursing home. As we eventually found out, he had been uprooted from the northern suburbs and, even though the accommodation is absolutely first class, having been there a short time he started pin pricking about the problems that he perceived in that nursing home. After some time and assistance given to him, it was found that his major problem was that his friends were no longer coming to see him. This is one of the problems that I have found not only from talking with people in nursing homes and those who care for them, but also with members in this place who have addressed similar difficulties in meeting the needs of the elderly within our community.

Whilst on the question of community assistance, I must also applaud the completion of the \$1.3 million Woodville District Office of the Department of Community Welfare, a major project in the western suburbs. The planned construction period and time saved amounted to about \$200 000 and the project came in under budget. In opening that centre, the Minister of Health (Hon. John Cornwall) said it was one of the department's flagships for innovation and coordination of services in that region of the western suburbs. I applaud the Minister for his initiative in that area and those other Ministers who have been involved in that project. A great deal could be said about what has been done in the western suburbs in relation to that project.

Finally, in the four minutes that I have left, I must say that I noted in the budget the allocation of \$103 000 towards the West Lakes community project on Hawkesbury Reserve. As a foundation member of the West Lakes Community Club since 1980, I recall having discussions with the late Norm Gibson about whether or not I would support this project. I believe that it is important to give praise to a number of Ministers on this side of the House for their strong support of the venture. I refer to the Hon. Jack Slater and the Minister of Housing and Construction. As well as the \$103 000, \$225 000 was provided previously by the Minister of Education who also warrants a mention, not ignoring the very important role and financial support of the Woodville council.

This project took a long time before it was commenced and it was only after the Bannon Government came to power that that happened. It already services many of the recreation and sporting needs of these people, not only in the West Lakes Shore area, but also, many other suburbs, including Semaphore, Royal Park and Seaton. The facilities were certainly sorely needed, and I look forward to the opening day of that project.

It is interesting that, when one is trying to get a project off the ground, many knockers will say, 'No, it cannot be done,' and they turn away. But, once the project is up and running and the money has been made available, they can see the tangible benefits of the project and then, suddenly, large numbers of people want to get involved. While some people were a little late in supporting the project, I applaud the fact that it is a community project and one that I believe, because of the high usage rate that is expected, will need to be expanded at some time in the future.

**Mr INGERSON (Bragg):** First, I take the opportunity to comment on some of the outrageous statements made by the Premier today in relation to the compulsory third party fund. He stated that only one Government was involved in deferring the increase in premiums. The report which was



produced by the SGIC—an independent report which the Government received some 18 months ago—clearly shows that all Governments of various political persuasions have intervened from time to time and that some, through legislative measures, as in New South Wales, have increased premiums by a limited percentage movement in the CPI and others through other directions, all with the same result—massive deficits.

It is interesting to note that in the past two years this Government has not made a decision to increase the premiums and, as a consequence of that, there has been a massive increase in the deficit from some \$200 000 in 1982 to the existing accumulated deficit of \$120 million. After looking at this document and pursuing some of the comments made by the Premier, it is interesting to note that he has not implemented any of the 12 instructions that he gave today. All of them are legislative changes, and not one of those actions has come before this House. So, for the Premier to stand up and say that he has implemented those sorts of actions is the greatest lot of nonsense that this House has heard for a long time. I think it would have been better for the Premier to say that both Parties were involved and to have accepted the responsibility of his Government's walking away during election time (as the Liberal Party did when it was in office) for political expediency. That is one of the reasons why the third party fund is in the mess that it is in today.

Of course, the other reason for this situation is that one needs significant changes in common law as well as a significant and important change in attitude on behalf of the community when ensuring that their legal rights are carried through as they relate to this fund. It is interesting that, with any compulsory or similar fund to Medicare, it attracts, in a short time, massive abuses. I think it is important that we get on the record very clearly that the Premier again has attempted to mislead the House as he did today.

In relation to taxation, the community has been told over the past three years that there has not been an increase in taxation in this State. That also has to be the greatest lot of nonsense that I have heard. Having heard it again yesterday from the Premier, I sat down and made a list of the taxation increases as they affect households in any one year. I looked at land tax, gambling, motor vehicles, FID, stamp duties, business franchises as they apply to the household, business undertakings of ETSA, the State Bank, and public undertakings of E&WS and Marine and Harbors. It is interesting to note that, compared to the collection last year, this year's estimate is increased by \$86 million, which really does not mean very much at all to the average person. However, if one looks at motor vehicles, you see that an estimated increase this year of \$40 per household is to be spent. If that is not a real increase in dollars being paid, I would like to know what is. If one has to pay \$40 more this year than was paid last year, one cannot turn around and say that there has been no increase in taxation.

An extra \$5 per year, as small as the figure might be, is required by every household in this State to pay the FID extra collections that will be made this year by the Government. In relation to the E&WS, this year an increase of \$28 per household will be collected for water rates. It is a lot of nonsense for the Premier to say that no more money is being paid by the taxpayer per year and that this Government is not collecting any extra tax. It is under the taxation line, under the collection of general revenue. This year \$86 million extra will be taken from South Australian households in taxation and the charges that I have listed. To say that it has not been done—

**Mr Tyler:** What are your policies?

**Mr INGERSON:** I am telling you that I am correcting the statements that were made by the Premier. In 1985-86 the cost per household for taxation and charges was of the order of \$1 758. This year, that amount will be \$1 902, which means that the householder will pay \$144 extra per year. I have been in business for a long time and I know that, if I pay out an extra \$144 in a year, I have paid out more than I paid last year, but here we have a Premier—

*Mr Groom interjecting:*

**Mr INGERSON:** Yes, I know, but I thought that I would explain it to the Premier because, when he continues to say that there is no increase in taxation in the State, it is not true: there is an increase, and any person who pays out that \$144 extra per year knows damn well that it is a real increase in the payment that they have to make each year.

It is important to point out that the Premier has grand-standed and said that there had been no increases in taxation. However, as I have shown in the very simple and basic figures, there has been a significant increase in taxation and charges by this Government this year. The Government grandstands and says that it has held everything under control, but the only thing it has done is borrow so that it can spend more, and it has not attempted to control in any major way the general spending of departments, and that is an area which causes me great concern.

I now turn to motor vehicle registrations, drivers' licences and sundries. On the day following the presentation of the budget the Premier told the people of South Australia that the biggest income receipt from taxation this year would be from gambling.

I thought that that sounded a bit strange, because I had noted the night before that a rather significant figure in relation to motor vehicles was shown in the estimates of income. In fact, the money collected from gambling is not the highest tax collection: it involves the poor old motorist again. Under this regime there has been a massive increase in registration fees: there has been an increase of 20 per cent in drivers' licence fees. That figure represents a massive increase of \$40 per household per year in motor vehicle registration and drivers' licence fees. A couple of those increases will cause problems for the Government, and I will pursue this matter further during the Estimates Committees.

Because licences will be valid for five years instead of three years, there will be a peak very soon, and it will be interesting to see how that peak can be evened out over the next four or five years. What is of particular importance is that a large percentage of the money collected in that area goes to the Highways Fund. If there is a massive drop off in any of those areas, the Highways Fund will be affected. It will be interesting to see how the Treasury resolves that.

Another thing of concern is the optimistic anticipated increase in the total tax collected. In the past six months there has been a 30 per cent reduction in the number of motor vehicle registrations. It is quite unbelievable that suddenly the estimate can be increased so that this is the highest single taxation area, when in fact there has been a 30 per cent reduction in the number of motor vehicle registrations.

*Mr Tyler interjecting:*

**Mr INGERSON:** That is not true, and the honourable member knows it. The whole area of motor vehicle fees must be further investigated, but I cannot do that in the time available to me today.

I am particularly concerned about one area in relation to transport. Last night the member for Heysen talked about the way in which the Government was treating the deaf, and I would like to take up two very important areas in

which the Government's actions are incredible and should be subjected to harsh comment. I refer first to concessions for the blind and incapacitated. In this budget there is a decrease of \$120 000 in the allocation for concessions for the blind and incapacitated persons; that represents a reduction of 80 per cent.

According to the Auditor-General's Report, last year there was an allocation of \$145 000. Perhaps a mistake has been made, and I hope that is the case. If not, the Minister of Transport should reconsider this matter and do something about it. In general, these people have no opportunity to put their case strongly to the Government. The allocation for the legitimate cost of their carriage in the public transport system has been reduced, but I hope that that is because of a mistake. I support very strongly the introduction of a taxi service for the disabled. It is important to note that an allocation was provided under last year's budget: this is another rehash of a previous program. I believe that that is an excellent program, and the Opposition supports it very strongly.

Another area of concern is road safety. The comments made by the Minister today in reply to a question about road safety were quite farcical. The allocation for salaries in this area has been increased by 10 per cent—from \$3.37 million to \$3.7 million—or \$360 000. One could think, 'That is probably not too bad, because road safety is a very important area.' We have heard the Premier espouse, in an announcement about the Grand Prix and its sponsor, Fosters, 'Don't worry about alcohol and road safety, because we will have a big program in the road safety area.' Today we heard the Minister of Transport say, 'This is great. We will have a real razz, razz.' But then we look at the budget and we see under 'Publicity and promotions' that \$346 000 was spent last year and that only \$280 000 has been allocated for 1986-87.

In other words, this Government has reduced spending on the publicity and promotion of road safety when it holds itself out as the great saviour in this area. Under this budget the allocation has been reduced by \$66 000, or 20 per cent. Today we heard the greatest lot of drivel from the Minister on this issue. He is grandstanding in relation to money that will possibly be supplied from the Grand Prix budget, but the allocation for road safety has been reduced by 20 per cent. This Government has been talking about road safety for the past three years, but what has it done? It has increased the allocation for salaries but reduced the allocation for the promotion and publicity of the road safety program. If that is not a con, I would like to know what it is.

In the past three months I have called upon this Government to do something about the road toll. Fifteen more people have been killed on our roads this year than at the same time last year. I have called on the Government to do something to attempt to control the road toll, but it has done nothing except reduce the budget by \$66 000, or 20 per cent. That is a disgrace. This Government should be held in contempt for doing that sort of thing.

*Mr Tyler interjecting:*

**Mr INGERSON:** It is quite incredible when one sees the money being spent on RBT. For the past three or four months we have heard the Government say, 'We will do something about random breath testing stations' but what has it done? The Government has reduced the allocation in this area. It has done exactly the same thing in this area as it has done in the road safety publicity area. I do not think that anyone in this State can believe that this Government is really serious about anything other than Grand Prix publicity. It has had nothing to do with the road safety program, which should be developed for the people of this State.

On 5DN we heard the Premier say openly that one of the great advantages of increasing motor vehicle registration fees is that all the money goes into the Highways Fund. It is about time someone told the Premier that not all the money from motor vehicle registration fees goes into that fund: in fact, only about 60 per cent of the money collected from that area goes into the Highways Fund. Last year, of \$71 million collected, only \$46 million went into that fund, and this year of the \$90 million expected to be collected about \$64 million will be involved. It is about time the Premier got a few of his glossy stories right and started to tell the community the truth. A fixed sum from the money collected from the fuel franchise is paid into the Highways Fund each year. This is one area where the Government is able to put money into general revenue and tell no-one what it is doing.

Instead of grandstanding about how much from consolidated revenue goes into the Highways Fund, it is about time that the Government came clean and admitted that not all the money collected from fuel franchise is so directed. Instead of grandstanding and saying, 'We are good fellows, because we are putting more money into the Highways Fund', why does not the Government tell the public the truth and then put all the money collected from the fuel franchise into that fund? The Government should be honest and reasonable.

Another area of concern (and this is not the fault of this Government: it is a Federal issue) is the reduction in moneys paid into the Highways Fund under the two national road programs, the bicentennial and the Land Transport Act programs. This is a pity, but it is good to recognise that some money has come from the State Government to try to offset that deficiency. I recognise that that has been a real benefit. As we have dealt with that matter as it relates to the State Transport Authority earlier today in Question Time, I shall not deal with it further at this stage.

I now turn to the subject of recreation and sport. I shall take up other matters when I have an opportunity in a grievance debate. I might say it is nice to see the former Minister of Recreation and Sport come into the House. For the second year in a row we will have a significant capital expenditure on recreation and sport and I hope that, when the ex-Minister leaves the House in three years time, we may have a hockey stadium, a small bore rifle shooting centre and, if the athletes wait long enough, an athletics track. I say that cynically because, in my short time as a member, those three projects have been before the Estimates Committee each year. I find it amazing that the Government can trot out again massive recreation and sport programs involving things that it has promised for the past three or four years.

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

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** How about an extension of time?

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport):** I appreciate the interjection of the member for Gilles (that the member for Bragg should have had an extension of time) because that is the first point that I wish to take up. Earlier, the member for Albert Park stated that he could not get all the points he wished to make into the 20 minutes allowed for his speech. That is an argument to show, as I said previously, how ridiculous it is that, when Parliament sits for only 28 days, a member's time for speaking in this debate should be reduced from 30 minutes to 20 minutes. I hope that you, Mr Deputy Speaker, will take up this matter with the Speaker and others who have a say on Standing Orders and point

out the ridiculous situation now existing in this House. I shall have more to say about that tomorrow, when I move that this house should sit for at least 80 days a year.

The other point that I wish to take up concerns the Federal Government and its role in making road funds available. I should like to see the Federal Government of Australia do what the Federal Government of the United States of America has done by saying to the States, 'If you do not raise your minimum drinking age to a reasonable level (in the United States of America 21 years), you will not get a road grant.' This year, every one of the United States will have raised its minimum drinking age to 21 because of the high number of deaths among young people on the roads, and I believe that this country could sensibly raise the minimum drinking age to 20 years. Indeed, if the Federal Government put pressure on States and made this a condition for making Federal money available, most parents would agree, as also would the young people themselves who are losing mates through over-consumption of this drug or from road accidents. It is about time that we took such action. I have a deep concern about a reply given by a Minister yesterday concerning the Country Fire Service. I placed on notice the following question (No. 118):

Do any paid officers of the CFS have a financial interest in any businesses that trade with the CFS and, if so—

- (a) who;
- (b) in which businesses do they hold an interest; and
- (c) what dealings have such businesses had with the CFS?

The people in charge of the Country Fire Service, the board members, the Director and other paid officers, have a significant quantity of equipment to buy each year and sometimes have to employ services. The sum involved is substantial. Every Minister should ask persons in those positions to declare their interest in any business with which they might be connected and which might have the opportunity to deal with the CFS. In other words, a person with an interest in a business with which the CFS is likely to deal should have to declare such an interest if he or she is a board member or a paid officer of that organisation.

I was shocked when the Minister of Emergency Services replied that he did not have that detail. He said that he had no knowledge of any officers having such interest. I remind him, however, that it is his responsibility, as Minister, to ensure that he has such information. We make members of Parliament declare their interest because they may have a conflict of interest, yet here we have people buying millions of dollars worth of equipment and spending large sums on services (sometimes tens of thousands of dollars) and we do not know whether they have an interest in the business with which the CFS is dealing. If such people were to declare an interest and we saw that it was a legitimate deal, there would be no hassle, but at least we should have the opportunity to know.

I did not ask the question because I had a doubt about any officer. I asked it because the volunteers in the field are saying that they believe that some people involved in the CFS (paid officers or board members) have an interest in a company or companies dealing with the CFS. Members of Parliament and members of the public should know whether a benefit is accruing to a member of the CFS. If no such benefit is received by that member, there is no argument, but at least we should know so that we can be satisfied. I thought that that was what it was all about, when we had people justifying their actions where there was a conflict of interest.

I could not ask a question today because of the ridiculous way that things are going in this House when ministerial statements are made in Question Time in reply to loaded questions. Surely, there is an opportunity for ministerial

statements to be made before Question Time. Indeed, if the Government wants to give information to the media, it could do that earlier than it can by making a ministerial statement before Question Time. When we had a two-hour Question Time, the Hon. Hugh Hudson asked 11 questions on the one day, and that from a person on the backbench. To be able to ask 11 questions from this side of the House today, an Opposition member would have to wait two years. In my remaining time I wish to point out what is wrong with Australia, including South Australia.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** You'll need more than 14 minutes.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** The honourable member is correct when he confirms again that there is insufficient time for members to make the point they wish to make in this debate, and I thank him for his confirmation of my argument. It is not the weather that is the problem in South Australia. We have in Australia land varying from desert country to icc caps. We have some of the best agricultural land in the world, so the weather is not the problem. We can take our holidays and enjoy our recreation in any type of weather. We have somewhere in Australia the ideal climate for virtually any kind of crop, so it is not the weather that is the problem. We are sure of that. We can grow all the food that we want to in this country. Indeed, we can grow enough to feed the people of other countries as well, so it is not a question of food. If we are energetic enough, we can grow in our backyards a substantial part of the food we require.

So, the problem is not food, and it is not natural resources. We have virtually all the natural resources we need—iron, copper, gold, uranium, coal and water. We may not have a lot of water in this State—we are on the end of the drain—but we have enough for swimming, boating, and so on. We do not worry about the pollution in it. We have thousands of people polluting it but do not worry about that, despite regulations to control the problem. So, there is not a water shortage in Australia.

The United Nations Food Organisation says that we could self-support with our natural resources 130 million people, yet we have only 16 million. So, food and natural resources are not the problem as we have all we need. Energy is not a problem. It may be a little expensive in some areas where we want to use water for energy, as in Tasmania or Queensland. However, it is not that expensive if we want to make sacrifices, although environmental matters come into it. We have tidal power in the north of Australia, with tides of up to 18 feet. We have the normal fuel resources, including coal, and we also have uranium. Although some of these resources are expensive, there is not a shortage.

There is a shortage of commonsense in this building, and I refer to the air-conditioning. The only temperature problem we had in this building before air-conditioning was on the western side. In the hot summer it was unbearable for people to work in those offices without small reverse cycle air-conditioners in the window. Then we air-conditioned the place and found that we did not know what clothes to wear, as the temperature varies from room to room. However, before air-conditioning, we wore the correct clothes. Instead of air-conditioning offices, we could cut costs dramatically.

What would a creature from another planet think if it had the power to think and to make an assessment of us as a race of people? I wonder what it would think of us as people and of our attitude. Would it see us as hardworking, industrious, frugal, forward-thinking people generous to others in deed as well as word, dedicated to causes other than our own, proud of our leaders and country, or would it see us as carefree, lazy spendthrifts—buy now and pay later

plus interest—gamblers—live for today and hang tomorrow? Would it see us as selfish—let the council or the Government do it and then curse the leaders because we elected them and expected them to provide all we asked for without paying any more taxes or rates? This country is in a hole, and to get it out of that hole means using intestinal fortitude and determination, as well as reverting to a more frugal way of living. Whether or not we like that, it is the truth. We are not an industrious people any more.

I do not just talk about employees. I ask members to go around and look at local clubs where some sport is played; one can pick any one of them on a weekday and see the numbers of people who find time to spend a day in the normal working week using those facilities in a country that is in trouble. Look at what we did about the hours for consuming alcohol. We extended closing time from 6 p.m. to 10 p.m. to midnight and all other hours of the night as well as extending hours of trading to Sunday. One can look at the people who patronise those places until all hours of the night and morning and then expect to go to work the next day and put in a reasonable contribution, whether the person concerned be the boss or the employee. In other words, we have looked at pleasures more than at what is happening to our country.

Some who read what I have said will be struggling to pay off high interest loans and are only achieving that goal by going without luxuries such as alcohol, smoking, dining out, theatre visits, holidays, and so on, whilst others will be arguing that it is their divine right to have such things at the taxpayers' expense. Some people not considered to be in the disadvantaged category are trying to pay off their homes and are as badly off at the end of the year as those to whom we refer as disadvantaged. They have not had the luxuries that some of the so-called disadvantaged people have been able to exploit at the expense of the taxpayer. To a degree, those of us in power are to blame.

When different interest groups asked for more, and in particular just prior to elections, we promise the world, when in fact we do not even own Australia now. For every dollar the Federal Government borrows this year, 70c will go to paying off the interest on previous borrowings. We do not even own our country and that is the truth. Political Parties bought votes and politicians laughed all the way to power as the sucker voters believed them. Now so many are receiving assistance through the people's taxes that it may take a total collapse of the economy before common-sense prevails. I suppose that of all the Western societies we had one of the greatest, mainly through plenty of natural resources and the sweat and toil of the pioneering spirit. Now we have the natural resources and the opportunities, but where is the sweat and toil? It is not in our country now. This country is in our hands now, but only just. If it is up to us, whose hands will it be in the future? I say to the people of Australia and South Australia—

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Foreign ownership.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** —that we have to contribute more. The member for Gilles has made a good point about foreign ownership. We opened a casino so that our people could spend more money. We have people getting into debt and business people becoming insolvent. We only read about those who spend much of their own or someone else's money and become insolvent. We never read about the small gambler in terms of income and the family unit suffering because we as a Parliament thought that that place next door—the casino—would bring in State revenue through so-called tourism, when all the other profit being made is going out of the State to foreign investors, as the member for Gilles points out.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Some of it, not all of it.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** That is where the vast majority is going. It is another example of our encouraging people not to contribute with work effort, frugal living or looking to the future. That may sound old hat, but it is the only way that a family, country, company, club or any other organisation that handles money can survive. Messrs Keating and Hawke admit that we are in trouble. However, it is very difficult to get a society to give up some of the privileges it has.

We had a minute's silence today for peace. We can look at the peace we have in the industrial field. Big business operators who can afford to foot the bill bow to a union movement that puts on the pressure, and these operators buy industrial peace. How can a society survive when peace of that type is bought with the dollar and eventually the consumer has to pay? That is not the real problem.

The real problem is that the other smaller business operators and other employees in a similar trade on a different project automatically ask why workers can get the dough on the big site but they cannot get it. Of course, the reason is that the people having the smaller contracts undertaken cannot afford it. So, we have a form of blackmail in our society, with more and more demands for more pay and better conditions. Sometimes it is business as well as the unions—it is not just one area that has dragged this country down to its knees.

I shall finish by referring to the family unit. At one time a family unit would set out to put something aside ready for the children to buy a block of land, build a house and get established. However, nowadays, a vast majority of them—although not all—look towards a trip overseas, a holiday shack, a boat, a yacht, a second car, or whatever you like. This applies not only to the rich but to all sections of the community. Children, at age 24 or 25, having just finished their education and beginning work, have virtually nothing and the parents say, 'Bad luck, they will have to go to the Housing Trust or somewhere else for shelter.' That is happening in our society now more than ever before. As a country we ought to wake up. The member for Gilles is right: with the influx of foreign capital we no longer have control of our own country. We are not prepared to invest in our own country; we spend money on gambling and other things and, while other people are coming in and proving the point, we sit back and hope that one day a fairy godmother will come along and lift us out of the hole. Unfortunately, we will end up being buried in a hole unless we are prepared to contribute.

**Mr DUGAN (Adelaide):** The budget debate so far from members on the Opposition benches has been fundamentally misconceived. In the time available to me I want to refer to the budget strategy laid down in the speech given to this House a fortnight ago by the Premier and Treasurer. No speaker from the Opposition benches has thus far addressed the fundamental issues that are part and parcel of the strategy outlined by the Premier in his statement. Over the last two days all we have heard has been a mish-mash of criticism, which has been contradictory in direction and misconceived in effect. We have heard claims that various spending projects ought to be restored to the budget. We have heard claims about the various taxation measures that ought to be addressed, but no-one has addressed the fundamental budget strategy that is needed.

The Leader has said that the budget is not one of restraint, not one that will impose restraints and constraints on various people and groups in the community. He went on to criticise both the revenue side and the expenditure

side decisions outlined in the budget, which in themselves do impose restraints and constraints on the Government, the community and the various groups within our society. The Leader criticised the growth in the tax receipts which, in themselves, were the direct result of economic activity over the past few years. Further, the Leader commented unfavourably on a reduction in the land tax liability. He criticised the increase in drivers licence fees and the maintenance of the FID tax.

On the expenditure side he criticised the rationalisation of the number of teachers employed. He criticised the debt servicing costs and the temporary deferral of items on the capital works program, to be put aside until we can afford them. He then went on to deny the essential features of South Australia's current financial position, namely, a considerable fall in our income, which the Government is attempting to overcome by using the strong financial position of SAFA both to supplement general revenue and to borrow for capital works purposes to ensure that some people can remain in employment and that programs can continue to go ahead.

The whole thrust of the Leader's speech was to deny that circumstances have changed considerably and that indeed our sights must be lowered in order for us to live within the new circumstances that we must confront. It is a transitional budget, to the extent to which the strong financial position of SAFA has assisted the State Government to ensure that some capital works programs can be maintained and that people who are reliant on State Government projects are able to keep their work force intact and to keep working. There is no doubt that, indeed, times will get much harder, but to criticise all the elements on both the revenue side and the expenditure side and the single most important thing of maintaining economic activity in this State by a substantial borrowing program is to deny the whole strategy of the budget.

In terms of the budget strategy, I refer to some of the basics. It is difficult to determine from the mish-mash of criticisms heard thus far from the Opposition benches what the alternative Liberal economic budget strategy is. Is it to employ more public servants, in terms of more teachers? Is it to abandon SAFA? Is it to abandon the borrowing program that was designed to assist the housing and construction industry and all those other people who are reliant on Government projects? What is it that the Opposition wants to restrain? It wants cuts, fewer taxes, and fewer public servants, but when that is achieved and a budget is presented that recognises that they are the economic imperatives that are facing all governments, the Opposition complains and says that the strategy is wrong. The Opposition cannot have it both ways.

The situation faced by the State Government has occurred because the State is so reliant on funds from the Federal Government. Indeed, 46 per cent of the State's income is dependent on Commonwealth sources. The situation that we face is obviously dependent to a large degree on the financial position that is facing the Federal Government. Quite simply, the reality facing Australia is that the prices we are now receiving for the goods that we export are pitifully low. Measured against a basket of world currencies, metal prices fell below 17 per cent during the past 12 months; non-food agricultural prices declined by 15 per cent; and in the June quarter wheat prices fell by 23 per cent in \$US terms, and the decline has continued.

No-one should forget that 25 per cent of South Australia's wheat crop goes to the USSR, and there is no point in saying that the position that the Federal Government finds itself in is as a direct result of Federal Government policies.

The decline in wheat prices is the direct result of trading decisions and practices taken by the United States which in themselves have been a reaction to the subsidisation policies of the major European trading partners, and, while it might benefit their agricultural producers in the short-term, it leads in their countries to bloated budgets and swollen unemployment queues and as far as we are concerned our inability to be able to sell our agricultural produce on the world market, because of the subsidisation policies of other countries.

That has nothing whatsoever to do with the policies of the Federal Labor Government. The decline in our terms of trade is costing Australia \$6 billion a year or, in other terms, about \$6.5 million a day. This is a reduction in our economic activity that we can ignore only at our peril, and one way or another we have to adjust at the Federal and State levels. We cannot choose whether or not we will adjust; we have to adjust and one of the most important tools that governments use to adjust to the process of new economic reality is in fact their budget.

To return to the strategy of the budget, essentially, the overall strategy of the State budget is to limit recurrent expenditure so that there is no real growth, to stabilise Public Service employment, but to maintain a stimulus to the private sector through an expanded capital works program. The South Australian Government's immediate objective is to avoid a sudden change in the size of its capital works program so as not to damage the private sector. Yet, all we have heard for the past two days have been criticisms of that very strategy. However, largely as a consequence of reduced funds from the Commonwealth and the Loan Council, the achievement of this objective will necessitate a considerable increase in the State's borrowing programs.

The consequences of not doing so will lead to even more bankruptcies than we are experiencing today. If that is the sort of objective that the Opposition would like us to address, then let us abandon the borrowing program, abandon the capital works program being run by the State and let those people who rely upon the State's public works programs go to the wall. If that is the strategy, they should get up and say so.

The Federal Government had to address that central question by establishing as the centre piece of its budget strategy zero growth in outlays, zero growth in the number of Government employees, while at the same time trying to maintain a level of Government involvement in economic activity that would not have a deleterious effect on the overall position of the economy. Let us look at some of the decisions taken at the national level. An amount of \$500 million has been cut from the emerging social security bill, and \$300 million has been cut from the health area. The Government has given notice that it will be applying for a 2 per cent discount in wages at the next wages hearing and, if necessary, it will be applying for a downward adjustment in the first case to be heard in 1987.

So, the Government can take a number of steps. It has indicated that it will take further steps. It can take steps in these macro-economic areas: it can reduce its own operations; it can reduce its outlays; and it can reduce its expenditures—and it has. For anyone to deny that, for anyone to deny that the Federal Government has not addressed the serious economic problem by addressing its own expenditure and its own revenue position, is to ignore the reality of the decisions taken federally. At the same time, it is necessary to ensure that Australia's competitiveness can be maintained. Therefore, it is necessary to encourage research and development, to reform education and improve the

skills base so that we can lift the quality and number of people who are taking training opportunities, particularly in the post school arena. We have to remove the barriers that otherwise would impede the expansion of efficient Australian enterprises. Again, that has been a central feature of the Federal budget and indeed of the State budget as well.

These are the decisions facing Governments at both the national and State level, and it is important to recognise that we have addressed these problems. That is the strategy that we have addressed. It is important to remember this national economic position because so much of the State's receipts relies on the Commonwealth Government. They have an enormously crucial impact on our State's budget.

Again, to go back to the criticism that has been levelled at SAFA, SAFA was established some three years ago in recognition of what the Commonwealth, through the Commonwealth Grants Commission had indicated to all States, namely, that the States were put on notice that the growth in contributions to the States would first stabilise and then may even decrease. As a result of being put on notice in that way, the State Government established SAFA to ensure that it could utilise whatever resources it had at its disposal to protect its income position. By far the largest of the grants that come to the State are the financial assistance grants. While these are in total growing by some 2 per cent in real terms, South Australia's share is being reduced following the report of the Grants Commission in May 1985. In 1985-86, the Commonwealth had made a special assistance grant of \$34 million to the State to help it adjust to the Grants Commission's recommendations, but that is being reduced in 1986-87 to \$17 million, and next year there will be nothing. Therefore, the position of the reliance of the State on its own resources will become even more critical. The drop in income that the Commonwealth Government has faced as a result of international pressures and as a result of the deregulation of the financial markets has led us to this position. Therefore, it was necessary to get a budget that would lead us slowly to a new position where our current expenditures were put under close scrutiny and the way in which we raised revenue was also put under intensive examination.

Members opposite know that, in addition to a reduction in grants from the Commonwealth, the State Government also lost some \$30 million in royalties from the operations of the Cooper Basin. Again, that had absolutely nothing to do with Labor Government policies—that had to do with the policies of OPEC, which was flooding the world market with petroleum products. It is a matter of adjusting to those new economic circumstances and attempting to ensure that, while we are changing the economic base of our community and adjusting ourselves to a lower economic growth, a lower employment growth, and continuing structural adjustments in the major sectors of our economy, we do that in recognition of the fact that we have to provide—and there is a responsibility on Government to provide—some protection and security for those people in hardship.

It is a matter of addressing ourselves to employment programs, looking at where economic development initiatives can be taken in South Australia so that the principal area of State Government revenue, namely, royalties and taxes on economic transactions, will in fact get the State back to a position where it is not necessary to be so totally reliant on the Federal Government. The strategy that has been adopted as part and parcel of both of the budgets that we are dealing with has been to adjust to the deterioration in the terms of trade and the associated deficits that it has caused, and to adjust to these international economic pressures that are affecting the income of Australia and conse-

quently the income of South Australia. I think the budget addresses this in a way which is sensitive to the needs of those people who are out of work. It addresses itself sensitively to the issue of its own outlays, its own public servants, and I believe that it will in fact provide the basis for us to address the issues that confront us in the near future.

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** The only comment I would like to make in reply to the member for Adelaide's last remarks is that, if you are in trouble as a Government, and you are of Labor persuasion, you raise the tax. You do not do anything about cutting costs. A little lesson in running a business, whether it is running the business of Government or a business of a pharmacy as the Government Whip says, is that, if you have difficulties, you cut your costs. The whole theme running through the member's speech was that, if there are expenses in running a Government, just raise the taxes. In his own words, he said that if the Federal Government left its taxes as they were, the State would raise its taxes so that we could become independent of the Federal Government arena. I think that is a specious argument, an argument following the socialist line of a high taxing Government. It is certainly not a Government which I would seek to be part of.

Last week I researched various 1982 editions of the *Advertiser*. On 15 September 1982 the *Advertiser* carried a full page advertisement which was inserted by the Australian Labor Party, and some of those members who were in the House in 1982 would remember it. I think that was at the time of the Florey by-election. The full page advertisement is headed 'South Australia now has the lowest population of any mainland State', and it contains a map depicting alleged movements of population around Australia. That advertisement, which was inserted by the then Leader of the Opposition, J. Bannon, reads:

For the first time ever, South Australia has the lowest population of any mainland State. We now have even less people than Western Australia. This has been brought about under the economic mismanagement of the Fraser dominated Tonkin Government resulting in less opportunity—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr OSWALD:** I think that members opposite should listen carefully, because they may have to eat their words. They could easily insert in lieu other surnames in 1986. It would be wise if members opposite kept quiet and listened to what Mr Bannon had to say. The advertisement further states:

... less business activity, fewer jobs and less inducement to come here or even stay here. There was a time when South Australia was a great State, where everybody wanted to live. It still should be, and properly managed it will be again. John Bannon has an economic plan which provides real viable incentives to commerce and industry and benefits all South Australians.

What a laugh! It continues:

On the third anniversary of the Tonkin Government South Australia is down. Don't let it stay down for the count: vote ALP.

The advertisement then has the usual endorsements. In 1986, here we are, four years down the track. I think that it is a very interesting scenario. At that time we saw the cock-a-hoop Labor Party in Opposition saying what it would do for the South Australian economy and the South Australian people if it came to power, as it did, a few months later. Let us look at a few economic indicators after four years of heavy taxation by a socialist Government.

As at 1985 South Australia had the lowest population growth in the Commonwealth. We have a net migration gain; that is, people are leaving South Australia. We now have the lowest employment growth in the Commonwealth. Members opposite have stopped smiling. A few interjections might help raise the morale of Government members. Mem-

bers opposite have all stopped smiling because they know that the arrogant nonsense contained in the advertisement inserted by J. Bannon, Leader of the Opposition, was just that—arrogant nonsense. They knew jolly well that he could not and would not deliver, and indeed has not delivered. South Australia works the lowest amount of overtime in the Commonwealth; it is in fact a negative percentage. Also, we have the second highest unemployment rate.

*Mr Hamilton interjecting:*

**Mr OSWALD:** Yes, I am reading from this document. As far as bulding approvals are concerned, under private sector buildings commenced, South Australia has the lowest percentage in the Commonwealth. Under new private capital expenditure, we have the second lowest; new motor vehicle registrations, the second lowest; new motor cycle registrations, the lowest; and retail sales growths are the second lowest in Australia. Members opposite are quiet now, are they not?

South Australia now leads the Commonwealth in bankruptcies. I can well recall in 1982 some of the arrogant letters and press releases which appeared in the local Messenger press depicting alleged bankruptcies under the Tonkin Administration and which stated how bad that Government was. I am not making any excuses, but it was a time when the national and international recession was starting to bite and the Bannon Opposition thought that it was onto something. It published all these figures but, alas, over the past four years things have not got worse in small lumps—they have gone absolutely down hill. The Bannon Government has presided over bankruptcies at a rate that has left South Australia with the highest number in the country. The silence from the Government is now deafening.

South Australia is now the second highest inflation State in the country. We are now the highest taxed State in Australia when, under the Tonkin Administration (when that advertisement was placed in the paper), we were the lowest taxed State in the Commonwealth. What a change that is from the time when the Australian Labor Party placed this massive advertisement in the paper and presented it as the panacea: 'Vote for me,' according to J. Bannon, Leader of the Opposition 'and I will lead the State out of alleged trouble.' In actual fact, it has just led us deeper into trouble. While the Labor Party continues to support the union leaders in the ACTU and locally at Trades Hall, and while those leaders use their industrial muscle, as they always want to, to push for higher wages (and they are concerned only with higher wages), there is no hope for this country or South Australia, and these figures will continue to get worse.

This Premier and his great friend and colleague in Canberra, Bob Hawke, have no interest in anybody else except those who happen to have a job. They are not interested in anyone who does not have a job, such as the unemployed, the superannuated, the pensioner and the repatriation recipient. The ACTU is interested only in those who have jobs and for whom it fights for better wages and conditions: that is the trouble. As long as the ACTU continues to push wage costs up, these bankruptcy figures will continue to rise, as will inflation and taxation because, as the member for Adelaide pointed out, if one has a problem in balancing books, State taxes will have to be raised and the country will continue to go down the gurgler.

The Labor Party's policy of support for the ACTU and its continuous demand for higher wages and conditions is bankrupting this country. The sooner the Labor Party stops this unqualified support for the union leadership and what it is trying to achieve, the better off we will be. Australia

has gone from AAA to AA rating in the overseas financial markets. That has occurred because overseas financiers do not trust Labor Governments and union leadership in this country. They know that the combination of the union leadership and their friends and colleagues on the parliamentary side—the leaders of the Labor Party—will fight at every opportunity, both inside and outside the Arbitration Commission, to increase wages. If wages are increased, Australia cannot compete overseas.

It is a specious argument to say, as the Labor Party has done, that the unit cost of labour is now cheaper in Australia than it is overseas. The fact is that in Asia and North America and, to a lesser degree in Europe, our trading partners do not trust the Australian Labor Government and the militant union leaders. Over the years the bottom line has been that the combination of those three has resulted in rising costs and higher wages, which is fine if one is on the receiving end of wages and one is lucky enough to have a job. However, it does not help those poor people who do not earn wages. The sooner the Labor Party starts to represent the non wage-earning sector of this community, the better off the whole country will be. We will then be closer to some form of recovery.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr OSWALD:** I know that members opposite are upset, because they know that what I am saying is correct. It is marvellous how cobweb corner suddenly springs to life when we touch a nerve. Is it not marvellous? I am pleased that Government members are responding—that is marvellous. For their information, I will cite other costs with which employers have to contend and which have been brought about between union of the hierarchy of the ACTU and the Premier and his friend and colleague in Canberra, Bob Hawke. Other expenses are involved in employing labour. Various studies have been carried out that estimate the overall costs of labour to be as much as 40 per cent to 70 per cent more than actual wage costs. It does not hurt to run through these costs from time to time and acquaint the House with this additional information. These costs are as follows:

- Payroll tax
- Fringe benefits tax
- Workers compensation
- Superannuation insurance
- Penalty rates
- Travelling allowance
- Site allowance
- Other special allowances
- Uniforms
- Training
- Redundancy provisions
- Holiday pay
- Long service leave
- Holiday loading
- Sick leave
- Compassionate leave
- Relief staff
- Staff turnover
- Staff advertising
- Staff use of phones
- Down time/productivity losses
- Rest room facilities
- Staff amenities

I could go on. These are all additional costs that are imposed on the employers of this country, and they are reasons why, according to the figures I read out initially, South Australia leads the country in the number of bankruptcies, and so on.

Time is very short in this debate, but I would like to use this opportunity to point out some of the other deficiencies of this Government apart from its mad, frantic desire to keep the costs of labour and wages as high as it possibly can. If it is to save money in the way it runs government,

there are certain areas in which that will have to be done. The member for Adelaide wants to increase State taxes to cover his costs, but I put to the House that we could reduce some of our expenses by coming to grips with wastage. I have noted from the newspapers over recent times several areas in which this could be done. I cite these areas in no specific order, but they are areas where there has been a total waste of taxpayers' money. I note that a publicity officer for the State's prisons is being sought at a cost of \$30 000. Goodness knows why we need a publicity officer. A press officer for the Minister of Correctional Services at a cost of \$40 000 is to be appointed. Three houses have been built in the north in relation to a particular project at a cost of \$428 974.

**Mr Hamilton:** Who wrote this garbage for you?

**Mr OSWALD:** The honourable member might like to hear about the Gerard Reserve yabbee farm for which there was a State contribution. In September 1983 there was a federal grant of \$480 000 under the Fraser Government's wage pause for the Gerard Reserve yabbee farm; there was also a grant of \$102 000 by the Aboriginal Development Commission, making a total of \$532 000. The project was stopped in February 1985, but in April 1985 a further grant of \$188 000 was thrown in under the CEP scheme, and there was a further State contribution of \$142 000. That made up an additional \$331 000. However, the project did not recommence because of concerns by the Aboriginal Development Commission about construction methods. By August 1985 an independent ADC inquiry estimated that an additional \$612 000 would be required to substantially reconstruct work already commenced to complete the project. To date, \$864 000 has been allocated in that regard; \$684 000 has been spent; and \$9 000 has just not been accounted for. Yet they are asking for a further \$612 000 to be thrown into the project. In other words, a \$500 000 project is already running out at \$1.5 million.

The Adelaide Festival Centre Trust shows considerable losses in relation to the Festival Theatre and the Playhouse. The State Theatre Company also runs at a loss of \$1.3 million. This sum was made up of a loss of \$196 394 on 162 performances and eight main productions, plus a fixed cost of \$1.1 million for wages and salaries for actors and producers' staff. There were other additional costs, such as rent.

In the Education Department, a loss of \$40 000 was recorded in relation to a public relations officer. There is a budget blow-out of \$6 million, to \$8 million, in the cost of reorganising the department. The original budget was \$1.5 million, so that reflects a loss of \$6.5 million. I refer also to the Youth Music Festival. A lack of basic financial control by the Education Department in organising the festival cost taxpayers \$800 000. There was a blow-out of \$300 000 on top of the original commitment—all because of bad management.

I question the appointment at \$52 000 of an interdepartmental liaison officer, Mr Geoff Anderson, who is well known to members of the Government. That is a scandalous waste of money. I raised in the House today the loss in relation to O.R. Beddison Pty Ltd, the wholly owned Government plywood company, which has already been identified as having incurred a loss of \$1.5 million over the past three years. I have asked questions about what happened to another \$3.5 million, which has been written off or repaid. We still want to know (and the Minister has been good enough to say that he will obtain the information for me) what happened to the other \$3.5 million, because there is a potential loss of \$5.5 million about which we do not know yet in relation to that timber company.

There was a grant to nuclear disarmament protest groups, which was quite outrageous. The sum of \$2 000 was paid to People for Nuclear Disarmament as part of the International Year of Peace. That group announced that it was heading to protest at the Nurrungar satellite communications base. The outrageous aspect is that the taxpayer then has to pay to send police up there and keep an eye on the demonstrators whom the socialist Government is funding to send up there. If that is not a scandalous waste of taxpayers' money, I will go home.

The Bannon Government also put up a \$3 500 grant to the South Australian Nuclear Free Group, and that is questionable, given that the Premier's friend and colleague in Canberra at one stage did not know whether or not he fully supported uranium mining in this country. But then the Government makes this grant. Where is the logic in that? I do not believe that there is any logic in the way in which this Government is going.

The Government has taken away valuable time in this debate: we are given only 20 minutes to develop arguments, and that makes it impossible for members. The Government expects Opposition members and shadow Ministers (who have to develop arguments on particular subjects) to take only 20 minutes, and that is jolly near impossible. I want to summarise some of the other wastage that occurs in this State. I refer first to wastage in relation to the State Aquatic Centre. This matter was raised before the last election.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr OSWALD:** Members are embarrassed and are trying to shut me up. They do not want this on the record.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr OSWALD:** There was a blow-out from \$3.9 million to \$7.8 million in relation to the State Aquatic Centre. There was also a blow-out in connection with the Novar Gardens police complex. I refer also to the Gawler East, Hackham South and Coorara primary schools and a reallocation for the Port Augusta basketball courts. We lost \$10 million in that regard, and that sum would have paid for the Finger Point project, in which members opposite are not interested. There was also an overpayment of \$225 000 in teachers' salaries. An interstate tugboat was hired at a cost of \$150 000 when five local tugboats were available. That is absolutely outrageous.

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

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** I am pleased to have the opportunity to make a contribution to the budget debate, but, before I refer to the subject that I want to discuss, I would like to comment on a few points brought forward by the member for Adelaide. It was interesting to note that the member for Adelaide steered clear of his situation in relation to the State budget. It was embarrassing to him, as it was to many of his colleagues. He ended up by talking about the federal financial situation. I do not know whether he was trying to tie that area to the State's situation. The honourable member said that we have to adjust to the adverse overseas trade situation.

However, I point out that, although we must adjust to that situation, that is not the cause of our present economic problems. That is only coming. Our harvest of wheat and other grain are still to come and to say that that is causing the present problem is incorrect: our present problems have been caused over the preceding years and, unfortunately, the negative outlook for the agricultural market will only accentuate problems in future.



The member for Adelaide referred to the OPEC situation, by which I assume that he was referring to the parity pricing policy. In this regard, it was despicable of the present Prime Minister not to take advantage of the fall in OPEC prices. When he was in Opposition and the Fraser Government was in office, OPEC prices were rising continually and the then Prime Minister instituted the parity pricing policy, a policy of which I was not totally in favour because it led to a large increase in our petrol and oil prices. The then Opposition, headed eventually by Mr Hawke, said that under no circumstances would it follow this parity pricing policy when in office. Mr Hawke said that he would not let that happen. So, when in the past year OPEC prices fell, did this Federal Labor Government accept the challenge and pass on the benefit as it promised to do some years ago? No. It offered only 1c or 2c from the 10c or 11c reduction and imposed a higher tax on our fuel. That was a big slap in the face for the Australian motorist and other users of petrol products.

**Mr Tyler:** Tell us about your policy.

**Mr MEIER:** I have tried to explain that the Fraser Government adopted the policy of parity pricing and increased the price of fuel, but that the Hawke Opposition said that, when in office, it would not allow that to happen. Yet we hear the honourable member opposite saying, 'Tell us about your policy'. That was a disgraceful exercise in broken promises, but we are used to that sort of thing from the Labor Party. It promised to build the railway line from Alice Springs to Darwin, but when it came into office it did not build that line. I could point to other broken promises, such as Finger Point and other State issues, but they have been hashed and most people know about them.

*Mr Tyler interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable member not to respond to interjections.

**Mr MEIER:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker: if the interjections were sensible and sane I should be happy to respond, but they are not. A combination of Federal and State Governments are now ruining Australia and that is apparent with the low overseas value of the Australian dollar. The hardest thing for the average person who is buying a first home, extending a home, or borrowing money with which to buy a farm is the high interest rate. I have been told by many farmers that they borrowed money two or three years ago at about 10 per cent, but must now pay up to 20 per cent interest. They have asked me why they are in that situation. Before they were given the loan, the bank manager said, 'You must budget to see whether you can pay for it over the years.'

**An honourable member:** And the value of their products has fallen.

**Mr MEIER:** Certainly, but now the high interest rates could easily be reduced by the Federal Government if it was prepared to admit that it had made errors and been the worst economic manager in the history of this country. It is even a worse manager than the Whitlam Government, and that is saying something. If the Federal Government was prepared to admit its error and to allow the dollar to fall, as it must do under the normal market forces, to about 55 cents, then at least the people who have bought houses or land or taken out a loan on a car would have an interest respite, because interest rates would fall. Virtually every economics writer is saying that, but Keating is too stubborn and will not admit that he has made error after error.

It is a tragedy for Australia, but more importantly for the small people of Australia who can least afford to be hit so hard. Perhaps that is a timely point that should be made in the debate on the State budget, because the average South

Australian is finding it almost impossible to meet the debts that he must pay on a weekly or monthly basis. I believe that many members in this House realise from their own household economics experience that things are tough, but things would not have to be so tough were it not for a continuation of Governments that decide to tax harder and higher.

The Premier said that there would be no increase in taxes and I accept that that is legitimately true, because the charges have more than outweighed any taxes that must be imposed, let alone the taxes that were either introduced or increased over the previous three years when the Bannon Government promised that no new taxes would be introduced or existing taxes increased. This Government made its moves then (when it had promised not to) but thankfully it is not continuing to hurt us more. What upsets me as a member of the Subordinate Legislation Committee is that charge after charge is being increased on the justification of those three magical words 'consumer price index'.

I draw to the attention of members a few of the increases that have been approved by the Subordinate Legislation Committee. Members from both sides of the House sit on that committee and I think that I speak for Government members as well when I say that we are not happy to pass such increases. However, probably we do not have the right to reject them. There are certain things which under normal circumstances the committee does not try to stop, and these are price increases. For instance, the fees payable on business names registration had not been increased since 1 October 1984 until they were increased in accordance with CPI increases from that date to 1 July 1986. The same principle applied to increases in motor vehicle registration fees, driving licence fees and sundry charges. The last increase had been made on 15 October 1984 and, since then, the CPI has increased by 14.6 per cent. The increase in the registration fees has been calculated at 15 per cent, which is a fraction higher than the 14.6 per cent, rounded off to the next whole dollar. So, we could be paying considerably more than the 14 per cent CPI increase.

The fees payable pursuant to the Crown Lands Act and the Pastoral Act have also been revised in accordance with movements in the CPI of about 46 per cent. Except for increases in 1983, that increase would be about 16 per cent. Again, the CPI was used. Under the Bill of Sales Act, fees payable to the Registrar-General of Deeds for registering, filing, discharge, extension, transfer, renewal or withdrawal from registration or filing of any bill of sale, in keeping with cost of living fluctuations, have been increased by the 16.3 per cent increase in the CPI, although that figure has been rounded off to the next whole dollar.

Again, fees under the Real Property Act land division regulations and several other similar regulations were revised in accordance with the CPI increase for the 18 month period from 1 July 1984 to 31 December 1985 by about 12 per cent, rounded to the nearest full dollar. So I could go on, just giving examples from the last two or three meetings. It worries me that all of these fees are increasing in line with CPI increases, or more, yet the average wage earner has not received CPI increases over the last two, three or five years. I am not saying that the CPI increase should have flowed through: good arguments were put to the Arbitration Commission at the appropriate time. But we are finding that charges are increasing in line with CPI increases, or by more, but wages are not increasing correspondingly—wage increases are always less. No wonder people cannot balance their household budget, and they are becoming desperate.

**Mr Oswald:** Including the pensioners.

**Mr MEIER:** Yes, including the pensioners and certainly the unemployed. I feel sorry for them and for so many people on relatively small incomes. We should not forget the middle and high income earners. It is a sad fact that people tend to adjust their lifestyle to the income they receive. If they are able to afford a slightly better house because they receive a slightly better income, their weekly accounts become much higher. This Government must realise that the charges and fees cannot be increased by the level of CPI increases or greater when wages have not been keeping up with CPI increases for a long time.

The Ministers responsible must come to grips with their department and must put a halt to things. Cuts have to be made. A very disappointing aspect of the budget is that we were buttered up weeks ago and told that this would be a horror budget. We were told that we would really feel the pinch, that we must look out as both State and Federal budgets were winning. When the State budget came, did we feel the pinch? We felt the pinch in one sense—the pinch of higher charges—but we are not feeling the pinch of lower Government spending or of a smaller Public Service. There is no recognition that the Public Service can be trimmed in some areas. That is the big failing of this budget and we could apply similar arguments to the Federal budget. I hope that that point comes across because I could cite many other examples of regulations under which fees have increased by the level of CPI increases or higher. It is very worrying. It was interesting to see in tonight's *News* an article on page 5, the first paragraph of which states:

A further 199 charges have been increased by the State Government, taking the total since the December election to 753.

In less than a year there have been 753 increases. No wonder the Government can say that it has not put up taxes or brought in any new taxes! Members opposite say that they are terrific people. Rubbish! An increase of 753 charges will have its real impact only over the next six months or so. It worries me greatly that more and more people will possibly have to sell their house, their car or an item in their home to pay the bills. That will be only a temporary measure and the matters that I have just brought to the attention of the House indicate that those people who are speaking of possible doom and of a situation that we have not faced since the 1920s or 1930s are possibly correct. It is frightening to recognise that there is a considerable increase in State borrowings under this budget. The Premier, in his financial statement, said:

Our immediate objective is to avoid a sudden change in the size of the program so as to not damage the private sector. However, largely as a consequence of reduced funds from the Commonwealth and from Loan Council, the achievement of this objective will necessitate a considerable increase in State borrowings for capital works in the forthcoming year.

On the surface, I would not object to an increase in borrowings, but we must realise that our gross indebtedness is \$6 billion. Transferring that to the debt per man, woman and child, it is \$4 600 per individual or \$18 000 per family. We must call a halt: we cannot afford to borrow any more. We are beyond our means already. We are mad if we go further, because it will simply put a debt around our children's necks with which no decent person would want to see them burdened. Yet, this Government has said that it has to borrow to keep things on a reasonably even keel. If we have to borrow at all, I wish that we were at least borrowing for areas that would help the State more, such as to increase water services to certain areas.

I was very pleased to receive an answer to a Question on Notice to the Minister of Water Resources in which, amongst other things, I asked:

What provision is being made to extend water mains in the rural areas to areas not yet having a reticulated supply.

The answer was, 'None.' If we are to borrow, let us at least use the money not to just prop up things but to create real new wealth. Without doubt there are several areas on Yorke Peninsula where the extension of the water supply could create real new wealth, first for farming enterprises from increased production, particularly in the meat line (which is still buoyant, particularly in relation to fat lambs—there is almost a record this year) and also for tourism. But we see that that is not the real consideration in this budget. We must not let things fall down too much; we must borrow even more. Borrowings will be increased by one-third more this year. That is a tragic situation and one that will only worsen the state of our economy.

**Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth):** In addressing the debate this afternoon I wish to bring a number of matters to the attention of the House. The first matter relates to the failure of the Government to proclaim the Builders Licensing Act passed by the Parliament in the first session of 1986. The Act represented a significant advance on the law as it was to date and provided significant new and improved methods of redressing grievances which consumers have in the housing area. Unfortunately, over the last 10 years we have seen a significant increase in the number, validity and size of complaints that consumers in the domestic building area have had cause to lodge against builders with the regulatory bodies that have been in existence to date.

Unfortunately, those mechanisms established in the early 1970s have proved inadequate on the whole to address the magnitude of the problems which now arise. These problems are confined to a small number of builders who choose not to address the problems which domestic building consumers have with the products which those builders create for them at very substantial expense. It is perhaps a truism to say that the purchase of a house, whether an existing house or a new dwelling, is usually the most major financial transaction that a family ever undertakes.

But of course, nonetheless, the statement remains a very powerful one and the impact that a faulty construction can have on a family who have invested \$50 000 or \$60 000 in their home can be very great indeed, and much hardship has been caused to those families who have been unfortunate enough to enter into a contract with a builder who subsequently has failed to perform to their reasonable expectations, gained from reading an advertisement or seeing a home in a display village, finding subsequently that their home is not up to the standard portrayed. A number of cases have come to light recently, and that is why the Government introduced into this Parliament, very properly, a major reform of the legislation in this area.

A Bill was introduced before the last election in December 1985 and was subsequently abandoned when the Parliament was prorogued shortly afterwards. It was reintroduced in 1986 and subsequently passed by Parliament and it was anticipated that that legislation would come into force on 1 September 1986. It was with some disappointment that I noted in the *Government Gazette* of that week that in fact that Act had not been proclaimed.

Inquiries subsequently revealed that the Act would come into effect some time in 1987, perhaps in February at the earliest. That is most unfortunate, as it means that consumers who enter into contracts to build properties between now and February and March 1987 will not be protected and so a substantial number of problems will arise during that six-month period which otherwise would not have occurred. Further, it means that those people who expected the new legislation to take over the problems that they had under the old legislation and, hopefully, rectify a number

of them, must now wait for a further period for that to occur.

It is most unfortunate that the Government has not been in a position to bring this legislation into effect as it originally promised, and this will have an adverse effect on those families involved. I believe that some of the problems that have caused the delay relate to the ability of the HIA to put together a satisfactory insurance package, an indemnity fund, so that those builders who are compulsorily required to take out that insurance under the new Act can in fact do so. As I understand the position, the HIA is the organisation primarily responsible for organising that indemnity insurance fund and it would appear that it is having difficulty getting that organised. It would also appear that there has been some delay in the preparation of the regulations that are required to be prepared under the new Act.

Unfortunately, I am very suspicious of the involvement of the HIA in that matter. Although many members of the HIA are more than reputable, the fact is that as a whole the organisation has a fairly suspect history and, while little has been proved in the way of direct allegations against it, the fact remains that many people in public life—members of Parliament, councils, and so on—have good reason to be suspicious of their *bona fides* overall. I am very concerned about the way in which some of their original contracts were written. Of course, the Government has reflected that concern and its own concern in the legislation which provides for standard form contracts, standard form warranties and a substantial uplifting of the legislation in that area. However, we have not yet had the benefit of that, and I believe that many more consumers should have made their concern at this matter known to the Government far more strongly before the deadline of 1 September so that the legislation could have been introduced because, without it, there can be no doubt that the protection that consumers expected to have as from 1 September will not be available and our legislation covering consumers will be all the poorer for this.

I certainly draw this problem to the Government's attention and I ask the Attorney-General to look very seriously at alternatives to the HIA indemnity fund. If that organisation is not able to deliver the goods on time, the Attorney needs to look very strongly at alternatives to that proposition. I suspect, anyway, that the HIA is not an appropriate organisation to be primarily responsible for such a fund. After all, it is the members of the HIA who will cause the default and the payments under that fund, and the organisation has a very poor history in terms of fairness in its contracts, and I suspect that the Government would need to give very close attention to the arrangements that that organisation provides with respect to insurance, to ensure that in fact consumers will get the protection that they are supposed to get under the Act. It is also to be hoped that the Government will give some great care to the precise membership of the new board that is to enforce orders under the Act to rectify defective building work and that in fact it will, as it does, have more power to deal with flagrant breaches of the Act in the way that the old law was not able to do.

A number of problems that owners of domestic buildings have brought to my attention in the past few months in relation to building work reveal the sheer size of some of the defects. One incident that I want to refer to in the House relates to a family who had constructed in the Hills area a new home in relation to which there were a number of major problems with the roofing, internal work and also the mortar mix used to hold the house together, so to speak.

In fact, it was faulty to the extent that AMDEL certified that it was far too weak and did not meet any of the prescribed requirements for mortar. The Builders Licensing Board ordered that that mortar should be replaced, which meant that, in effect, the house would have to be rebuilt brick by brick. That is a very expensive proposition and, while the builder has undertaken a considerable amount of the minor repair work that the board ordered him to undertake, so far he has failed to commence on that more serious work, no doubt because of the costs to him involved in it.

The only remedy left to the consumer is to fight the matter through the courts, but it must be acknowledged that in the ordinary event courts have completely failed to help domestic building consumers because of the enormous costs and long delays in pursuing any domestic building work dispute through the ordinary court system. There is no doubt that the average builder has the financial resources to completely out-litigate any normal consumer and that therefore that builder is able to pursue the matter at great length in the courts, if necessary to appeal to the Supreme Court here and, ultimately, to the High Court if necessary, in order to so delay matters and so burden the consumer with legal costs as to ensure that the average person is required to withdraw before the matter can be decided in that person's favour.

There is the additional problem that, under the law as it stood before this new measure was passed by Parliament, a person had to demonstrate a significant degree of damage before being able to claim monetary compensation. Of course, in the case that I have just referred to, the house is still standing; it has yet to actually crack or suffer any major structural defect as a result of the incorrect mortar mix and, therefore, the courts are reluctant to award significant damages until such time as the house does show signs of being defective. Of course, it is quite obvious to any competent professional in the area, or indeed to any layman, that, if a mortar mix is so substandard as to warrant the assessment that AMDEL made of it, in the long run it will cause significant damage to the house. Also, it must be noted that the builder in so using such a mix did not comply with the terms of his own contract, but because the damage to that structure the builder is yet to be evidenced the courts are reluctant to act and this is in keeping with their traditional principles but I would suggest not in keeping with elementary fairness as far as the consumer is concerned.

That is why the new provisions were introduced. It is to be hoped that that legislation will rectify many of the problems that exist. However, that will not be the case until the Government brings the legislation into effect. I strongly urge the Government to introduce that legislation as a matter of the utmost urgency. I believe that the delay until 1987 will be quite untenable and that the Government should take steps to see that the legislation is introduced in the 1986 calendar year, no more than two or three months after the originally announced date of introduction. I think that a delay beyond that time would be unduly prejudicial to the interests of consumers in this State.

I now turn my attention to the reply that I received from the Deputy Premier today to my question in relation to noise control at the Hexagon Engineering factory at Salisbury. The Deputy Premier was good enough to take a strong personal interest in this matter from the day when it first became a problem, and he responded to the initial concern of residents and of the company itself by issuing an order under the noise control Act, and that was perfectly reasonable and proper. In fact, the order was quite fair to both parties, although it did provide a complete exemption to the company in allowing it to make whatever noise it wished

during the day while prohibiting the factory from making any noise, audible beyond the boundaries of the factory, after 4.30 at night and before 8 a.m. in the morning, or at any time on weekends. While the residents of Devon Drive, Salisbury, and surrounding areas accepted that the factory should be allowed to make a reasonable amount of noise during the day, they were not happy with the unlimited exemption which was granted. However, they accepted the necessity to do that on a short-term basis, while the factory either exhausted its current contract or found alternative premises.

Of course, substantial Government assistance would be available, I believe, for it to do that. The factory unfortunately has chosen to disregard to some extent the notice issued by the Deputy Premier. Those breaches have occurred out of normal hours, simply because the company is exempt from the Noise Control Act during the day, during office hours. Therefore, obviously no breach can occur then. The breaches, if at all, must occur out of hours, either at night or at the weekend. It is at just those times when it is most difficult to obtain a noise control inspector, an officer of the noise abatement branch, and therefore the residents have found it very difficult to pursue the matter through the normal and proper course. I hope that the Government will address that problem.

I believe that my colleague the member for Semaphore raised it with the Deputy Premier during the debate on the Noise Control Bill some weeks ago. I realise that there are tight budgetary constraints at the present time, but I believe the only way to effectively address these problems is to provide an out of hours service. Maybe we have to look at alternatives to the present service, to allow local government officers—general inspectors in local government who presently police a whole range of activities such as traffic, health, planning and the like—to perhaps also be equipped with and trained in the proper use of noise control meters. Those devices, after all, are the central device which a noise control inspector from the State Government would use, and once properly trained in its use—and these people are entirely appropriate for that sort of training—they would be able to take readings out of hours.

Local government officers are often rostered on weekends and in the evenings, and they are much closer at hand than the State Government inspectorate. They could take readings and make statutory declarations to the State Government as to the reading and the time, and therefore perhaps save a significant amount of overtime costs by the State Government. Local government, I am sure, would expect some sort of financial reward in that area, and perhaps a division of the fines levied or the like could be arranged. It is essential for the State Government to address the question of out of hours noise control. That is when it is of concern to residents, when real breaches of orders in the Act take place. If the matter is to be seriously addressed, that is the only way to do it.

In the five minutes which remain to me, I would also like to take up a more mundane but, I believe, nonetheless important matter in relation to the internal business of this House, relating to private members business. The Government, under previous arrangements, has now made time on Thursday mornings for two hours of private members business. That is a very reasonable approach to take and I believe will result in private members having much more opportunity to bring matters before this House. Unfortunately, on many occasions that opportunity is frittered and wasted away by the nature of the resolutions and the nature of the Standing Orders which prevail during that time. In fact, a close examination of the Notice Paper reveals a

substantial number of notices of motion for private members time which are simply resolutions of a fairly blatant Party political nature and these come from both sides of the House. Naturally, the Opposition of the day—whether that is the Labor Party or the Liberal Party—chooses to make more use of that because the opportunity is there for it, but Government backbenchers are in many ways often equally guilty.

Unfortunately, Standing Orders give each resolution or notice of motion equal status and no attempt is made to differentiate between them. In fact, of the 28 notices of motion presently on the Notice Paper, at a rough count five cover Federal issues, which are not the responsibility of this House at all. In respect of say nine or 10 of them, alternative remedies are certainly readily available. They could easily be disposed of in questions in the House during Question Time, in speeches in Appropriation Bill debates, grievance debates and the like. There are some four private members Bills and some 10 of what might be described as reasonable, legitimate or appropriate resolutions, but many of those refer to the Subordinate Legislation Committee recommendations for the disallowance of regulations. If they are to be debated, they will take up a substantial amount of time. Having looked at that catalogue of the present 'Other business' before the House, I would make the following suggestions.

In order to promote private members legislation, which is often the only opportunity to achieve significant law reform in areas which the Government of the day does not wish to touch, certainly it is the case that some consideration should be given to giving precedence to Bills over and above resolutions. I believe that that would significantly improve the chances of private members legislation seeing the light of day and actually being approved by this House, because much of it is contentious. Whether or not one agrees with individual items is not the point. It is a mechanism by which law reform can take place outside of that of the Government of the day. Having it pushed into the background by numerous resolutions of a political nature rather than a substantive or constructive nature I believe is most unfortunate, and certainly warrants attention and reform by this House.

I believe that, if in fact the Government is serious about giving private members time some prominence, that would be a very useful reform for it to undertake. While the Government has chosen to restrict the time available for debate in its own time, I believe equal attention for that should be given in private members time so that a fair allocation is given to each of the resolutions before the House and not an unduly long period of time spent on any one item because individual members choose to exercise their almost unlimited speaking rights in private members time as distinct from Government time.

Lastly, I mention the Subordinate Legislation Committee resolutions which I believe, because of their official nature as part of the business of this House from a permanent standing committee of the House authorised by law, should in fact be given time in Government provision so that they do not form part of private members time. These resolutions are serious and important. They come from a Committee of this House and accordingly I believe they should be allocated a premium time through Government allocation rather than through private members allocation. In that way, we could achieve a significant and further reform of private members time, perhaps allowing for viewpoints other than those officially endorsed by the ruling Party of the day, whichever that might be, to come before this House. I

believe that the significant reforms of the law which have occurred in the past and one which readily—

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

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey):** I have endeavoured to listen to a number of the contributions made by members opposite, to try to determine just how they would justify the decisions taken by this Government in the budget that has been presented to the House. In their endeavours to justify the Bannon budget, they are also locking themselves in and quite clearly committing themselves to the decisions of the Hawke Government in the Federal budget. That is the situation, and the Federal budget cannot really be separated from the State budget, because one certainly impinges on the other.

I listened with a great deal of interest to the comments made by the member for Adelaide. Although I regard him as an intelligent person, I certainly did not agree with the line of argument that he was trying to put to this House. He was arguing that South Australia must be competitive, while at the same time trying to justify the taxes that have been imposed in the State and Federal arenas. The two are just not compatible in that we are not competitive on the world scene. That goes for virtually every product that we produce in this nation today. That is a tragedy for this nation, because it results in many of our industries and jobs being effectively exported to other countries.

As an example, I refer to the 1970s. I raised this matter in the House just recently because of the increased tax imposed by the Federal Government on wine and the new tax that it placed on the citrus industry. In the 1970s, the brandy industry in Australia was predominantly a South Australian industry. The vast majority of that industry was based in the Riverland and it was very much a grower oriented industry in that the bulk of the brandy was produced by grower members of cooperatives.

The effect of the massive increase in excise throughout the 1970s was that it brought the excise on brandy roughly into line with that on other spirits. The effect of this was that many of the would-be Scotch whisky drinkers in this country changed from brandy to Scotch whisky so, effectively, the Federal Government of the day exported our brandy industry out of this country. It was replaced by imported spirits principally from countries such as Scotland and France. Australia lost not only its brandy industry but also the vital employment that went with that industry and, to this day, it has never recovered.

In the 1980s we now see the Federal Government again attacking another section of the grape growing industry, that is, the wine industry, in the form of a further increase in the tax on wine. In the longer term this will have exactly the same effect on the wine industry as it had on the brandy industry. When the member for Adelaide says that we must be competitive and at the same time support that type of action, his logic went out the window, because the two things are not compatible. This is the time not only when we should have logic but also when a great deal of basic commonsense should be injected into the decisions that are made by Government.

Unfortunately, on the State scene, that is not occurring, and it is occurring to an even lesser degree on the Federal scene. This has not just happened overnight: it has been occurring over the past three or four years. As a result of the policies of the State and Federal Governments, we have now reached a point (and the facts were referred to by the Leader of the Opposition and by the member for Morphett) where the State Treasury's figures clearly show that unem-

ployment in South Australia has risen by 1.3 per cent, although it has decreased nationally by 0.8 per cent. Advertised job vacancies have risen by 2.8 per cent in South Australia, but nationally they have risen by almost double that to 4.1 per cent. In South Australia job vacancies have decreased by 23 per cent, but on a national basis they have decreased by only 2.1 per cent. While retail sales have risen by 7.9 per cent in South Australia, nationally they have risen by 10.7 per cent, so South Australia is certainly not performing as well as the rest of the nation which, in relation to the rest of the world, is performing very poorly indeed.

I listened with a great deal of interest to the comments made by the member for Adelaide, but they did not add up. He fully supports the taxes that are being imposed, but they are having a tremendously adverse effect on every employment opportunity in this nation. Does the member for Adelaide support the fringe benefits tax which, because of our heavy involvement in the motor industry, has cost literally thousands of jobs in South Australia? How can he suggest that that type of action is in the best interests of the nation? We must be productive and, if we are not equally as productive and competitive as other countries, then we will continue to head in the direction we are heading—down the drain.

It is an absolute disaster. We have not only a right but also a moral obligation to this country to be productive and to do what we can to see that this country survives. As I said, as individuals we have the right to be out there, to be productive and to survive but, unfortunately, the action that has been taken is having exactly the opposite effect. If we look at another example (and, as I said, both the Federal and State budgets are closely tied, because one impinges on the other), any reasonable person would accept that the basis of any tax should be the ability of the industry or individual to pay that tax and, at the same time, remain viable. Any tax that goes beyond that point is obviously a disaster, and the brandy industry of Australia is a good example of where that philosophy was not applied.

As I have said before, successive Federal Governments have effectively destroyed that industry in Australia, and it has never recovered. If a person or Government accepts the philosophy that a tax should be based on the ability of an industry or individual to pay and remain viable, if we take the situation in relation to the recent tax imposed on the wine and grape growing industry, then really the Federal Government does not have a leg to stand on, because figures of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, which is an instrumentality of the Federal Government, clearly indicate that the average income of a wine grape grower in Australia is about \$6 500.

I do not believe that anyone in this House would relish the thought of trying to live and keep his or her family on \$6 500. I wonder what the attitude of the wives and families of Mr Keating and Mr Hawke would be if they suggested to their families that they should try to live on \$6 500 yet, when we have families who are already trying to exist on that amount and we then apply a further 10 per cent tax to that industry—

*Mr Rann interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** I am not disagreeing with that at all. I have said consistently that successive Federal Governments effectively destroyed the brandy industry in Australia. 'Successive' means one Government after the other. If the member for Adelaide does not understand the word, I will explain to him later what the word 'successive' means. The fact is that the Federal Governments of the 1970s effectively destroyed the brandy industry.

The member for Adelaide said that we must be competitive. It is the Government of the day, no-one else, who is responsible, and the Government must be responsible for its actions. It is no good Opposition members saying what they would or would not do when in office. The Hawke Government, having said before it came into government that it would not introduce a wine tax, applied in its first effort a 10 per cent wine tax and then in its second effort another 10 per cent. That is blatantly dishonest to start with. The Government of the day is responsible for its own actions, so let us not have any more of that rubbish. The point I am trying to make is that for any Government, whether Liberal or Labor, to apply a 10 per cent tax on any individual who is trying to live on \$6 500 is absolutely outrageous. I do not care who is in government at the time: it is absolutely outrageous when we consider that many families are trying to exist on \$6 500 or less. That is not my determination—it is the determination of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, a Federal Government instrumentality.

There is no way on earth that this country can get back on its feet as a viable nation if the people are not allowed to be productive. As I said previously, we have a moral obligation to this country to be productive, but we must be competitive with the rest of the world if we are to make any use of that productivity. The member for Henley Beach only yesterday asked the Minister of Agriculture the following question:

Will the Minister inform the House whether his department has undertaken an investigation into replacing imported agricultural products with South Australian produced products?

That is a logical question but, if a lot of these products are coming in from overseas because in many instances they are heavily subsidised by the country of origin, there is something wrong. I cite as an example the citrus industry. We hear a lot of criticism from the Federal Government and elsewhere about South Africa and the conditions that exist there, including the rates of pay, yet the Government is quite happy to allow the importation of citrus concentrate from Brazil, where workers earn about \$3 a day. If that is not exploitation, I do not know what is, and it occurs on a much wider scale than in South Africa—but we never hear anything about that.

The wealth of this nation originates from those who are prepared to be productive; ultimately, everyone lives off that productivity. All we ask as producers in this nation is that those who are responsible for productivity in the first place at least be given a reasonable opportunity to survive. We do not need subsidies: all we need is the opportunity to compete on an equal footing, but we cannot compete with countries where workers are paid only \$3 a day. If this Government and the Federal Government are prepared to continue to allow that to occur, if products flow into this country from a nation that is exploiting its workers and paying them a pittance, at the same time destroying our industry, what hope have we in this country of competing on the world scene? Of course we cannot do that. No way on earth can we compete when we are paying \$6 or \$8 an hour against \$3 a day.

There are numerous other examples, such as the importation of heavily subsidised brandy from France or imported dried fruit. I tend to refer to the industries which I know best and in which I have been involved all my life. A year or so ago dried sultanas were being imported into Australia from Greece, and a subsidy to the grower from the place of origin of \$800 a tonne was paid—that is more than the Australian grower received as an end price. But the Government turns around and says, 'Listen, you fellows, you have to get your act together. You have to be more efficient',

but the subsidy was greater than our end price. On the world scene South Australia is considered to be one of the most efficient producers of dried fruit and citrus in the world. Only one country has a slight advantage on us in terms of production per hectare, and that is Israel, and that is because the Israeli citrus industry is a comparatively new industry. In other words, most of the plants are at the peak of production, whereas the plantings in most other countries are at different stages.

Comparing like with like—comparing the Riverland citrus industry with the citrus industry in Florida or California—we find that we out-perform other areas hands down. Let no-one suggest that that industry in the Riverland or anywhere else in Australia is inefficient. Our industry is one of the most efficient in the world, yet in many instances the growers are going broke and are being forced off their property. Until we realise that to be competitive we must have the opportunity to compete on an equal basis with other countries, and until this proposition is accepted by the Federal Government, there is no way on earth that we can get our industries out of the mess that they are in.

Unfortunately, comments from members opposite shed very little light on that subject. The taxes that are being imposed by the State and Federal Governments must be removed so that we can compete on an equal footing. Until that happens, members can huff and puff as much as they like, but fewer and fewer people will be prepared to produce. The economic base of this nation revolves around those who generate the wealth in the first place. We as members of Parliament are not generating any wealth for this nation, although I would venture to claim that, as a fruit grower, producing a considerable tonnage of dried fruit and wine grapes, I am being productive and providing considerable opportunities for employment for other people. The way things are going and the way in which taxes are being applied by this Government and the Federal Government means that that scenario is disappearing day by day.

**Mr PETERSON (Semaphore):** In contributing to this debate I wish to concentrate on matters that are of deep concern to me. In particular, I refer to two proposals put forward by Federal Government departments that have the potential to severely affect the operation of the Outer Harbor container terminal and the container industry in this State generally. Those proposals will negate the effect of many groups, companies, individuals and Government bodies in their efforts to make the terminal viable and competitive. At the same time, millions of dollars that have been invested in No. 6 berth and in other facilities in the State will be involved. It must be realised right now that the second crane at the terminal is being built at a cost of \$5 million, and all that money will be wasted if these proposals go ahead. In addition to the Outer Harbor terminal being affected, many allied occupations in the State will be at risk. These two proposals are being put forward by the Australian Customs Service and Australian National. The Australian Customs Service is a federal body, and it has the responsibility for all imported cargo: it levies customs taxes and tariffs.

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

**Mr PETERSON:** The Australian customs service is intending to introduce a radical change in the processing and control of import cargoes and documentation under its proposed integrated cargo control and clearance system. The implementation of this new scheme will have significant effects on South Australian port and airport operations and other related industries. The present situation, as far as the effect of customs is concerned, is that much of the South

Australian manufacturing industry currently in operation relies on the viable operation of ports and airport facilities available to them.

Port Adelaide and airport's international cargo operations, which are significant in their own way, contribute considerably to the South Australian economy. In fact, I believe that over \$200 million is involved annually in the operation of those facilities. There is a recognised potential for increased trade in Port Adelaide, and we must realise right now that \$5 million is being spent on a brand new additional crane for Outer Harbor.

*The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:*

**Mr PETERSON:** I have some figures that I will give the honourable member a little later. Millions of dollars are being invested by private enterprise in this State because of their establishment and the ability of handling cargo into this State. The State Government, through its own facilities and through the Departments of State Development and Marine and Harbors, is heavily involved in trying to attract new industry to the State. Any industry requiring an overseas component needs to be able to control its own customs and clearance facilities. If the system is changed the theory of the new system is to clear cargo at its point of arrival in Australia. Under the current system, cargo can be discharged at any port in Australia but cleared through customs in Adelaide if it is the point of destination.

Some 70 per cent of South Australian import containers are processed through the port of Melbourne. That means that that much container clearance could go interstate. If that occurs, the potential for disruption of employment in this State is significant. The majority of FCLs shipped through Melbourne by rail from Adelaide are still processed through the Outer Harbor terminal. Only 30 per cent of the containers are handled out of our own port. If there is a scaling down or change in the system, customs agents, shipping officers and agents will be affected, as the clearing will take place in Melbourne, where the cargo will be available. The international freight forwarders will work through officers in Melbourne, and local carriers will be affected, as cargo will probably be delivered direct from Melbourne to a consignee here, rather than being processed through the system. Bond stores will not be required. Other ancillary services such as providoring, stevedoring, engineering and the manning of tugs would also be affected.

There are, of course, the totally unquantifiable effects that it would have on the Department of Marine and Harbors and other State and Commonwealth Government departments. It is estimated that there will be job losses for some 380 people in port and airport related industries in Adelaide, reducing Adelaide's viability as a whole, as the work will not be coming through the port. It will bring about a relocation of some warehousing operations and industries at the point of landing and discharge that will now become the point of clearance in Australia. The loss in the State would be millions of dollars by way of personal wages, business income, the under-utilisation of facilities, the loss of Government income through the lessening of port operations and the flow-on of all of these things into the community.

Significant problems could occur if the system is changed. The proposed system is a pre-discharge clearance system. At present, 70 per cent of our cargo transits through Melbourne as the point of discharge, with Adelaide being known as the destination point and not the discharge point. The customs service proposal is that any Adelaide cargo will be cleared before discharge in Melbourne. This means that that cargo lands as free cargo: there are no holds on it.

The problem for ports such as Adelaide, and for Adelaide in particular, is that such cargo will then, in the vast majority of cases, be considered to have been cleared or to be free cargo with no impediment upon its movement. It will then be possible to deliver such cargo to Adelaide from Melbourne as an interstate transfer without any need for terminals or depots, so existing depot companies will be bypassed, and terminals will also be bypassed, because they will not be required. The full container movements traditionally processed through the Outer Harbor terminal will no longer be processed through that terminal, thereby lessening its viability.

It is estimated that this change in direction of cargo could result in a loss of 180 jobs in the container industry in this State. Tugs will be affected, as will the whole port operation. The other aspect of goods being delivered directly from Melbourne is that it is probable that many local carriers and truck drivers will lose their jobs and/or their businesses. The extent of this loss is difficult to assess, but it seems that at least 50 jobs will be lost.

With all these matters in mind, the State Government should look seriously at this matter to ascertain what can be done about it, because the current system of clearance and control has not changed in many years. A computerised system was introduced in 1985. Since then this new proposal has come forward. The present proposal is to link the customs service, airlines, and freight forwarders who will exchange information directly and electronically so that cargo is processed before it reaches Melbourne. Part of the proposal is to link the customs service, shipping companies, freight forwarders and terminal and depot operators to the system in order to link all the required documentation.

The essence of the whole proposal is to obtain greater information about the bulk of imported cargo before it is discharged in Australia. Another aspect that must be considered is that it has been said by the customs service that this information is not necessarily required to implement any sort of drug detection or smuggling detection processes but is needed purely for tariff assessments and normal customs assessments of the types of cargoes coming in. I do not quite understand why the customs service wants to do this. The present system works: the machinery is set up; it is understood; the information passes through shipping officers, importers, exporters and stevedoring companies and whatever is required is done.

They now want to change to a system that could potentially damage South Australia. The cost to our State will also be great. I have received information from the Customs Agents Association which indicates that direct container movements at this stage result in direct imports involving 5 500 containers, with 1 400 containers coming via Melbourne. This is why I have been saying that Melbourne is a significant discharge port for Australian cargoes. Exports total 10 500 containers of which 2 800 go via Melbourne. Melbourne is very important as a discharge port for Adelaide cargoes and as a loading port. If clearance takes place there, we will lose all the ancillary and supporting mechanisms in this State.

It is additionally surprising because the South Australian port enjoys the lowest level of disputation of all the Australian ports. We have the best record in Australia. We have no major hold-ups at this port. The harmony results in a faster turnaround of vessels and a faster delivery of goods, which obviously has economic advantages to the importers and exporters.

**Mr D.S. Baker:** How many hours do they work?

**Mr PETERSON:** They work as required. There is always criticism of those working on the waterfront, because people

do not understand the system. I think. It is a matter of working when the work is there. It is like this Parliament—if there are no Bills to debate, it is not much good being here. So, the waterfront works the same.

*Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:*

**Mr PETERSON:** That is exactly right; it is just like Parliamentarians—they get paid when they are not in Parliament.

*Mr Gregory interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Semaphore has the floor.

**Mr PETERSON:** Currently there is about a 15 day delay from the point of discharge to the point of delivery of a container in South Australia. With this change of system, there is no guarantee that that time will improve. There are obviously time locks in the system; once the container gets to the terminal, getting suitable carriage available, loading, dispatching, transport, shunting this end, sorting out and getting to the situation here, with whatever must be done, I will come back to the rail situation later, because that is the other aspect that I want to raise.

So, we have a situation where the container industry in this State is a significant employer, too, overall. I mentioned earlier some of the types of ancillary aspects of this. The types of employment in the container industry that are at risk have been categorised if the clearance system is redirected to Melbourne. The shipping companies and agents in this State employ about 110 people. The customs and forwarding agents employ about 130; the local carriers, about 100; and marine surveyors, and similar, about 10. Those are the people who have to assess damage and insurance claims on cargo. The bond and free stores employ about 10. 'Bond' is cargo that is sent over here under some sort of customs hold and must be cleared before it can be delivered. The container depot and terminal employs about 200 people, that is, clerks, storemen and packers and wharves Stevedoring companies directly related to operations at the terminal employ about 30 people in their operation. About 200 wharf labourers are employed in other ancillary industries. The Department of Marine and Harbors employs about 600 people in this State, the Customs Service employs about 900, and the Quarantine Service employs about 50. In total, that makes about 2 340 people.

The value of wages paid to those employees has been estimated to be in the vicinity of \$46 million, the flow-on effect of their wages is estimated to be \$117 million, and it is estimated that the State Government collects some \$2 million in rates and taxes. So, this is a viable port. It offers all the good aspects of the industrial climate. It is an effective and efficient port, and this is being put at risk by this proposed change.

The other aspect to be looked at as far as customs clearance is concerned is the Adelaide Airport. I do not know whether too many people realise the volume of international air freight that goes through that airport. It is estimated that some 100 people would be affected by a change in the system there where at the moment cargo is cleared at the first port of arrival in Australia and then is sent through as domestic cargo. There are problems with this system. The terms used are 'full container load' and 'less than container load'. A full container load is just that, in the sense that it is one consignment for one consignee. That is cleared. If that consignment can be cleared in Melbourne, in my opinion there is a great risk that it would be warehoused in Melbourne and then distributed on a domestic basis from Melbourne, as has become the practice of many companies now in using a single warehouse port or city around Australia.

It is very difficult these days to get a part for anything without it having to come from interstate. Just recently in our own State, one of the Japanese companies (Hitachi, I think) decided to pull out altogether. We will see a centralisation in all of these ports. If the FCLs are required to have any examination and they are sent on, there is a problem then with unloading and repacking. If there is a quarantine or fumigation requirement, there is a problem. There is a problem with insurance if there is any damage. There is a problem if refrigerated containers have to be checked. I noticed a story in a paper today about an importer—I am not sure where it was—who lost many thousands of dollars through an inspection of a refrigerated container.

The other aspect I want to raise is the Australian National Railways new proposal for moving containers. All of these things have an effect on the container business in this State. On 15 September 1983 I raised in this House a case where there was an arrangement between Australian National Railways, Victorian Railways, Seatainers Ltd terminal in Melbourne and the Port of Melbourne, where they were rebating \$90 per 20-foot container for every container shipped through Melbourne. That went on for some 12 months, and there is no way that this State can compensate a shipping company at \$90 per container. The breakup of that \$90 was that Seatainers Ltd gave a \$40 rebate, VicRail gave a \$22 rebate, Australian National gave a \$8 rebate and the Port of Melbourne gave a \$20 rebate. I can understand their set-up. Their job is to stay in business, to make as much money as they can and to be as viable as they can. We have this competition between ports, as we have always had.

Ports, like any other business in Australia, compete and try to get the business. I do not dispute that. I am pointing out to the House the danger that that presents for our industries. The current proposal by ANR is to set up a super freighter service which is a block train system of containers to and from Melbourne. The rebate would be significant. The difference under this proposal, I am told, is \$149 as against \$271 currently, which sets up again a competition point. It would then be handled through the railway yard instead of the terminal and would again put our depots and terminals at risk.

A further proposal on the land bridge system is to double piggyback containers on railway trucks from Western Australia. If that happens, all of that trade could go out of this port. The terminal, which cost millions of dollars and innumerable man hours before it was viable, would be at risk and we would just be a station at the end of the line. I believe that our Minister of Marine, our Premier or Minister of State Development and Technology should take this up immediately.

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

**Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria):** I will begin my comments on the budget by quoting from the Financial Statement and the Premier's speech. First, he stated:

We are moving from an environment characterised by high levels of Commonwealth support and strong revenue growth, to one of slower revenue growth and significant cutbacks in Commonwealth funding. In this sense 1986-87 is a transition year.

He goes on to say:

Before turning to the details of the budget, it is appropriate to review the circumstances which have brought about this changed environment.

Then he gives some reasons for the so-called changed environment, and I want to pick up one of them. He stated:

This year has seen a dramatic turn-around in Australia's economic circumstances. In particular, the international economic



environment in which Australia must sell its exports has become very much more difficult.

I think that this statement is completely naive. This country and State have been going downhill for quite a long time. Small business knows it; the farmers know it; and all of us on this side of the Chamber know it. However, in my view the Treasurer has been blind to the facts of life. When he goes on to say that the Australian economy is facing a period of adjustment and lower economic growth caused by volatility of the external situation, I shudder. This country has been living beyond its means for many years. Successive Governments have been spending more than they earn for a long time.

We have been telling the union movement and the Labor Party that they are out of touch with reality. Treasurer Keating, in his ignorance of its real consequences, floated the Australian dollar—a move that I applaud. Now, the rest of the world is telling us what has been obvious for years—that we are out of touch with reality on work practices, social security payments, and especially productivity, as a result of which we are no longer competitive with the rest of the world.

That did not just happen. We have been living in a fool's paradise for many years. The Treasurer then goes on to give his reasons, saying that the predictions and assessments are unusually difficult. They will continue to be unusually difficult while we have a Government which is not prepared to cut its expenditure or stop borrowing but which, instead, taxes the people who create this State's wealth to a stage where it crucifies incentive. The world will continue to laugh at Governments that put out kindergarten answers to a very simple and basic problem.

I note that the Premier concedes that there will be lower rates of employment and an increase in unemployment, and I will deal with these matters later. It is a transitional year, in the Treasurer's view, but a transitional year to where? Is it a transitional year from the Treasury forecast of a vibrant economy of production and growth, to an economy in deep recession, or is it a transition from a major exporter to the world to a second-rate banana republic (which seems to be the buzz word phrase used by people on the other side of the Chamber)?

I believe that the Treasurer has shirked the issue and not answered the question, 'A transition to what?' The Treasurer also stated:

In such an uncertain economic context, there is no doubt that the Government must ensure that programs are adjusted so that the State is not locked into expenditure which we may not be able to afford in the future.

I can tell the Treasurer right now that the Government has locked not only the Treasury but also the private sector and individual taxpayers into future payments that none of us will be able to afford; this has already been achieved. We are looking at an horrific annual interest and capital repayments burden in the future, and I believe that that is scandalous financial management. The Leader of the Opposition pointed out what the future repayments would be in the early 1990s. Those figures demonstrate what we are doing—putting a millstone around the necks of future generations.

The budget income relies almost entirely on two income items: stamp duties and payroll tax. Both figures given—stamp duties at \$219 million and payroll tax at \$283 million—are very suspect or rubbery. I believe that the stamp duties budget income will not be achieved. It is a fact of life that the valuations of property by the Valuer-General's Department are well above present-day values. Because of the disaster into which Mr Bannon and Mr Hawke have plunged the country, the only rural properties that will be sold will be forced sales in the next two years, and these

sales will be at prices well below the valuation placed on them by the Valuer-General's Department.

The figures speak for themselves. For the 1985-86 year the estimate was \$227 million, and only \$205 million was actually received. We did not even make our budget figure last year. This year we have a budget of \$219.5 million with economic circumstances nowhere near as good as they were in the past 12 months. Payroll tax seems to be another area where the figures do not stand up: in 1985-86 actual receipts were \$265 million. Exemption levels for business have been raised from \$250 000 to \$270 000 and I totally agree with this philosophy. However, in 1986-87, budget receipts are estimated to increase to \$283 million, which is a rise of \$18 million.

At the very beginning of the Treasurer's speech he admitted to lower rates of employment. Therefore, a fact of life is that the only area left from which to get the extra revenue will be wage rises. Does anyone really think that, with the state of business in South Australia, there will be wage rises? If the Treasurer thinks that the additional wage rises that obviously have been budgeted on will make up the deficit in payroll tax, I do not think that the figures add up because, if there are further wage rises in the business community, I can guarantee that there will be more unemployment and, if that occurs, it will exacerbate even further the shortfall in income that will be received from that area. Therefore, I do not believe the budget figures can be achieved in two of the major areas of income that are supposed to give us a deficit of \$7.3 million. I believe that the Treasurer knows this and that he is allowing for contingencies of \$94 million. This is the largest sum that has ever been allowed for in a budget in this State, and I think that it is a deft piece of deception.

The 1985-86 budget provided for contingencies of \$91.6 million. If one looks at the figures provided for on page 5 of the Estimates of Payments, one will see that the amount of money used for increased salaries and wages and other contingencies is not given. At the end of the figures it states:

Actual payments on account of this provision are included in figures for the agencies concerned.

In trying to research this amount, my calculations showed that a figure of less than \$60 million was used. However, I hope that the Treasurer, especially during the Estimates Committees, will be able to furnish us with the correct figure. If the figure was only \$60 million last financial year, the odds are that the increase in wages and salaries will be less than it was last year and, if the figure was less than \$60 million in actual terms last year, the line of \$94 million this year is just as rubbery as the stamp duties and pay-roll tax collections—unfortunately, in the other direction. It is almost as if the Government admits that the income figures are not correct. If the income figures do come out as estimated in the budget, it is clear that there will not be a \$7.3 million deficit; more than likely, it will be a surplus of \$15 million or \$20 million, provided, of course, that all other areas of the Government's activities fulfil their estimated performances.

This happened last year when taxpayers' money was returned to South Australians just before an election as a gimmick. However, there is still one other factor that could be the fly in the ointment. It is a factor that needs to be examined carefully, and I refer to the use of SAFA funds. Without any doubt, SAFA has been an outstanding bonanza for the Government, but the ability of SAFA to continue its phenomenal run cannot be absolutely guaranteed. I trust that the Treasurer has taken heed of the Auditor-General's Report concerning SAFA.

Further to this, one should realise that the returns of SAFA are another means of imposing hidden taxation—or taxation in a different form. Transferring capital funds to SAFA at relatively low interest rates, from statutory authorities, then releasing them to those statutory authorities at higher interest rates (as happens with ETSA) is the three card trick method of raising extra taxes and must be exposed to the public. The continued success of SAFA is the key issue in the 1986-87 budget. These four issues—stamp duties, payroll tax, SAFA and the contingency line—are four of the important issues that will affect the State budget for 1986-87.

Let us look at another assumption involving land tax, and I refer to the Treasurer's speech, as follows:

Last year the Valuer General implemented a computer based system of land valuation. This has enabled him to bring all valuations up to date and to dispense with the calculation of equalisation factors. If the present land tax arrangements were left unaltered, there would be a sharp increase in tax as landowners ceased to enjoy the benefit of the lag between increases in land values and their impact on liability for tax. While the Government believes it is entirely appropriate for land tax liability to be based on current valuations, it has decided to make certain concessions to soften the impact of the change in 1986-87. These will be effective from 1 July 1986 and will return \$11 million to South Australian taxpayers.

Although it is claimed that the present valuations have been brought up to date, that is not the case. In the South-East of this State alone, land values are 20 to 30 per cent below valuations. The Treasurer says that land tax will be reduced: in fact, that is incorrect, as land tax receipts in the budget have gone up from an actual \$38.5 million to an estimated \$45 million. Land owners will be paying land tax on properties that are severely over-valued. They are in excess of current values.

A further impost on country people will be caused through this method being used for local government rates. I would like to briefly comment on the Premier's statement that he was able to reduce taxation in 1985-86. That is a delusion, and the Premier should know it. Taxation increased beyond the requirements of Government in 1982-83 and 1983-84. Therefore, what was given back in 1985-86 was only putting in order the excess amounts of previous years.

The financial institutions duty is a great example. When FID was first introduced the Government claimed it would raise \$22 million at a rate of .04 per cent, compared with the other States which had applied a rate of only .03 per cent. In fact, in its first year FID raised close to \$29 million. The Democrats—those people who sit eternally on the fence—voted with the Government in that other place in not allowing an amendment to bring the rate back to .03 per cent, which would have produced the amount of revenue required by the Government. The return to the Government over the past three years has been \$30 million a year, thus leaving the Government in the position to offer reductions in taxation in the election year. They are not really reductions—the Government is just returning what was originally not required from the taxpayer.

Because of the considerable emphasis and cut in capital funds from the Commonwealth, borrowings for capital works will rise considerably. Over its term of office the Government has been able to reduce the accumulated deficit, and credit must be given to the Government for achieving that reduction. However, this financial year will take us back to the level of deficit financing that the Treasurer previously criticised, and quite rightly so. It is necessary then for Parliament to scrutinise carefully capital expenditure in the next 12 months. All capital usage this year needs to be mainly directed towards returning investment interest, oth-

erwise the heavy borrowings will only defer the taxation rises that such expenses will incur.

I have dealt with three or four matters only on the receipts side of the budget. I contend that, if the budget is to be balanced, it is vital that those three or four items are correct, and I do not believe that the estimated amounts budgeted will be achieved. It is deceitful to use contingencies in the way they are used, and members should continue to probe the Premier on why he is using a contingency line far in excess of its normal use.

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

**Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee):** I have two or three matters that I wish to put before the House tonight. The first concerns the way in which this budget confirms the trend that I have noticed in budgets from this Government over the past four years, that is, to leave existing programs funded at the same level they were (or less) in the previous year. The Government is either leaving them as they were or reducing them, but introducing a commitment to new programs, and introducing those new programs in localities considered to be electorally sensitive and advantageous to the Labor Party.

It is clear to me that the kinds of services that people in the metropolitan area have accepted as the norm for the Government to provide are not available in rural communities of the kind that I represent. Yet, the Government not only provides these complete blanket services in the metropolitan area but also proceeds with newer schemes regardless of the morality or merit of doing so, and ignores the fact that the rural communities, paying equal shares of taxes and forgoing other benefits that they might have otherwise enjoyed from those taxes, are deprived and denied access to services existing in the metropolitan area.

I do not think that any member here who belongs to the Labor Party would say that in any of their communities there are simply insufficient or, literally, no preschool facilities available. They would take preschool for granted, be it under the CPC (Child Parent Centre) or the old Kindergarten Union programs. They have been in place for so long that new kindergartens have had to be established, in recent years, only in developing suburbs, and are generally put in place well before the demand for the service is there.

However, there are communities in the electorate I represent which do not have any preschool facilities, whether CPC or Kindergarten Union, and have great difficulty in getting even some assistance to pay the salary for a part-time kindergarten teacher. They do not have a facility, so they do not have a director. The parents organise play groups for their children. Many of those parents happen to be teachers who have moved into that locality, or other professional people working in the public or private sector—in Government departments, banks or stock firms—who have been accustomed to having preschool available to their children when they are of an age at which they are eligible for it, only to find when they arrive at, say, Geranium that there is no preschool facility.

They use a room provided by the area school part time. That means a few days a week—not five, not four but two days a week, part-time sessions. One way or another it should be possible to provide a CPC or Kindergarten Union facility with a full-time director for the children of Geranium, given that the number of children eligible to attend equals anything there is in some of the newer suburbs around the metropolitan fringe, into which preschool facilities in the form of buildings and staff have already been placed.

That is my beef about this Government's attitude to people in the country. It illustrates the fact that the Government is prepared to provide facilities in the metropolitan area, where it is electorally sensitive, and ignore the people who, apparently, have no electoral clout in that their vote will not change the Government and it will not embarrass the Government if the majority of them vote against it. That distresses me.

The same thing applies to the Police Force. Per unit area we are miles behind the metropolitan area or other urban communities. Those communities which I represent are understaffed to hell. The policeman and the policeman's wife cannot keep up with the work if they both do more than 40 hours a week in the cause of providing the services and maintaining law and order in those respective communities which members of the Australian Labor Party in this place would take for granted.

I instance the police for the very deliberate reason that I want to lead into the next matter to which I wish to draw the attention of the House. It distresses me to have to do this. I refer to a question I have on notice—question 124.

I want to find out formally from the Minister of Correctional Services what the trends have been in criminal behaviour in Murray Bridge, including reports of breaking and entering, illegal use of motor vehicles, petty larceny, assaults and the like, which have occurred in that community since 1970 until he present time on a year-by-year basis, and, since the beginning of 1986, how many of those crimes there have been each month. I also want to know formally police strength in terms of full-time equivalents posted to the Murray Bridge Police Station within that time frame and how many police personnel there have been in the Police Force (full-time equivalents) during the same time frame. I want to know how many applications there have been for Aboriginal legal aid for people committed for trial for the offences of breaking and entering, larceny, illegal use, assaults and breaking with threats and menaces in that same locality for the same time frame.

The other information of which I need the House to be aware in connection with this problem is the time at which the current building in which the police are housed was first established and what was the population of the district at that time. I also want the House to be told what substantial modifications there have been in the space available in that building for police work during that period. I want the House to be provided with the information of the number of cells and what kind of cells they are—whether suitable for adults, juveniles, female or males—since that complex was constructed.

The House should also be told why only four shifts are rostered and worked at Murray Bridge, while in every similar establishment around this State there are five and in some instances six shifts. Indeed, in Murray Bridge it is arguable that we have only about 40 to 60 per cent of the police presence that the metropolitan area and other similar communities have. Indeed, that is certainly the case for our Region Six. That is appalling and it has led to the situation in Murray Bridge where it is not uncommon for some thing like 15 of these crimes to which I have referred—illegal use of a motor vehicle, breaking and entering, burglary, assaults and larceny (apart from burning down bus shelters, public buildings, and so on, that have been happening along the way)—to be committed every night in that town. That is appalling, and it is about time the Government addressed that question and provided the people in that community with the reasonable level of police presence to which they are entitled. It is not only the police but also the Department for Community Welfare, where children's welfare is at stake

and put at risk by the kinds of attitudes and behaviour of the adults with whom they are living, and the Department of Correctional Services.

I will have more to say about that. I only hope that the request I make to the Premier to meet a deputation of people from that community will be greeted with a prompt, positive response and that he will hear from them at first hand what they see as their problems and concerns and the extent to which, if something is not done and done quickly and permanently (not just bandaid stuff), the community will suffer a total breakdown of law and order and we could expect homicide to be the result.

I turn now to the youth affairs portfolio area. I have previously referred the House to a survey I conducted during last year, International Year of Youth. I surveyed all the young people who had left the schools in my electorate and whose councils wanted to participate in that survey, which involved the years 1979 to 1985 inclusive. Those children are now young adults scattered all over the State. Many of them have gone interstate. Suffice to say that the survey received an amazing—just over 20 per cent—response rate from those children. Most people in market survey work conducting direct mail surveys of a sample scientifically determined at random count themselves lucky if they get a 2 per cent return and know that they have been very successful if they get a 3 per cent return. The results that they get are considered to be 95 per cent accurate.

I surveyed those young people by sending them a letter with an accompanying survey document, the text of which I will go through in a moment. I will then give the House some results. I wrote personally to each of those school leavers, as follows:

I am writing to you to get your help.

Why? Because I want to understand all the people I represent, regardless of their age, etc. Naturally, that includes you.

How? By conducting this survey as part of my contribution to IYY.

I need to know how you feel about things and what you think about things which affect the future we are both (indeed all) going to live in. (In peace and cooperation and respect, I hope.) So I am writing to you as one of the people in the category of 'those who have left school during the past five years'.

Will you help me by answering this survey questionnaire, then put it in the enclosed envelope and send it back to me.

Please Remember: DON'T ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS YOU DON'T WANT TO

Also Remember: ALL THE INFORMATION YOU GIVE ME IS STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL

I am only interested in the overall result: the aggregate. You can trust me with these details. You probably realise that many people come to me as their M.P. with details about very personal problems. They tell me very personal things about their lives, their business and finances, their family, their relationships, etc. They trust me. I don't 'blab about it' to anyone.

Members of Parliament must simply never betray the trust which people have to give them. If an M.P. does so, then people will never trust that M.P. again. He/she will not be given vital information about how things are going, what people are doing, thinking about, or worrying about. He/she will be out of touch. You can't help anyone, or make good laws if you're out of touch.

Please fill me in—by filling in the questionnaire. That way we'll both be in touch.

I sent that letter to more than 2 000 children along with a questionnaire inviting them to fill in their name and address. That questionnaire falls into several sections: the first is about the person filling in the questionnaire; the second is about the person's education; the third is about their attitude and other people's attitudes to them; the fourth is about work and adult life; the fifth is about leisure time activities, recreation, hobbies, etc.; the sixth is about law and order; and the seventh is about helping each other. The format of the questionnaire is as follows:

**SECTION I: ABOUT YOU**

1. Do you have any brothers/sisters?  
 Brother(s) ..... (Number)  
 Sister(s) ..... (Number)
2. Do you have any step-brothers?  
 Do you have any step-sisters?  
 Step-brother(s) ..... (Number)  
 Step-sister(s) ..... (Number)
3. Who lives in the same house as you do? (Tick Box)  
 Mother  
 Father  
 Grand-father  
 Grand-mother  
 Other adults who are relatives (c.g. uncle, etc.)  
 Brothers  
 Sisters  
 Boarders/Lodgers  
 Other children (not brothers or sisters)
4. Are you:  
 Single  
 Married  
 Married, but separated and/or divorced
5. Do you have any children?
6. If single, do you plan to marry?  
 Yes/No (circle the one which is applicable)  
 If the answer is YES, at about what age would you prefer to marry? (circle approximate age cluster of about 3 years) 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31 and beyond.
7. Do you have difficulty getting people to understand what you are trying to tell them? YES/NO. Is it easier to explain something in writing? YES/NO.
8. Are you satisfied that your schooling taught you enough about communication? YES/NO.

**SECTION II: ABOUT YOUR EDUCATION**

1. At what age did you leave school?  
 (circle appropriately) 1979 1980 1981 1982 1983 1984
2. What level did you reach when you left school?  
 (circle appropriately) Yr8, Yr9, Yr10, Yr11, Yr12, or still going to another secondary school.
3. What academic results did you obtain upon leaving school? (i.e., subjects passed (or studied) in your last year at secondary school). If matriculation, score please.
4. What was your reason for leaving school in your district?  
 (circle appropriately) Bored  
 Needed Employment  
 Other  
 To continue Education in another institution.
5. Indicate your preference of the following subjects that you did at school. (List 1 to 6 in order).  
 Science  
 Arts  
 Sport  
 Technical Studies  
 Agriculture  
 All the foregoing (no preference)
6. Was the education system adequate or not at the school you attended? YES/NO.
7. If not, what ways do you suggest to improve the education system?

**SECTION III: ABOUT YOUR ATTITUDES AND OTHER PEOPLE'S ATTITUDES TOWARDS YOU**

1. How did you feel about your parent's attitude to you as you approached school leaving age? (tick the box)  

Mother	Father
<input type="checkbox"/> Very Encouraging and Supportive	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Encouraging and Supportive
<input type="checkbox"/> Helpful	<input type="checkbox"/> Helpful
<input type="checkbox"/> Indifferent—'It's up to you'	<input type="checkbox"/> Indifferent—'It's up to you'
<input type="checkbox"/> Uncaring	<input type="checkbox"/> Uncaring
<input type="checkbox"/> Put you down	<input type="checkbox"/> Put you down
<input type="checkbox"/> Angry, discouraging and keen to see the last of you	<input type="checkbox"/> Angry, discouraging and keen to see the last of you
2. If living with other than both natural parents then, please state (i.e., step-father, aunt, foster parents, etc.) and indicate their attitude to you.  
 Very Encouraging and Supportive  
 Helpful  
 Indifferent—'It's up to you'  
 Uncaring  
 Put you down  
 Angry, discouraging and keen to see the last of you
3. What was your attitude to your parents when you left school? Did you—(tick the box)  

Mother	Father
<input type="checkbox"/> Admire and Respect	<input type="checkbox"/> Admire and Respect
<input type="checkbox"/> Just Tolerate	<input type="checkbox"/> Just Tolerate
<input type="checkbox"/> Avoid if possible	<input type="checkbox"/> Avoid if possible
<input type="checkbox"/> Reject her	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject him
<input type="checkbox"/> Loathe and Detest	<input type="checkbox"/> Loathe and Detest

**SECTION IV: ABOUT WORK/ADULT LIFE**

1. Are you presently employed? YES/NO.
2. Did/do you find first job seeking—(tick the box)  
 Easy and Immediately Successful  
 Satisfying  
 Laborious  
 Frustrating and depressing  
 Impossible
3. Are you still doing the same job? YES/NO.  
 If 'NO', how many jobs have you had? (Number)
4. Are you presently doing the kind of work that you would like to be doing? YES/NO.
5. If 'No', would you like to change work occupation? YES/NO.
6. If 'Yes', are you trying to do anything about changing?
7. What is causing high unemployment in youth in Australia? (List priority 1 to 5)  
 Wages too high  
 People unemployed don't try hard enough to get work  
 Intolerant bosses  
 Insufficient training  
 Other (please state)
8. Are youth wages (and other related costs) too high for bosses to be able to afford to employ and train them? YES/NO

SECTION V: ABOUT THE THINGS YOU DO FOR LEISURE  
TIME ACTIVITIES, RECREATION, HOBBIES,  
ETC.

1. What are the two or three most important activities for you in this category?
2. Do you belong to any clubs or organisations in your community? YES/NO.
3. If 'Yes', please list the most important and the subscriptions you pay.
4. Do you attend Church?
5. Do you go out socially?

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

**Mr GREGORY (Florey):** I have now been in this House for four years and I have been continually amazed by the attitude of members opposite when it comes to the management of the State's finances. I first entered this place a few months before the Liberal Government lost office and ever since the Labor Government has been in office it has had to adopt policies to roll back the damage caused by the inability of members opposite to manage the economy of this State. I have said before, and I shall say again, that when the Labor Government first took office, not only was the Treasury bare but it was very close to bankruptcy. Ever since we won Government we have been assailed by members opposite asking the Government to give more and tax less, but that would run the State into real debt. That exposes their limited approach to economics and the management of this State.

However, they always boast that they know how to run a business. If they were to run their businesses as they want us to run South Australia, no wonder some of them have gone bankrupt; if they have not already done so, they soon will. Their general attack in this area in the past 12 months has really been an attack on workers, and in the past few months it has turned around to an attack on women. It has attacked women as individuals and as members of our society. We had an experience here a few weeks ago when the member for Alexandra questioned the ability of Debra McCulloch to be the Chairperson of the Local Government Information Advisory Committee. I worked with Debra when she was a women's adviser to the Premier and established the Working Women's Centre. I am conceited enough to believe that it was the work that she and I did that established such an important centre in this State for women. Since its establishment, the centre has grown from strength to strength, and during the term of the Tonkin Government, the centre was funded and supported by that Government and did considerable work for females in South Australia.

The work that the centre is doing is very important, because women are an oppressed section of our community. They are the poorer paid; they have more menial jobs in industry, and in single parent families they seem to bear the brunt of the pressures. The attack by the member for Alexandra was, in essence, an attack on women themselves. It followed a decision by the Federal Council of the Liberal Party in this State when it decided that it would not support the application of the Federal discrimination legislation which would have an effect upon private industry. It would support it only in its role in dealing with Government employment—at the very same time that it is saying it will reduce the role of Government employment. So, the Liberals are saying that they will, if ever they are lucky enough to get into Government in either the State or Federal sphere, force thousands of women who work in the Commonwealth and State Public Services back into the clutches of the private enterprise people where the anti-discrimination leg-

islation would not apply. That in itself is discrimination against women.

Another attack was made by the member for Victoria when he said that he did not believe that repetition strain injury existed at all and seemed to believe that it was in the minds of the people who had it. I do not know what is the honourable member's experience in employing people, but I have been told that at best he employed two or three people at the same time. He may have employed shearers, but I think he employed shearing contractors. Even if he employed the same shearing contractor over a period of time, he would never question the fact that the same shearers never turned up. He would have assumed that they were off shearing somewhere else. The honourable member does not understand that shearers are one of the sufferers of repetition strain injury, to the extent that many of them can no longer hold the handset when shearing sheep. He does not question that, because he does not know.

The honourable member made some other points in his speech about other people such as musicians not suffering from RSI. I happen to have a sister-in-law who can no longer play the piano because of an RSI injury. She was a very good pianist and was getting to the stage where another two years of study may have seen her performing in competitions in the last half a dozen in the State. That piano career was cut short because of it.

My sister-in-law played the piano because she liked to do it, and was very skilled at it. She did not stop because she wanted to bludge and not go to work. The problem with people like the member for Victoria is that they have so little contact with women and working women that they do not know what happens to them. They do not appreciate that most sufferers of RSI in industry today are women. Those women suffer from it because they work with keyboards and the new phenomenon of information gathering and dissemination in the office with computers, new electronic typewriters, and what have you.

Some of these women are being asked to perform between 18 000 and 20 000 keystrokes an hour and, if they are not achieving that, their manager can monitor just how many they are achieving and challenge them. After four or five years those women can never work in industry again. I know women who can no longer work at the profession they chose or who are virtually crippled for life and cannot do certain things because their hands can no longer hold things with certainty. Their hands involuntary cease to hold an article; they cannot type or do much else, and feel that they are worthless.

All this is a deliberate attack on women. I do not know whether or not it is because members opposite are misanthropes. I suggest that they look up that word in a dictionary and find out what it means, although I believe that one or two members opposite may know. Virtually it means that they are men who hate women. What members opposite have said illustrates that they hate women and it illustrates their attitude towards women at work. They then say, 'We really want the women to stay at home so that they can look after the children. If they did that we would not have any of these problems of runaway children and delinquents, broken homes and so on.'

This brings me to the central attack that members opposite have been making. Their Leader—and I am not sure whether he is permanent or temporary, or whether he is on his way out or on his way in—I think on 9 September, in an article entitled 'Olsen supports the New Right', said:

Mr Olsen defended the New Right philosophies of market and labor deregulation against attacks by the Hawke Government and said calls for some revision of wage-fixing practices, labor on-costs and other initiatives deserved widespread and objective consideration.

In a speech to the Stirling Chamber of Commerce last night he said many of the changes called for by the New Right had been supported for many years by the Liberal Party.

'I make this historical point not to seek any particular credit but merely to expose those who claim the emergence of the so-called New Right lacks consistency as well as credibility. I believe much of what it is advocating is right,' he said.

Mind you, a person in Queensland who is a little further to the right than Mr Olsen has passed them off as being charlatans or something. We should examine what they are saying about wages: it is not something new. I am pleased that he has identified himself with these more vocal members—the employers and the exploitative class of people in this country. There seem to be some new members in the Liberal Party who support the same line of thinking and say that people should be able to negotiate with their employer about what they consider is a fair wage. What does that mean? It means that the girl who works in the corner deli will negotiate with the owner, or the member for Victoria who employs a chamber maid will negotiate with that girl for what he thinks he should pay her.

There would be no award to ensure that that person was paid an appropriate wage rate or worked appropriate hours. That person would have to work what the employer considered to be fair, and usually if they do not do what the employer wants they do not work. This means a reduction in rates, and that has occurred in other countries. It is now occurring to a certain extent in America, where 40 per cent of wages paid are not sufficient to support a family. Members opposite often say they support the family. However, they want the wife to stay at home to stop the kids from running on the streets, and at the same time they want to take away from the husband or breadwinner the right to be able to earn a wage or salary that can keep the wife at home. They cannot have their cake and eat it too and that is what they want. That, in itself, is another attack on women in our community. If they say so and not remove the support for those people.

Last week's *Sunday Mail* stated the philosophies of the New Right. Mr Olsen has said already that he supports the New Right and that his Party has been doing so for a long time. If the Liberal Party were in Government, I suppose that it would do such things as were stated in the *Sunday Mail* like ending indexation of pensions and benefits—it would leave that to Cabinet. The assets test would remain, but I thought that it wanted to remove the assets test. The article in the *Sunday Mail* stated also that the details of the New Right budget were that the family allowances would be taxed at the chief breadwinner's marginal income tax rate and abolished for the first child; disability pensions would be taxed for veterans and dependants; the Veterans Affairs Department would be abolished; Medicare bulk billing would be abolished and the rebate cut from 85 per cent to 60 per cent; a new means-tested charge of \$25 a day for the first week of each stay in hospital; the Government subsidy on most prescription drugs would end; and health card holders would pay a small fee up to an annual threshold. Also, tertiary education fees of \$1 000 per annum for most courses but higher fees for courses such as law and medicine would be reintroduced; grants for advanced education would be cut; the Commonwealth/State Housing Agreement would be redrafted and grants cut by half; the first home owners scheme would end and the Housing Department would be abolished; grants for road building would be halved and aid to a wide range of industries, including textiles and tourism, would be cut; and tax deductions of 150 per cent for research and technology would be removed—the only incentive for new industry research and development would be removed.

The New Right budget also would abolish all Commonwealth legal aid services—a policy that supports the wealthy as opposed to the poor; apart from training programs for Aborigines, all job creation and training programs would be closed; and local government grants would be reduced. Of course, the Federal Leader of the Liberal Party refuses to say where any of these things would be, but this is the New Right spelling out its program after the budget. We have Mr Olsen and the rabbit member for Victoria saying that they would support all these things.

One source of amazement is the recent attack on the trade union movement. When one looks at the paucity of the material opposite, I suppose that one should not be amazed. What do they really have to attack in our country? As I said before in this House, the problem that we have is that some time ago we chose to get on the commodity band wagon in our overseas exports. We did not choose to go along a path of developing our secondary industry so that we could lock into, in a selected way, the other 80 per cent of the trade that is conducted in this world. Also, we have had the spectacle of members opposite supporting their great and powerful friends. The prescription that has been put forward by members opposite to return to economic health ignores one or two things. First, it ignores the fact that the general prescription of economic theory as announced by Adam Smith, which they tend to want to embrace in large lumps, applied in an era when there were no monopolies, and when many little organisations operated in business but today those theories do not apply.

Secondly, they ignore the role that people play in our community and come to expect from the community itself. Members opposite are the first people to call for deregulation and non-interference by the Government in the conduct of affairs in this State. However, when this Government decides to get out of some of the affairs in this State, members opposite are the first to complain. I can well remember the squeals from members opposite when this Government decided to abolish the Potato Board. I will now make a general comment about the trade union movement. That subject seems to raise the ire of my friends opposite who, in most instances, have had very little to do with trade unions.

*Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:*

**Mr GREGORY:** I suggest to the member for Victoria that he has had very little to do with trade unions. Trade unions constitute an involvement in public life for workers who otherwise are not encouraged to have any such expression. At the same time, unions provide a sense of security and identity to millions of people whose employers do not care to do any such thing, and they remain consistent supporters of democracy and freedom at home and abroad.

*Mr Gunn interjecting:*

**Mr GREGORY:** That shows the absolute ignorance of the member for Eyre. When he talks about growing wheat, shearing sheep and perhaps carting wheat to a silo or wool to a railway station, I will listen to him because I think that he has some expertise in those areas. However, if the member for Eyre was confronted with a living, breathing trade unionist out in the street, he would not recognise him because he would find that trade unionists do not have horns and a tail and they do not breathe fire. In all probability, the member for Eyre would find that trade unionists are a mirror image of himself. The member would be confused because he has not seen one before, so he would not know and does not understand.

The trade union movement will not disappear or shrink into insignificance. After all, it is the most important voluntary organisation in the country by many miles. It has

been created, sustained and staffed by representatives of working people. Members opposite seem to forget that the trade union movement is a large organisation involving a lot of people. Because members opposite do not understand how unions work, they sit in this place like parrots.

*Mr Ingerson interjecting:*

**Mr GREGORY:** I think the best way that I can describe the member for Bragg is by likening him to the laughing clowns that one sees at the Royal Adelaide Show: they have their mouths open, moving from side to side and making no sense at all. Whenever I see a laughing clown at the show I am reminded of the member for Bragg, because he sits in his place with his mouth open and moving his head from side to side.

*Mr Meier interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duigan):** Order!

**Mr GREGORY:** The member for Goyder invites me to tell him how the trade unions will take over. That shows the honourable member's ignorance, because the trade unions do not want to take over and they have never said that they want to take over. They have always said that they want a fair share for their members so that they have a reasonable standard of living and are protected in the workplace. In the time left to me, I point out that in South Africa nearly 200 people died as a result of a fire in a mine. Perhaps members opposite have missed the point. A news broadcast stated that for every working day in those mines a worker dies. That means that 365 people will die this year in South Africa—a country where trade unions for black people are not allowed to operate effectively.

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

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** I rise to take part in this debate following the member for Florey, who has a peculiar sense of understanding of how the economy of this State operates. He appears to base his understanding on a situation where the unions can do no wrong and the rest of the community do not seem to have any rights. It appears that the member for Florey does not intend to listen to what I have to say in relation to the most important industry in this country and in this State, that is, the industry comprised of the agriculture and rural sectors. Any country which neglects its primary industry neglects the welfare of the community at large. That has been proved throughout the world.

The unfortunate analogy is that socialist governments throughout the world do not have any understanding and do not recognise or appreciate the real value of their primary industries. Unfortunately, they are advised by theoretical people who do not have any practical understanding of those industries. Last night it was my pleasure to attend a meeting where the Minister of Agriculture gave practical producers a lecture on socialist economics. It was like trying to swim with a lead balloon—that is how well his speech was accepted.

The unfortunate situation is that the Minister did not understand and could not appreciate the problems he was going to create for the industry. I make no apology for being a practical farmer, for being someone whose industry has been well served by the establishment of orderly marketing for primary industry in this country. Of course, that does not mean that the industry should not from time to time be scrutinised. We have to ensure that it operates efficiently, and that producers and consumers are protected. I point out what the orderly marketing system has done, especially for those members who can remember past conditions or who have talked to people who had experience with the grain industry and the people involved in it in the 1930s

before orderly marketing was introduced. It was only with the introduction of the wheat stabilisation program that the industry developed to become the second most important export earner in the country. No matter what anyone says or thinks (people can have all the prejudices they like) this country was built by the primary and mining industries, and it will be sustained by those two industries if they are given a fair go. Those industries do not ask for preferential treatment—they just want a fair go. It is my responsibility to speak on behalf of those industries for the Opposition in Parliament, and I now advise the House that I am perturbed and concerned about the situation now facing this State's graingrowing sector.

The grain industry has employed many people. The House should understand that, of the \$1 600 million that primary industry puts into the South Australian economy, about 70 per cent goes back into the local economy. That input has sustained and developed country towns and kept many people in jobs. I refer to the people who produce fertiliser, and the member for Price would be aware of the activity in his electorate at Semaphore. Also, I refer to the people who distribute fuel, and those who sell machinery.

Members should go into country towns today and see what has happened to motor vehicle suppliers and machinery agents. They should see the number of people whose jobs are on the line because producers are not buying or changing over their machinery. Producers do not have the money to do that, and they are not game to commit themselves to taking chances. Any free enterprise mixed economy system requires growth. If it does not have growth, the economy stops, and so we must encourage people to invest, take chances and create wealth. Unless there is an incentive, then primary industry, which requires a large capital investment, cannot succeed.

I have been most perturbed at the line the Commonwealth Government is taking. It came into Government with a great fanfare. The new Minister for Primary Industry was going to rationalise and straighten out the industry. We all waited with baited breath for the economic and rural policy statement in April, but what did it really do for primary industry in Australia and people in country areas?

Before the introduction of that document, the Government had made a savage attack on primary industry. Unfortunately, Australia is prone to having droughts and bad seasons. Each industry should be encouraged to stand on its own feet, especially if it is competing on the export market where we are open to world competition. Our farmers have been successful because they have been able to keep abreast of modern technology and have equal to the best machinery in the world.

That is not an idle statement. I have been lucky enough to look at farming practices around the world. Anyone who knows anything about agriculture will know that that is how we have been able to have a farming industry which has not needed the massive subsidies of the United States and the EEC, and we do not want to get to that situation. I do not believe that, in the long term, the Governments and the taxpayers of those countries will continue to tolerate that massive support.

If we are to maintain that competitive edge we have had, Governments have to recognise quite clearly that taxation systems and investment policies have to be designed accordingly. The Prime Minister has made it clear that he wants industry to invest, yet his Government took away the 40 per cent investment allowance: a quite stupid policy, because people had been encouraged to continually turn over their machinery and to keep abreast of the latest technology. The cost of labour is too high, and people have to be able to

continue to mechanise so that they can put in their crops and harvest them efficiently and quickly (because the longer the crop is out in the weather, the more likely it is to be damaged), get those crops as quickly as possible into the silo system—which is probably the best bulk handling grain system in the world—so that they can be stored and remain safe.

The Federal Government took away that investment allowance. It interfered with the income equalisation deposit scheme, which encouraged people in years of plenty to put some money away in order to draw it out when there was low income, so that they could equalise their income.

It is far better to allow people to do those sorts of things than to have to top up rural adjustment schemes. We have had statements by the Minister of Agriculture that some \$50 million will be spent this year on those support schemes. They are necessary because we have to encourage people to stay on their farms, and we have to encourage young people to go on to the land. If we are to do that, we must have in place incentives and policies which will encourage and attract, and that starts with the education facilities. If we want people to live in country areas, their children must have access to education equal to that in the larger cities and in the metropolitan area.

One of the things that has disturbed me as a member—and my electorate is further west than any other in this House—is the sort of conditions which people in my electorate have to put up with: for example, the problem of isolation. It concerns me greatly that governments can spend millions of dollars within a few kilometres of the GPO, but to try and get a few hundred thousand dollars spent in the country areas of my electorate is virtually impossible.

I want to make some comments about the Kerin economic package and some of the points that this document made under the heading of 'Key Issues.' It refers, first, to the 'maintenance and longer term development of the capital base of Australian rural industries'. They have made an attack on the capital base by bringing in a capital gains tax, by getting rid of the investment allowance and by the fringe benefits tax. That was a great help to improving the capital base. Then it refers to the 'preservation and enhancement of natural resources upon which our comparative advantage in rural production has been based'. They have taken that away. They have encouraged excessive wage claims and encouraged superannuation claims. In New South Wales the Government has been a party to the most disgraceful industrial relations record in the wharves and handling system, where millions of dollars of our export industry has been tied up and could not be shifted from the wharves. The document then refers to the 'adjustment and reorganisation of the rural capital stock in response to the underlying trends in world markets'. That is a motherhood statement, that is. Then we see 'adjustment to the Government's foreign investment policy in relation to rural land'.

That policy is a complete turnaround, because they will allow large overseas companies to come into this country and buy large quantities of land here. What the Government should be doing is making it possible for young Australians to continue to stay on the properties. Then there is a reference to the 'provision of effective management of our fisheries'. That is not an area for which at this stage I have any responsibility, and I leave that to my colleague.

If there was ever a document which was a letdown for rural industry, it was the April statement of Mr Kerin. The unfortunate situation we have in South Australia is that that package and the package of proposals contained at in the tax summit were supported wholeheartedly by the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture in South Australia. It

was a clear example of people who did not understand—and, if they did understand, obviously they did not care. I think that is not only unfortunate but contrary to the best interests of the people of this State. What we have to do in all sectors of the South Australian economy is encourage people to produce, or help those people who will create the wealth so that they can employ more people and do something about the ever-growing numbers on the unemployment list.

That is something that I sincerely believe ought to attract the attention of every member of this House, because there is nothing worse than being confronted in one's electorate office with many young people who sincerely want to work when there is no work available for them. We will not overcome those problems if we continue to burden the income producing sections of this nation with more taxes, more charges, more red tape and more controls. The recent Public Service blow out and the comments in the editorial in the *Advertiser* of 5 September give a clear warning to the Premier that he must rein in in those areas.

In a budget of about \$3 700 million, agriculture will receive \$52 million and it warranted only two paragraphs in the Premier's speech. However, the Premier has previously said that agriculture accounts for \$1 600 million and 65 per cent of our export income—but it warrants only two paragraphs in his speech. That clearly indicates the value that the Government places on this most important section of our economy. If the Minister of Agriculture continues to attack our orderly marketing system, there will be a confrontation between the Minister, the Government and the industries. I will do everything in my power to see that the silly egg Bill that is before the House and every other similar measure is defeated. I make no apology for saying that. There was not one semblance of commonsense in that measure.

I challenge the Minister to produce the so-called report on which he based his decision. He refused to produce it last night. I would like him to table in this House the figures and the surveys conducted by the Egg Board in supermarkets in Adelaide, as well as the Public Service report into the efficiency of the Egg Board. Let the Minister put those documents on the table so that people can make their own judgment. I challenge the Minister to document clearly how he will save 20c a dozen. We know that the Minister inherited this measure from his predecessor (the member for Whyalla) and his officers, one of whom was Ms Bunning.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** It was only me.

**Mr GUNN:** So the Minister is the arch villain—at least he has owned up. I thought better of the Minister.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** I am proud of it.

**Mr GUNN:** The Minister has nothing to be proud of, because this is an ill-conceived course of action doomed to failure. The State needs egg producers. Clearly, the Minister has proposed to hand over egg production to people in New South Wales; that is what will happen—there is nothing clearer. People are just waiting for this legislation to be enacted. In my judgment, that will not occur, so we will save jobs. There is no guarantee whatsoever that there will be a saving of 20c a dozen. The former Minister increased the size of the board. We believe that there should be a reduction in its membership. The Minister has appointed one of his friends, a Labor Party activist, to the board. He was of no value to the board, but I understand that the consumer representative has made an excellent contribution on that board. The membership should be reduced in size so that the board is more efficient.

If the Minister applies these standards to the Egg Board, he should apply them to Samcor. He is quite happy to get rid of the employees of the Egg Board, but he does not have



the political courage or the guts to do what should be done in relation to Samcor, because his mates in the PSA will not let him. Let the Minister front up. I make no apology for what I am saying. The board of Samcor must be given the power to manage and administer. The taxpayers can no longer continue to pay \$3 million every three years to keep that organisation running. Therefore, we are past the stage where we can just go on, and management decisions have to be made to bring it into line.

*The Hon. T.M. McRae interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** There is a great difference between the Egg Board and Samcor. The Egg Board is not costing the taxpayers any money. The Egg Board is financed by the producers—13c per hen per fortnight—and owns its own assets. It has not had to be continually bailed out as Samcor has over the years. Tough management decisions have to be made. The board knows what has to be done and needs ministerial support to carry out those decisions. If that board is not prepared to do it the Government has to appoint a board that is. There is no good beating around the bush. The Minister cannot get away by attacking the Egg Board and letting Samcor off the hook.

*The Hon. T.M. McRae interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** It is a matter of the interest of all South Australians being taken into account and the Government having to meet its responsibilities. It must facilitate the transfer of those people back into the Public Service, because they have been standing around doing nothing.

The other issue is that those people must be put under a Federal award so that there is provision when there is no work that people can be stood down with proper arrangements made. There is no good people allowing emotion to govern their judgment. Commonsense has to apply and decisions made in the interests of all sections of the community.

*The Hon. T.M. McRae interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** The honourable member will have his chance and I look forward to the contribution of the member for Playford on this matter. I look forward to furthering these discussions in the Estimates Committees of this place. At that stage we will be able to have full and frank discussions, and I am sure that they will be most invigorating.

*The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** We believe that if the right management decisions are made Samcor can run at a profit—there is no doubt about that. Samcor can be made to run at a profit with the right management and if management is allowed to manage. We need to give the board the power of management—it is a matter of commonsense. We cannot ask people to manage if we ask them to have one hand behind their back.

The Minister closed Port Lincoln—it was his decision. I am putting on record for all to see what we believe about Samcor. It is commonsense, and I make no apology. The State can no longer expect the taxpayers to pay increasing taxes and charges, running down the economy. The more taxes and charges are levied the more difficult it is for industry to develop. We have to allow industry to develop and create some wealth and employment, because the economy must be allowed to grow. The sort of economic policies currently being brought into vogue certainly will not help that aim. It is rather peculiar that it is absolutely necessary to spend a considerable amount of money upgrading the President's office in this building. I do not know how much it will cost, but it is a great exercise, because she has—

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

**Mr ROBERTSON (Bright):** I want to take the opportunity tonight to go through the parts of the budget concerned with capital works and recurrent expenditure as it relates to my electorate and pay a tribute to the Government for allocating funds in the way it has when the dollar is shrinking and the tax take has to be watched closely. What has been done with our taxes is thoroughly worthy of endorsement.

I will now raise one or two aspects from recurrent expenditure, initially in the area of children's services. One finds in the area of children's services that the home and community care (HACC) program has been allocated about \$5.8 million. People in the southern areas of Adelaide, particularly, know of the needs of many families in those areas and the way in which they will benefit from some of the HACC programs which have been instituted. In the Noarlunga area, a home and community care program has been set up enabling disabled children (a matter close to my heart) to receive after-hours care. That benefit was fought for very hard by local community organisations. I am extremely glad that they have been granted funding for that program and am sure that it will be very much appreciated.

A survey in the Noarlunga area in October last year indicated that roughly half the people with preschool aged children required out-of-hours care for those children and saw such care as their major child care need. Obviously, disabled children are in the same boat, and the HACC out-of-hours care program will cater extremely efficiently for those children, enabling parents to have at least a few hours time off to recover, retain their sanity and take a little rest and recreation so that they are able to handle the responsibility of caring for their disabled children more easily when they return.

It is pleasing to note that in the area of child care that family day care fee relief is to receive \$3.8 million. Anybody who is aware of child care problems knows what an important niche the family day care program fills. We ought to regard child care as a right rather than a privilege: it should be available to all children in the community. At the moment only 20 per cent of the population is catered for in this area and, quite rightly, it is prioritised so that working parents and unemployed people who are retraining have first call on child care systems.

It is pleasing to see that the Government has again endorsed the principle of child care and picked up the bundle, as it were, left with us to some extent by the Federal Government. We have stepped into that breach and filled it admirably. I appreciate the fact that \$3.8 million has been allocated to child care. There is obviously a need to extend that care, because, as I have mentioned, only about 20 per cent of the population have access to child care. Other people who need this benefit are single income families. There is certainly a great need for child care, particularly for the children of women left alone while their husband is at work, having taken the car, leaving them at home with the children. There is a desperate need for some of these people to gain access to child care so that they can have two or three hours off once a week in the afternoon. I am sure that that is the direction in which we are heading and I commend that action.

In the area of preschool services, I note that \$2.6 million has been allocated for the construction of child care centres. Again, this is an area bequeathed to us, or handballed to us by the Federal Government. I am pleased to note that the Hallett Cove Child Care Centre in my electorate is one of the centres constructed out of last year's budget allocation of \$3.5 million. That child care centre was only completed because of the enthusiastic support of the entire community

at Hallett Cove, including the three resident organisations in the area, all of which were under the guidance of a management committee. Of course, the centre now has an excellent staff complement and is proceeding very nicely. I again commend this Government for its commitment to a program of construction of child care centres.

I turn now to the subject of education and particularly of primary schools. It is pleasing to note that there is again an enormous commitment to the construction of new schools and to additions and upgrading of existing school hardware and buildings. Money allocated for new schools has increased from \$3.1 million last year to \$5.5 million this year, and there is to be a similar increase for additions and upgrading of primary schools; in fact, all the primary schools in my electorate have benefited from that allocation in various ways. Various school committees and councils are extremely grateful for the ease with which they have been able to put their case, the way in which they have been listened to by the previous Minister and the present Minister, and the fact that we have a compassionate and caring Administration that is willing to allocate resources where needed.

Concerning school construction under the capital works program, I cannot let this opportunity pass without referring to the building of the Hallett Cove R to 10 school, which will certainly be a great boon to the Brighton electorate, and especially the Trott Park and Sheidow Park areas adjacent to the Hallett Cove area within my electorate. In the past year, \$3.5 million was spent on stage one of that school. Another \$2.9 million will be spent, and the school will take students, amongst whom will be one or two of my children, in February next year. Stage one will be completed by that time. It is a massive undertaking, an enormously impressive place to see. It has been built with a minimum of fuss and at this stage it looks as though it will be finished absolutely on time ready to take children at the beginning of the first term next year.

Stage two of the school will commence in October this year and continue through to February 1988. The total estimated cost of that project is an additional \$4 million, of which \$1.35 million will be spent in the current financial year. That will give us the first two stages of a three stage project. The total cost of the school will be about \$8 million. It is an exciting concept: the concept of an R to 10 school is reasonably new in the metropolitan area, although it is quite similar to area schools in the country. The community in the area is justifiably proud and excited at the prospect of having a school built at Hallett Cove. It is a new school, done in a new way for a new community. It is thoroughly deserved, with the amount of community effort that has gone into organising, running and coordinating the building of that school. The running of the interim school council has been quite amazing and quite pleasing to see. The residents' organisations of the area deserve kudos and praise for their support for the school council. I heartily endorse the R to 10 concept, and I am sure that it is something that the community feels will be of great benefit.

I turn now to matters pertaining to people at the other end of the age spectrum. There are many older people in the northern part of my electorate. The City of Brighton has the third largest concentration of retired people in the Adelaide area, following Norwood and Glenelg. It is right and proper that I should take this opportunity to record the massive support that Brighton council has given to the aged people in Brighton over the past five or 10 years in particular. It is good to see the way in which the Government has picked up its responsibility in relation to the aged as a group in the community. I note that in the budget papers

concessions to pensioners, whether they be aged people or unemployed, come to a massive figure.

The cost of electricity concessions is \$5.89 million. Concessions on land tax and local government rates account for \$12.5 million. Rail freight and transport concessions amount to \$3.7 million, and water and sewerage rate concessions come to over \$11 million. That is a massive commitment towards trying to make the lives of older people a bit happier and allow them to live with a certain amount of dignity, particularly those people on some form of social security who really need to spin out their pensions as far as possible. Concessions for electricity, land tax, transport, and water and sewerage rates certainly enable them to do that. Obviously, even the age pension has not yet reached 25 per cent of weekly earnings—which are busily in the process of going backwards, anyway—and it is necessary for the Government to again pick up the tab and to supplement incomes by means of a form of social wage, which ought to be a Federal Government responsibility.

We have done as much as we can be expected to do in augmenting the rather meagre incomes of people on social security by allocating money for concessions in that way. It is worth noting also from the budget the very admirable idea of the grants for seniors scheme which in this financial year has been allocated \$150 000, and the Home and Community Care program allocation specifically for senior citizens centres of \$812 000. I applaud that allocation.

I believe that if people in the twilight of their lives cannot have fellowship and companionship with one another and cannot mix with other people of their own age and share their experiences, they are bound to have a far less happy existence and that it will probably shorten their lives. I regard some of the activities currently encouraged by this Government, especially in communities like Brighton, as being life strengthening, and life lengthening programs. I am sure that grants such as the HACC senior citizens centre grant and the grants for seniors scheme will go a long way towards making the lives of these people a good deal more bearable.

In my electorate they have provided small, inexpensive but most important things such as mats for indoor bowling competitions, board games, tea urns, cups and saucers. All those things come out of seniors grants and are most welcome by the people who receive them. It also allows those of our senior citizens who are able bodied to remain able bodied even longer by staying active and maintaining an interest in sport and fellowship with one another.

Another point that needs to be picked up is the concessions to aged persons. Under the Department of Transport \$270 000 has been allocated to allow pensioners and other State concession card holders to go interstate. In this case it allows older people to go interstate to see their children or grandchildren and take a bit of R&R away from Adelaide. After the winter that we have just been through, that could be a very good idea. If we were suffering from arthritis, we might be tempted to take advantage of that ourselves. It is also worth noting the taxi service for the disabled and the allocation of \$512 000 for that. It is a new scheme and an excellent innovation, providing enhanced mobility for people who previously had none, and enabling those of our senior citizens who have not previously been able to take part in these activities in senior citizens centres to get there, partake of those activities and to gain from them.

Turning very briefly to the area of capital works, I think it is worth noting, particularly in my electorate in the southern part of Adelaide, that a great deal will be gained from the allocation to the Happy Valley water filtration plant. The total cost of that project is in excess of \$75 million,

but in this financial year slightly more than \$11 million has been allocated for continuation of the work at that plant. I can assure members, as one who lives there that, although the water in the southern suburbs is quite nutritious and crunchy, it lacks a certain taste which we might expect when we have the filtration plant up and running. I look forward to the time in 1990 when that innovation is finally put on stream. It will represent a major improvement in the quality of life for people in the southern suburbs, and again I applaud the allocation. It is a most welcome improvement.

Again in the area of the Engineering & Water Supply Department, I take this opportunity to record the gratitude of the community of Hallett Cove Estate, which has been on the survey map since 1912. It is not exactly a new suburb, but we have finally managed to persuade the E&WS Department to put sewers into the older portion of the Hallett Cove Estate. This battle has been fought by a number of residents, one of whom, Mrs Doreen Davis, has been absolutely tireless in pursuing that objective. I do not blame her for, if one has been waiting for sewerage since 1912, obviously that is a reasonable complaint.

Mrs Davis has received admirable support from the Karara Residents Association, the Hallett Cove Estate Community Association and the Hallett Cove Beach Progress Association, and all these groups deserve credit for the tenacity that they have shown and the political literacy that they have exhibited in persuading the E&WS Department to implement that scheme. It is certainly long overdue, and I applaud the decision to go ahead with it.

I will pick up some of the other areas of expenditure which are particularly welcome and which I see as being especially relevant to my electorate. I note that in the allocation for the State Transport Authority another \$10.5 million is provided for new rail cars. Anyone who has travelled on the major lines, particularly the Noarlunga line, will note that for obvious reasons people queue up to go on the new rail cars and tend to shy away from the red hens, which have provided sterling service, having operated for in excess of 20 years. I am pleased to see that the replacement program is being hurried up. The total cost of the program will be something like \$23.4 million, and the increase in this year's allocation to \$10.5 million is most welcome.

This provides an excellent service for the people living in the south-western suburbs. Hallett Cove residents, for example, can travel to town during peak hours in 20 minutes or slightly less. Those of us who travel by car—some would say foolishly—sometimes face up to 45 minutes travelling time from Hallett Cove to North Terrace. I again welcome the Government's commitment to hurry that program along to get those new rail cars onto the rails where they can be appreciated so that we can upgrade our public transport system to a level that is at least equal to that in other States.

I also note in the State Transport Authority allocation that \$200 000 has been provided to upgrade car parks and that \$287 000 has been provided to upgrade various railway stations. I have eight railway stations in my electorate. I think the largest number in any suburban electorate, but possibly the member for Eyre has more. Everyone of those stations, with the exception of the smallest one (Marino Rocks) has benefited during the past year from that funding allocation. I am confident that they will benefit again. I refer to minor works, such as upgrading car parks and footpaths. The State Transport Authority really does listen, and it is nice to see Government authorities that are capable of listening to the people. I commend the State Transport Authority on its ability to listen and respond to the people who use the service. The residents of Hallett Cove Beach will be provided with a resurfaced car park and the residents

of Hove, Hallett Cove and Brighton, who will obtain improvements in their car parks, would also acknowledge that, although the State Transport Authority does not have money to throw around, it certainly listens.

Another allocation under the transport line on which I wish to comment concerns an allocation of \$280 000 for publicity and promotion surrounding the road safety program and a further \$240 000 for research in that area. Some of that, at least, will go towards the bicycle helmet program, which I thoroughly applaud. The target groups have been young children and adults, at this stage. It seems, from an article that appeared in the *Advertiser* yesterday which indicated a 20 per cent increase in the wearing of helmets by adults and young children, that it has been partially successful. I look forward to further allocations so that the program can be extended to the problem group—adolescent children—who so far have not taken to wearing helmets.

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

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles):** As I rise to speak, I note that it is nine years to the day since I was elected to the House of Assembly as member for Coles. I am indebted to the member for Hayward, who reminded me of this anniversary, which would otherwise have passed me by. It has certainly been an eventful nine years.

In addressing myself particularly to tourism and environment and planning aspects of the Government's budget, I want to put my comments on those aspects in the context of the budget as a whole and, in particular, relate it to some aspects of the Auditor-General's Report on State Government expenditure for the year ended 30 June 1986.

It is important that what I say about the tourism, environment and planning appropriations is seen in the context of Government expenditure in other areas, in the Government's priorities and in the Government's lack of management of funds. I refer particularly to those aspects of the Auditor-General's Report that point to the comparison of cleaning contract services and the savings in those areas which could be made to workers compensation and the Auditor's criticism of the management and administration of claims and to workers compensation in particular for Government employees in the Education Department, the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Police Department and the Correctional Services Department.

In making reference to the cutting of expenditure in tourism, environment and planning—three critical areas for the State—I believe it is important to look at expenditure in other areas and the way in which proper control has not been exercised. I refer firstly to page 7 of the Auditor-General's Report and to the Auditor's analysis of savings which could be made by the Government in cleaning services. The Auditor states:

Last year I reported that, since 1979, the Education Department had been progressively phasing out, whenever practicable, petty cleaning contracts as they expire. It has sought competitive tenders to replace those contracts; and also for the cleaning of new school premises.

However, the Auditor further states:

At June 1986, industrial cleaners were responsible for cleaning 667 000 square metres of Education Department property, compared with 587 000 square metres at June 1985.

The cost effectiveness of this arrangement is illustrated in the following table—

	Average Cost Per Square Metre Cleaned
	\$
Industrial Contractors .....	7.11
Petty Contractors .....	11.04
Departmental Workforce .....	12.39

That is a very significant difference. The Auditor-General continues:

Based on present contracts the department has estimated annual savings in using industrial cleaners at \$2.6 million.

I will base my analysis of the appropriations for the departments of Tourism, Environment and Planning on the premise that that kind of expenditure could have been very profitably put to the advantage of the State, particularly in the area of tourism, where it could be construed to be not expenditure but, rather, as investment to generate revenue for the State, but those areas have been cut while the Government has failed to exercise the discretion that it could have exercised in saving \$2.6 million by using industrial contractors instead of a departmental work force for Education Department cleaning.

At page 8 of the report the Auditor directs attention to the operations of the Government Insurance Fund and states:

... and the significant increase which has occurred again this year in workers compensation claims paid in 1985-86 for Government employees. Net claims paid increased by \$5.4 million to \$26.2 million.

The Auditor-General also states:

The main components of the increase were in *Weekly Payments*, up to 21 per cent to \$11.9 million; and in *Lump Sum Settlements*, up 31 per cent to \$10.9 million.

There is something very seriously wrong with a Government that claims it is concerned about occupational health and safety yet also allows workers compensation costs to increase at such an extraordinary rate. The same cost escalation is highlighted on page 122 of the Auditor-General's Report where reference is made to the workers compensation costs under the CEP scheme. Under the Community Employment Program the amount for workers compensation costs for coverage of persons employed is \$2.2 million. However, when one looks at the cost of the CEP schemes, one finds comparatively small grants proportionate to the cost of workers compensation. For example, the Home Assistance Scheme received a grant of \$894 000; the Jubilee Youth Employment Program received a grant of \$815 000; the CEP scheme received a grant of \$800 000; the Adult Unemployment Support Program received \$350 000; the Self Employment Venture Scheme received \$324 000; and other minor schemes received \$332 000. Therefore, total funding for Commonwealth Government Community Employment programs amounted to \$26.7 million while we paid \$2.3 million in workers compensation.

On a ratio basis it is quite extraordinary to spend that kind of money for workers compensation on programs which in pro rata terms are worth comparatively little. There is something seriously wrong with that. It is quite clear that taxpayers' money is being spent in a way that is bringing very little benefit indeed to anyone except perhaps the health profession and lawyers. In relation to the South Australian Health Commission, for example, for the Strathmont Centre and Community Services the Auditor-General claims that over \$400 000 could have been earned each year since November 1983, which amounts to \$1.2 million by November 1986 (and those figures are on page 344 of the Auditor-General's Report). So, we are talking about big money that could have been saved on the Auditor's estimates; we are talking about several million dollars.

However, what do we find in the tourism budget—an area which the Government claims is the great growth area and an industry reputedly worth \$1 billion annually to the State of South Australia? We find that the budget has been actually reduced in real terms. On page 24 of the Financial Statement of the Premier and Treasurer it is stated:

Tourism is an area where there are excellent prospects for continuing growth in 1986-87 as a result of events overseas and the devaluation of the Australian dollar. A number of improvements and initiatives will be undertaken through a reallocation of resources—

not increased resources but a reallocation; in other words, robbing from Peter to pay Paul—

to maximise the potential growth in this industry. There will be significant changes to the structure and services provided for tourism in the regions—

yes, big changes such as big cuts, for example—

and a greater emphasis given to market research. The Adelaide Convention Centre will be opened during this financial year—

not if the Builders Labourers Federation has anything to do with it—

and should further enhance South Australia's ability to compete in both the national and international convention market. An amount of \$985 000 is provided to support the first year's operation of the centre.

That seems fine until one actually looks at the tourism budget, which is artificially inflated by the inclusion of that \$985 000. It is a new sum, which makes the tourism budget appear as if there has been a slight (approximately 5.5 per cent) increase in funds, which still amounts to a decrease in real terms, when 8 per cent inflation is taken into account. However, if one reduces that in round terms of \$1 million, the total Tourism Department budget is barely \$8.5 million, which is positively puny compared to its interstate counterparts.

The devaluation of the Australian dollar, which certainly represents an opportunity for the tourism industry in South Australia, has that opportunity virtually cancelled out if our interstate competitors are more effective in competing for the international tourism dollar and indeed competing for the Australian and South Australian tourism dollar than we are. The reality is that our tourism budget, with all its inflated inclusions, which represent new amounts rather than increases on existing programs, of \$9.6 million has to compete against a budget in the Northern Territory of \$12 million and in Western Australia a budget of \$14 million, plus \$2.6 million that will be generated in revenue; in other words, a total source of expenditure in that State of \$16.6 million. We also have to compete with Queensland which is spending \$15 million in total, \$8.3 million being spent on marketing.

It is abundantly clear that South Australia will be left at the starting post. We have not a hope of competing with other States in a highly competitive market when our funds are not even maintained at a constant level but are in fact reduced. It is a severe indictment of both the Minister of Tourism and the Premier that the tourism budget in South Australia represents the lowest expenditure per capita of any Australian State.

I exempt from that statement New South Wales, because it is very difficult to separate the tourism budget from the recreation and sport budget and, in any case, on a per capita basis New South Wales population could distort that expenditure comparison. However, the principal components of the tourism budget are where severe criticism must be directed to the Government, especially the puny amounts allocated for tourism advertising and promotion.

Last year \$2.5 million was voted for that purpose. This year \$2.228 million has been allocated, a substantial reduction in actual money and even more substantial in real terms when one realises that the rate of inflation in media costs for advertising and promotion is not so much like 8 per cent but more like 18 per cent. In other words, the Government has deprived South Australia of any meaningful opportunity to compete for the Australian tourism dol-

lar. and that at a time when next year is will be a taxing one for the industry in more ways than one.

It will have to bear heavier costs than ever before. There will be no jubilee year to build up the figures. In fact, there will be a slack period, which has been acknowledged by the department itself. In a paper prepared for the Tourism Industry Plan Forum, the department states:

Based on its own recent performance, South Australia will have to work hard to maintain and improve its market share. There will be intense competition from interstate destinations and as more and more accommodation comes on stream from the ongoing resort development boom occurring elsewhere in Australia.

I believe that the Government has dealt a very severe blow to the one bright hope that South Australia has of pulling itself out of the economic doldrums, and it is a very short-sighted policy which, certainly, will not serve this State well. In addition to the cuts in the advertising and promotion budget there has been a substantial cut in the capital grant for assistance for facilities development.

From \$966 000 voted in 1985-86, that line has been slashed to \$855 000. It would be worthwhile for the House to note that there is a backlog of not hundreds of thousands but several million dollars in applications for those funds for facilities development from local government throughout South Australia and if, indeed, we are to upgrade our tourism infrastructure and develop our tourism product, slashing the facilities development assistance line is not the way to do it. We will just become less competitive and literally shabby in our regions, and visitors will go away in droves when they find that we cannot provide the basic facilities needed for them.

Another very serious point which has been solidly criticised by the Chairman of the South Australian Association of Regional Tourism Organisations is the failure of the Government to provide regional tourist office funding and to provide for the implementation of recommendations of the task force report into regional tourism. The regions were pinning great hopes on the implementation of that report: it is quite clear that those hopes are not going to be realised.

In the few minutes remaining I wish to turn briefly to the environment and planning budget and highlight the fact that, once again, the funds provided for national park management are totally inadequate. If the \$2 million that could have been saved by adjusting cleaning contracts in the Education Department could have been spent in national parks it still would have been barely enough to rescue our parks from the crisis situation which is enveloping them at the moment. The Premier states that there is to be a minor reallocation of staffing to increase National Parks and Wildlife Services by five additional staff members. That will still leave the service very much under its staff ceiling as approved by the Public Service.

There is approval on the books for a number of extra staff, and it is quite clear that the Government has no intention of appointing people to those positions. The result is that the situation which I outlined in my Address in Reply speech on 6 August (page 141 of *Hansard*) is going to be exacerbated. Parks throughout the State will fall into an even more decrepit state than they are at present, and the park rangers will find themselves faced with an even more intolerable position.

The same goes for coastal management: funds there are completely inadequate for fulfilling the task of coastal management, as are the funds for pollution management. These things could be understood if the Government was not wasting funds elsewhere.

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

**The Hon. T.M. McRAE** secured the adjournment of the debate.

## ADJOURNMENT

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Labour):** I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey):** I want to take this opportunity to draw to the attention of the House a report entitled 'Report of the Working Group on Options for Salinity Reduction', which was prepared and presented to the Murray-Darling Basin Ministerial Council. This report is of considerable significance to South Australia in that it identifies work that must be undertaken if we are to control the build-up of salinity in the Murray-Darling Basin and at the same time maintain a salinity level at Morgan that is acceptable to the people of South Australia.

In many respects, the report is similar to the position paper that was presented to the Federal Government and the Governments of Victoria and New South Wales by the South Australian Government in 1981. One might say that in some respects we have not progressed a great distance in the past five years. However, the report is significant, and it certainly has my support. In summary at page 7, clause 6, under the heading 'River Murray Commission Salinity Objectives' states:

The salt interception and river management options identified in this report have the potential to reduce River Murray salinity at Morgan to less than 800 EC for 95 per cent of the time.

That objective certainly has my total support, and it was the objective of the position paper presented in 1981 by the Tonkin Government. Most members would be aware that the World Health Organisation lays down an upper limit of 830 EC units as the maximum salinity level desirable for potable water: in other words, the salinity level of water for human consumption should not exceed 830 EC units. Once again, the problem is that the report must be accepted, and the means by which such works will be funded has been an ongoing problem for years. I hope that as a result of this report to the Ministerial Council we will see action in the very near future. The report clearly identifies the works that must be undertaken, and in the main they are well known to us. The schemes, ranked in order of economic merit, are as follows:

Improved Mildura Merbein/Buronga works.

That will improve the salinity level at Morgan by 5 EC units. In fact, all the figures are based on improving the water quality at Morgan. Other schemes are:

Chowilla ground water interception	(17 EC)
Berri East ground water interception	(7 EC)
Mallee Cliffs ground water interception	(4 EC)
Waikerie ground water interception	(16 EC)
Woolpunda ground water interception	(32 EC)

We have referred to the Woolpunda ground water interception in this House previously. If we can achieve a salinity reading at Morgan of less than 800 EC units for 95 per cent of the time, I believe that most people in South Australia would agree that that was acceptable and highly desirable. That objective can be achieved if the recommendations of this report are put into effect after adoption by the four Governments concerned. For a long time I have said that, if such a scheme is to get off the ground, given overseas experiences, it must be funded largely by the Federal Government.

It is a national resource and, human nature being what it is, the Governments and people of Victoria and New

South Wales are not necessarily going to carry out work in their State, principally at their cost, for the benefit of people further downstream. This has been proved in other parts of the world and, until the Federal Government or the country concerned is prepared to come in and put in the lion's share of the capital cost, projects such as the one described in this document just never get off the ground. I still maintain that the Federal Government should contribute 70 per cent of the total cost of capital works required, with the three States concerned contributing 10 per cent each. On that basis the work would proceed and would have the support of all concerned.

To refer briefly to some of the contents of this report, in the conclusions, clause 1, headed 'Trends in River Murray salinity', states:

Changes in land use over the last 150 years have seriously upset the hydrogeological balance of the Murray Darling Basin resulting in higher groundwater levels and increased movement of saline groundwater to the Murray.

If there were no further changes to the use and management of the land and water resources of the basin a new hydrogeological equilibrium would eventually be reached driven by processes already set in train. This new equilibrium is not expected to be established for more than 100 years. Over this time there will be potential for an increase in the salinity of the River Murray.

The report further describes the increases that would be likely to occur if no work is undertaken. We exceed the World Health Organisation recommendation of 830 EC units at Morgan most of the time, and it is absolutely essential that this work be undertaken. We are talking of an amount of some \$44 million in capital cost to implement the recommendations of this report. If that \$44 million were spread over the next 10 years and was financed on the basis I suggested of 70 per cent coming from the Commonwealth and 10 per cent from each of the three States—New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia—the load would not be excessive.

We are talking about a resource that is estimated to contribute in the vicinity of \$10 000 million annually to the economy of Australia—a massive contribution. The small contribution that would be required to be put back into that resource over the next 10 years to maintain and in fact improve the quality to a slight degree is very small indeed.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** It would still not be the ultimate solution.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** No, it would not be. Nothing is the ultimate solution. Whilst we have a right to use that resource we have a moral obligation to look after it and hand it over to the next generation in better condition than we inherited it. Whilst I agree that it is not the ultimate answer and that nothing is the ultimate answer, it does at least preserve the situation and slightly improve it. Until we have better answers, as it is an ongoing work that will have to be done in any resource utilised for the benefit of people, there has to be a capital input to preserve it. I ask the Government where it stands in relation to this report. I hope that it supports it and will come up with the necessary State contribution to enable it to be implemented.

**Mr ROBERTSON (Bright):** I rise again tonight to comment on a particular budget allocation about which I feel a little less sanguine. I think that this matter deserves a certain amount of thought. I certainly hope that the points I make tonight will be taken seriously. This, again, involves the Department of Transport's allocation and Highways Department money set aside for stormwater drainage. I note that in the budget papers last year, and again this year, an amount of \$3.2 million was set aside for drainage works. That, in itself, is admirable.

However, I am concerned that some of this money is bound to find its way into drainage programs in the eastern suburbs. That is fine, provided it is used in the right way. My concern is that part of this money will be spent on the so-called five creeks in the eastern suburbs. I believe that the allocation of money to be spent there ought to be looked at closely before that money is, in fact, spent. Indications are that of the five creeks in the eastern suburbs only two retain any vestige of their seemingly natural environment—Fourth Creek in the Campbelltown area and Fifth Creek in the East Torrens council area.

Bits and pieces of these creeks are in reasonably good condition, but other parts are absolutely abysmal. I had the unfortunate experience of living for 15 years in the electorate of the member for Morphett near Sturt Creek. I am sorry that I missed out on the run in the *Messenger* newspaper in which the honourable member listed all the Labor members living in his constituency. I escaped in the nick of time and now live in the district that I represent. During my time in Morphett, and while living near Sturt Creek, I was struck by the waste of that resource.

In the 1960s this was a pristine creek with running water, reeds, fish, birds, yabbies and playing areas for children; it was turned into a concrete waterway in the name of flood mitigation and completely spoilt. That action was taken with no sensibility or sensitivity. That creek now has around it no animals, no wildlife, no trees and no yabbies, tadpoles, reeds, birds or fish, no playing areas for children, no fishing, no canoeing areas, and no recreation areas. To all intents and purposes it is a complete and utter waste of time as a natural resource. It is not being used intelligently.

I sincerely hope that similar things will not be done in the name of progress to Fourth and Fifth Creeks in the eastern suburbs. It seems to me that we have destroyed a unique opportunity to use this creek environment for the benefit of our children and people who want recreation from those creeks. I would hate to see the same thing happen again. Indications are that this problem has been foreseen for some time. I point to a 1977 publication, *Five Creeks*, produced by the Civic Trust of South Australia, and edited by Jim Warburton, from the Continuing Education Department of Adelaide University.

In this publication Jim Warburton points out some of these problems. It grieves me that this publication was not read as closely as it might have been. In it he points out these problems in the following words:

Erosion of the creek banks and flood-control measures form the most visible signs of the European impact. Engineering works have run into millions of dollars, much of it avoidable if flood plains had been preserved, as was possible in a new city with so much developmental space. Adelaide has lost the chance of planning with nature instead of against it.

He points out that nobody in particular was to blame for this happening; it was just the way that the area developed. Mr Warburton says:

Undoubtedly, private ownership of the creeks inhibited good planning at that time.

From the book, it seems that Fourth and Fifth Creeks escaped partially unscathed. In that regard the book states:

More by luck than design there remain a few open spaces on the flood plains to show what could have been achieved naturally, even without much reduction of proprietorial rights or short-term profits.

According to the book, the advantages of retaining the creeks would have been: preservation of more open space; the encouragement of ribbons of native flora; removal of noxious and spontaneous regrowth and by replanting, sympathetic treatment of beds and banks, with less concrete and more accommodation to nature; removal of rubbish and visible sewer and water pipes—

*Mr Ingerson interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the member for Bright to resume his seat. I have called the member for Bragg to order on four occasions. I ask him to show the Chair respect and to be silent when silence is called for. One of the disadvantages in Parliament is to have to sometimes sit down and listen to things with which one disagrees, but I ask that members of the Opposition show the same courtesy that was extended to the first speaker in this debate.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker—I appreciate your intervention. In my view, the advantages outlined in the publication are obvious. It would have provided recreation space, what is known as visual amenity to people in the area, corridors for animals to move up and down, and for native animals to migrate across the Adelaide Plains. It would have restored natural flood plain areas and it would have allowed for floods to occur naturally and not be constrained within narrow channels which in themselves are often the cause of a flood. To a large extent, the cause of flooding in these creeks has been the man-made earthworks, the bridges and pylons that gather tree branches, and so on. This exacerbates the build-up of water, and narrows and constricts the channels into which the creeks are forced to flow.

Had the flood plains been left in their natural state, ironically fewer floods would have occurred. According to the book, that would have provided a far more flexible use of open space and recreation, both structured and unstructured, could certainly have been programmed in. It would have been advantageous for native animals as well as for humans, and it seems to me that we have lost that advantage completely. It may be, though, that things are not totally bleak. It may be that people have now woken up. I note that in the past year or so a group known as the Fourth Creek Preservation Committee has written to the Environment Protection Council, in the following terms:

The Campbelltown City Council, through the services of an engineering consultant, is in the process of designing a flood mitigation plan for Fourth Creek.

The residents explained that they were alarmed by certain proposals. They point to the possibility of eucalypts being removed, banks being realigned and covered with concrete and stone work, and the possibility that natural seepage from the creeks will be completely cut off and that the remaining native trees, particularly, the river red gums, will die as a result of that. The committee also points out that it considers that there was an over-reaction to the 1981 flood and it reiterates the point that I made earlier that, had the creeks been handled in a sensitive and intelligent way in the first place, the floods would never have happened. In its letter the committee also makes the point that the 1981 flood was a one in a 100 year flood and that such a flood will not occur very often.

I think that things are probably a little better than they were. I certainly hope that the councils in the eastern suburbs have woken up to some of the advantages to retaining the remainder of the creeks in their present state. I point out that the preservation committee organised a petition, which was presented to the Campbelltown City Council, on which 630 signatories maintained that they wanted Fourth Creek left pretty much in its native condition. They were not particularly enamoured of the council's proposal for further works, and the committee urged the council to consider the matter very carefully before converting what are regarded as natural portions of the creek to a cultured, cement clad and completely useless version of a natural asset. I sincerely hope that none of the \$3.2 million of Highways Department funds is allocated to projects of that nature.

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

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** I notice in the press and on the electronic media that the subject of licensing of travel agents has once again come to the fore. It probably was brought to a head by a statement made by AFTA Chief Executive, Mr John Dart, who made the observation that, following the introduction of travel agent licensing in January 1987, 400 travel agencies would close their doors by the end of the year and 1 000 would also close their doors by the end of the decade. The question of licensing and the subject of trust accounts for travel agents was first raised in the Parliament last February. It came before the Parliament with the Government introducing a Bill which had the aims to establish: first, an industry based compensation fund; secondly, a uniform system of agent licensing; thirdly, a board of trustees comprising industry, Government and consumer representation; and, fourthly, strict licensing requirements and minimum financial criteria and standards for travel agents. It was based on model legislation introduced in New South Wales, Victoria and Western Australia. At the time the Bill went through the House, we were told by the Attorney-General that, as a result of the Bill, all licenced agents would be required to contribute to the fund according to the size of their business. The moneys would be used to compensate consumers who suffered through the collapse of a travel agent. At the time, the Attorney-General claimed full support from the travel industry for this measure. In particular, the Australian Federation of Travel Agents (AFTA) came out strongly in support.

My information is that the legislation did not receive 100 per cent endorsement by the industry, many of whom still see the need for trust accounts to protect travellers' funds. I think the House should address this subject. There is no doubt that by simply licensing agents and having compensation funds we will not stop agents investing customers' funds to their own gain to supplement their own cash flow and meet routine weekly expenses such as wages, power, light, etc. It will not stop agents going into insolvency. It will not protect travellers' funds if a company goes into liquidation, and these are important factors.

At the time the legislation passed, the Attorney-General rejected the concept of trust accounts as being unnecessary, claiming that licensing regulations would be sufficient. If it is unnecessary in the travel business, then pray tell me why it is retained amongst the legal fraternity and land agents? Surely if the legal fraternity believes that trust accounts are vital in their profession, and also if the powers that be and the Government believe that land agents should have trust accounts, pray tell me why the Government does not consider that travel agents should have trust accounts?

I was alarmed to read a report that appeared in the *Advertiser* on 12 July of this year in which a Mr Clayton, the Manager of the Australian International Travel Centre at Brighton, made certain statements. When referring to other professions that were compelled to have trust accounts, Mr Clayton said:

... other comparable industries, such as real estate, were forced to have trust accounts yet the new system for licensing of travel agents did not include this.

The report continued:

Mr Clayton said this was because the Australian Federation of Travel Agents had not advocated trust accounts to the Government in its legislating for licensing. And AFTA had not wanted trust accounts because some of its members relied on using and investing the cash flow from travellers' booking payments to stay in business.

He said he believed moneys paid by travellers in good faith to a travel agent should be placed in a trust account so it could not

be used by the agents other than for paying the tour operators, such as the airlines. Trust accounts could be audited or random checks make sure agents were obeying such requirements.

Travel agents should be in business from selling travel, not existing on investing clients' money, he said.

He said trust accounts would mean that, if a travel agency did fail, the travellers' payments would at least be safe. Yet the system to be used under the new legislation—of paying a licensing fee into a central fund—would not necessarily be enough to cover collapses by agencies that may have taken a lot of money without issuing tickets.

Mr Clayton, on 26 August, made further comments in the *News*, and I think they are quite relevant. He said:

Adelaide travel agency manager, Mr Peter Clayton, slammed the licensing as useless without trust accounts. He said discounting on airline and group bookings had forced some agencies to trade on fares with commissions as low as \$20.

This is causing them to run their business, including payment of wages, on clients money, he said.

There is a distinct danger there. The report continued:

If there was a trust account and the company could not run on the commissions they make from sales then at least the client's deposited money, if it was safeguarded in a trust account, would be returnable, he said.

Mr Clayton suggested the use of a scheme similar to that for insurance brokers, where accounts were more regulated.

The final comment by AFTA President, Phil Hoffmann, in the same article, perhaps underscores the resistance to trust accounts that was offered by AFTA to the Government at the time the legislation was passed. The report stated:

I am not against control for protection of consumers but the moment a government body comes in to it someone has to pay. Travel agents just do not have that kind of money, he said.

He said banks and other businesses survived on using clients' money.

We are no different to them in a similar situation where the consumer is allowed to dominate the market, he said.

The key words there are that banks and other businesses survived on using clients' money. Really, he is saying that the travel industry should be allowed to trade on the moneys collected from the sale of tickets. After the initial injection of capital to set up a business, I believe that travel agencies should use the commissions that it receives for the legitimate running of its business. To take any other course of action, I believe, is wrong. If this is enforced by way of trust funds, there would be no need to set up a compensation fund and force legitimate well run agencies to contribute. That is what will have to occur under the Government's legislation.

The Government should adopt this course of action of removing the need for licensing and the compensation fund and revert to a system of trust funds. Legitimate business has nothing to fear. The Government can still achieve its licensing. However, to take a course of action other than trust funds will not ultimately provide protection. That is what this legislation sets out to achieve—protection for the travelling public and protection for their investment, not necessarily to give travel agents a vast amount of capital on which to run their businesses.

I urge the Government to amend its legislation and allow trust accounts in the travel industry. This will protect the public more than the present system, which the Government is about to implement on 1 January next year and which is already proving unpopular in the travel industry.

Motion carried.

At 10.20 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 18 September at 11 a.m.